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1. INDLEDNING

Dette projekt bærer titlen Dzień dobry, Europa, der kan oversættes som "Goddag, Europa". Det er polsk, og det referer til Polens nye rolle som medlem af den Europæiske Union.


Som ny aktør i EU og med en nyere historie, der er markant anderledes end de vestlige EU-landes, skiller Polen sig ud på mange områder. Polen er økonomisk set stadig bagud i forhold til vestlig standard, og det er vores opfattelse, at man i Danmark også på andre områder betragter polakker og andre nye EU-medlemslande fra den tidligere østblok som anderledes end vesteuropæere: I nogen grad associeres Polen også i dag med gråt betonbyggeri og illegal arbejdskraft.

Denne rapport skal imidlertid ikke handle om Polen set med danske eller vestlige øjne; den skal handle om Polen og Europa – set med polske øjne. Deraf projektets polske titel. I dette polske perspektiv mener vi, at spørgsmålet om, hvad natio-
nal og europæisk identitet er, bliver mest interessant, fordi Polen som nation har en omvæltningstrykt historie, der gør, at landet i nogen grad i dag betragtes som værende på kanten af Europa.

Polakkerne virker om nogen entusiastiske i forhold til ideen om et europæisk samarbejde i form af EU. Ved traktatafstemningen 2003 stemte polakkerne for optagelse i EU med et rungende ”ja”, også hvis man tager den forholdsvis lave valgdeltagelse i betragtning. Polakkerne vil altså gerne EU, men hvad er det for et Europa de vil?

Genstanden for vores rapport er således polakkers opfattelse af fællesskaber; herunder deres eget nationale fællesskab og deres nye fællesskab, EU. Vores problemstilling kan formuleres i to spørgsmål:

- Hvordan kan Polens nationale fællesskab karakteriseres?
- I hvilken grad føler polakkerne sig som del af et europæisk fællesskab, og hvordan karakteriseres dette fællesskab?

1.2 Motivation
Projektets idé startede med en fælles interesse for at undersøge, hvad østeuropæisk identitet er. Særligt det, at flere af de østeuropæiske lande er kandidater til optagelse i EU, mens andre allerede er optaget. Her er det interessant at kigge på om deres kultur gods er foreneligt med det, vi finder hos de nuværende medlemslande. Vi vidste, at vores genstand for undersøgelse måtte indsnævres, da en undersøgelse af østeuropæisk identitet i bedste fald kommer til at sige noget på et helt generelt niveau og måske beskrive nogle få tendenser, der gør sig gældende i alle landene. Dette er ikke tilfredsstillende, da der med garanti vil være ligeså mange, eller flere, områder, hvor landene adskiller sig fra hinanden. Vi indsnævrede således vores kriterier til, at vi ville beskæftige os med et af de nye EU-medlemslande, og besluttede os hurtigt for at

Polens historie er ligeledes interessant. Særligt den nyere historie, netop i kraft af Polens geografiske placering, hvor det har ligget mellem to stormagter, Rusland og Tyskland, og som følge heraf har været under stærk politisk indflydelse udefra. Dette har måske yderligere været med til at skabe en klar identitetsopfattelse hos polakker.

En anden motiverende faktor, som ligger til grund for vores valg har ligeledes noget at gøre med Polens beliggenhed. Grunden, som er mere personlig end faglig, er, at landet ligger forholdsvis tæt på Danmark, hvilket dels betyder, at man med Polens indtrædelse i EU i fremtiden, kan forestille sig et øget samarbejde Danmark-Polen imellem.

1.3 Problemfelt
Projektets overordnede rammer ligger i problemstillingen omkring polakker forhold til fællesskaber, henholdsvis det nationale fællesskab og EU. Således bevæger projektet sig indenfor socialvidenskaben.

En forholdsvis omfangsrig del af rapporten har vi valgt at bruge på et afsnit om det kvalitative interviews anvendelse og videnskabsteoretiske status. Rapportens efterfølgende historiske afsnit beskæftiger sig redegørende med Polens historie med vægt på det seneste århundrede. Afsnittet giver sig ikke ud for at være mere end en redegørelse, hvad det heller ikke er tænkt som. Dets formål er blot at give den udenforstående læser et indblik i vigtige begivenheder i nyere polsk historie. Rapportens teoretiske del afgrænses til at beskæftige sig med begreber, der har relevans for
problemstillingen fra et socialvidenskabeligt standpunkt. Der skal derfor også tages forbehold for at begreber, der bruges i andre videnskabelige sammenhænge, her skal forstås i deres socialvidenskabelige kontekst. Med afsæt i problemstillingen, vil den afsluttende diskussionsdel bevæge sig indenfor ovenstående rammer, dog med forbehold for nye synspunkter og perspektiver.

Afslutningsvis skal det påpeges, at spørgsmålene i interviewsituationen ligeledes naturligt er afgrænset af problemstillingen; vi spørger af og til helt konkret ind til områder, vi er forholdsvis sikre på vil give brugbare svar, men vi stiller også mange åbne spørgsmål. Således kan rapporten bevæge sig ind på uforudsete områder. Det skal altså forstås, at rapportens rammer ikke alene afgøres af os, men, i et vist omfang, i samspil mellem os og interviewpersonerne.

2. METODE

Som nævnt i indledningen forsøger vores projekt at besvare, i hvilken grad polakkerne føler sig som en del af et europæisk fællesskab, og, hvis ikke, hvad udsigterne så er, for at de kommer til at gøre det. Herunder vil vi undersøge hvilke værdier polsk identitet er funderet i, og hvordan disse står overfor eventuelle europæiske værdier. Overordnet vil vi gøre dette ved at ved at tage til Polen og udføre en række kvalitative interview af polakker fra forskellige steder i samfundet og fra to generationer.

2.1 Valg af interviewsegmenter

Vi har valgt at fokusere på en gruppe af universitetsstuderende og en gruppe fabriksarbejdere i vores undersøgelse, begge grupper i Krakow, hvor vi inden afrejse til Polen, fik etableret flere gode kontakter. Grunden til at vi har ladet uddannelsesniveau være et af udgangspunkt for udvælgelsen af interviewgrupper er dels, at det er vores hypotese, at det særligt er i forhold til spørgsmålet om mobilitet på arbejdsmarkedet, at man enten kan betragte EU som fuld af muligheder, eller som en trussel. Dels at
der er en mulighed for at akademikere ved mere om EU i kraft af deres uddannelse, og måske holder sig bedre ajour eller holder sig ajour igennem andre medier. At vi har valgt at beskæftige os med to generationer, skyldes at de, der er unge i Polen i dag, aldrig har oplevet kommunismen, og vi forestiller os, at der, i højere grad end i for eksempel Danmark, er en kløft imellem generationerne, som vi, af hensyn til rapportens reliabilitet, ikke vil lade stå uudforsket. Det er også muligt, at EU for den ældre del af befolkningen ikke repræsenterer samme forøgelse af muligheder og rigdom som for den yngre del, men for denne gruppe måske har diametralt modsatte konsekvenser. Hvis det er tilfældet vil en pro EU-holdning måske være sjælden, og i hvert fald funderet i ikke-egennytlige interesser.

2.2 Projektets struktur: Den historiske redegørelse og teoridelen

I det kvalitative interview er der opmærksomhed på interaktionsdynamikken mellem interviewer og den interviewede, og en kritisk opmærksomhed over for hvad der siges. Det er i denne samtaleform muligt at indhente beskrivelser af specifikke situationer og handleforløb. Det er derfor vigtigt, at vi bliver fortrolige med den begrebsverden, vi skal bevæge os i, så vi kan sortere vigtigt fra mindre vigtigt og følge interviewets dynamik, og så vi ved, hvad der er værd at tage hånd om i den efterfølgende fortolkning af interviewene, som er projektets kerne. I den sammenhæng, har vi valgt at inkludere nogle kortere afsnit, som skal bidrage til forståelsen af vores arbejde med interviewene. Rapporten vil derfor indeholde et kortere historisk afsnit (afsnit 3) hvor vi ser på de vigtigste historiske begivenheder i nyere polsk historie. Dette er interessant af flere årsager. Polen har en lang og særegen historie bag sig. Det har været en stormagt i Europa, det var et af de tidligste Nordeuropæiske demokratier og så har det være strøget af landkortet i en periode på 125 år; i de seneste år har det været igennem Anden Verdenskrig og har været underlagt kommunisme i 40 år. Med en så turbulent fortid, som Polen har gennemlevet, særligt i kraft af dets geografiske placering, må historien nødvendigvis spille en væsentlig rolle i forhold til Polakkernes
identitet og selvforståelse. Derfor er et kendskab til denne vigtig, både i forhold til interviewenes udførelse, den efterfølgende tolkning og endelig som et konkret holdepunkt i forhold til at kunne drage konklusioner i forbindelse med vores to primære teorier: Anthony D. Smiths essentialismetanke og Benedict Andersons konstruktivisme, som vil blive præsenteret i det følgende.

For at besvare projektets hovedspørgsmål vedrørende polakkernes forhenværende, nutidige, og eventuelt fremtidige, følelse af europæisk fællesskab og identitet, må man også kende de faktorer, som skaber et sådant fællesskab. Af denne grund er det nødvendigt at redegøre for den udvikling, der har været i de sidste 20-25 års studier af fællesskaber af nationstørrelse, hvilket vi gør i Rapportens teoridel (afsnit fire). Studierne af nationalfællesskabet, er et forskningsfelt, der er blevet skabt af både antropoligiske, entnografiske, politiske og sociologiske studier. I denne diskussion interesserer vi os især for, hvordan man kan definere begreberne ”nation” og ”nationalisme”. Netop denne debat kan man argumentere for at dele i to teoretiske retninger: En konstruktivistisk og en essentialistisk. Sådan har Cederman1 gjort det, og sådan et filter ønsker vi for en nemheds skyld også at lægge ned over den mangefacetterede diskussion. Vi forudsætter, at en sådan tvedeling på trods af dens simplifikationer, alligevel vil kunne gøre diskussionen af vores empiriske undersøgelser frugtbar. Tillige har vi i projektrapporten valgt, at lade én teoretiker repræsentere hver fløj, da vi af hensyn til rapportens omfang ikke mener, at vi kan dække andre teoretikere tilfredsstillende. Som med tvedelingen i form af de to skoler, må vi også her erkende, at vi hermed udelukker en lang række teoretikere fra diskussion. Derfor vil vi også bestræbe os på kun at følge en diskussionsstruktur vejledende, og således også pointere det reduktionistiske i opdelingen, samt inddrage andre teoretikere i det omfang, det er strengt nødvendigt.

En vis progressivitet gør sig gældende i afsnittet: Vi ønsker at starte ud med en mere generel redegørelse for begrebet kollektiv identitet og individet som del

---
1 Lars-Erik Cedermann (se afsnit 4.2)

Rapporten kommer altså til at arbejde med flere faglige områder. Det er imidlertid interviewtolkningen der er projektets kerne, og rapportens øvrige indhold har til formål at støtte op om denne og bidrage til forståelse.

2.3 Det kvalitative forskningsinterview

(…) [det halvstrukturerede interview] har en række temaer, der skal dækkes, såvel som forslag til spørgsmål. Men på samme tid hersker der åbenhed for

² Kvale, 1997
³ Ibid. s. 19
⁴ Se bilag 8.4
⁵ Kvale s. 95
ændringer af spørgsmålenes rækkefølge og form, således at man kan forfølge de svar, interviewpersonerne giver, og de historier de fortæller.6

Vores valg af metode grunder i flere væsentlige forhold. For det første er der det rent praktiske. En kvantitativ undersøgelse ville simpelthen være for resursekrævende, når det primære parameter for reliabilitet for det første afhænger af antallet af adspurgte subjekter. En anden, og overordnet set vigtigere, årsag er at vores problemstilling vedrører begreber som, ikke vil kunne undersøges tilfredsstillende i en kvantitativ undersøgelse.

2.3.1 Det kvalitative interviews videnskabsteoretiske status
Steinar Kvale bruger i sin bog meget plads på grundigt at beskrive det kvalitative interviews videnskabsteoretiske status. Grunden til dette er formentlig, at den kvalitative metode i historisk perspektiv har haft megen modgang, og stadig kæmper for at vinde anerkendelse indenfor visse forskerkredse. Eksempelvis bygger langt den overvejende del af samfunnsviendskabelige undersøgelser på en positivistisk erkendelses-teori, der, ifølge Kvale, har rødder i Comtes positivistiske paradigm, som affødte videnskaben sociologi7:

Ifølge positivistisk tankegang skulle de unge samfunnsviendskaber følge de eksperimentelle, kvantitative metoder i de etablerede naturviendskaber, i særlighed den mest avancerede videnskab ved århundredeskiftet, fysikken. Samfundsviendskaber skulle sigte mod forudsigelse og kontrol af adfærd.

Dette paradigme styrkedes i første halvdel af det 20. århundrede, hvor Wienerkredsens krav om verifierbarhed gjorde, at alt, hvad der ikke lod sig beskrive i sproglig logik, blev betragtet som pseudovidenskab. Det kvalitative interview bygger derimod

6 Ibid. s. 129
7 Ibid. s. 70

Indenfor postmoderne konstruktion gør en manglende tro på moderne projekter som økonomisk vækst og de store fortællingers sandhed sig gældende. Kvale støtter sig her til den franske filosof Lyotards erkendelse af, at der ikke findes nogen universel og objektiv virkelighed. Den svækkede tro på, at mennesket kan opnå objektiv sandhed som sådan, smitter af på videnskabsbegrebet sådan, at man nærmest ikke kan skelne mellem videnskab og pseudovidenskab, eftersom enhver videnskab har en iboende ufuldendthed. Dette ændrer også på, hvad må anses for at være videnskabens opgave; ”Legitimeringsspørgsmålet om, hvorvidt en undersøgelse er videnskabelig, tenderer mod at blive erstattet af det pragmatiske spørgsmål om, hvorvidt den giver nyttig viden.” Heri ligger, at videnskaben må operere i en anden erkendelsesramme, og man må så overvinde den relativisme, der ligger i et postmoderne sandhedsbegreb. Viden kan derfor forstås på forskelligartede måder, som viden i samtale, i fortælling og i kontekst. Fælles for al viden er dog en indlejring i en socialt konstrueret virkelighed, og som Kvale har citeret Berger for, så erstatter konstruktionismen ”individet med relationen som focus for viden”. Denne erkendelse er grundlæggende og fletter den postmoderne konstruktionisme sammen med de fornævnte begreber.

Fænomenologien grundlægges ligeledes på en Kantiansk erkendelse af, at mennesket aldrig vil kunne se ”Das Ding an sich”, men kun vil kunne se fænomenet ”Das Ding für mich”. Vejen ud af dette perspektiviske sandhedsbegreb er den hermeneutiske fortolkningstradition.

Hermeneutikken søger generelt at nedbryde en kulturel kontekst for at forstå fænomen på et alment og universelt niveau. Kvale ser hermeneutikkens funktion som

\[8\] Ibid. s. 61
dobbelt indenfor interviewgenren; den kan både nedbryde dialogen mellem interviewer og interviewede, og samtidig afklare den efterfølgende fortolkning af udsagn ved hjælp af den hermeneutiske cirkel.\(^9\) Denne cirkel betegner en metodisk fortolkning, hvor man konstant skifter perspektiv fra delene til helheden og vægter dem i forhold til hinanden. Dette er i teorien en uendelig proces, der dog i praksis stopper, når man har nået en meningsfuld fortolkning uden indre modsigelser. I dette modsætningsfyldte begrebspar, del og helhed, ligger der en indre dynamik, som Kvale mener, hører dialektikken til. Men han mener samtidig, at dialektisk materialisme (som marxisme) står i opposition til den postmoderne konstruktion, fordi den anerkender virkelighedens progressive karakter, og adskiller sig også fra hermeneutikken på den måde, at den accepterer en modsætningsfyldt videnskab som billede på en modsætningsfyldt virkelighed.


2.4 Overvejelser omkring interviewenes struktur og udførelse

\(^9\) Ibid, s. 56
Som tidligere nævnt baserer vi interviewene på en interviewguide, som skal give retningslinier for, hvad vi skal nå omkring i løbet af et interview. Guiden følges ikke slavisk, men skal blot fungere som en slags støtte, så vi kan holde tråden hele interviewet igennem, og så der er en vis styring. Guiden tilpasses situationen og den pågældende interviewperson, så vi eksempelvis undgår akademiske termer når vi taler med arbejderne og ikke stiller spørgsmål om kommunismen til de, der er så unge, at de ikke vil kunne svare. Der er ikke tale om ekspertspørgsmål, så en yderligere tilpasning har ikke været nødvendig.

Vi har inddelt vores segmenter efter de hensyn som blev beskrevet tidligere. Således er vores hovedkriterier, at vi vil tale med akademikere, henholdsvis en gruppe mellem tyve og tredive og en gruppe mellem fyrre og halvtreds, og arbejdere indenfor samme interval, og vi håbede på at få to interviewpersoner i hver af de fire segmenter. Vores ene interviewgruppe, akademikere og de studerende, har vi fundet på universitetet i Krakow, hvor vi har taget kontakt til to studerende og en professor. Vi fik altså desværre ikke fat i akademiker nummer to. De studerende repræsenterer den unge del af vores segment, mens professoren repræsenterer den ældre. Vores anden gruppe, arbejdere, har vi fundet på fabrikken Trelleborg Sealing Solutions, som ligger cirka hundrede kilometer syd for Krakow. Her har vi kontakt med to ældre arbejdere og to yngre samt to ingeniører som skal fungere som tolke, da de fire udvalgte interviewpersoner ikke taler engelsk.

Der melder sig selvfølgelig en række problemer i den sammenhæng at overordnede i virksomheden skal agere tolke. Der er risikoen at vores interviewperson ikke vil være ærlig, hvis vi spørger ind til lidt følsomme områder, og vedkommendes overordnede er til stede. Denne risiko vurderer vi dog at være til at overse; der er tale om ingeniører og altså ikke som sådan beslutningstagere, og vores spørgsmål omhandler, så vidt vi kan se, ikke emner der kunne være ømtåelige. Under alle omstændigheder får interviewpersonerne at vide, at de bare kan lade være at svere, hvis de ikke har lyst. Et andet problem er, at vi ikke har at gøre med uddannede
tolke. Dette kan blandt andet betyde, at der stadig er en sprogbarrier, ligesom, det kan betyde at vedkommende ikke er sig sin rolle bevidst, men vi forsøger, at komme rundt om problemet med en grundig beskrivelse af hvad det er, vi ønsker fra tolken.

I forbindelse med at informere vores interviewpersoner om interviewsituationen og hvad interviewene skal bruges til, har vi udarbejdet en briefing. De overvejelser vi har gjort os i den sammenhæng er af etisk karakter, og vedrører blandt andet, at vi garanterer fuld personlig anonymitet, informerer om hvorfor vi interviewer, gør opmærksom på at interviewpersonen selvfølgelig er velkommen til ikke at svare, hvis vedkommende ikke har lyst og så videre.

Udover de syv interview, vi skal bruge til tolkning med henblik på at bevare vores problemstilling, har vi taget kontakt til to eksperter, som vi har i sinde at bruge, som videnskabelige artikler, forstået på den måde at give os et billede af Polens nuværende situation i forhold til det politiske landskab, Polens politiske forhold til EU, Polens særegne landbrugs kultur, den katolske kirkes status og så videre. Alt sammen så vi ved, hvor det kan være interessant at dykke ned i vores efterfølgende primær-interview, og således, forhåbentlig, forbedre deres kvalitet. Personerne vi har udvalgt til disse interviews er valgt på baggrund af deres status som eksperter på disse områder. Vi har således sat møder i stand med henholdsvis Mr. Kaczinsky som er leder af ”the European Program” på Instytut Spraw Publicznych (Institut for Offentlige Anliggender) i Warszawa og Jan Janietszky, dekan på Akademia Papiseska (Paveakademiet) i Krakow.

Primær-interviewene har vi ligeledes fået sat i stand inden afrejse og en præsentation af interviewpersonerne følger her. På Trelleborg har vi aftaler med fire personer: Anita på 26, Krzystof på 31, Joska Browska på 41 og Valdik på 46. Anita arbejder som kontorist i logistikafdelingen og tager sig af indenrigsproduktion; Krzystof er uddannet metalarbejder, men er ansat som ”foreman”, hvilket, efter eget udsagn er en tand højere i hierarkiet end menig arbejder; Joska Browska arbejder med

10 Se bilag 8.4
kvalitetskontrol, både under produktionen og i kontrollen af det færdige produkt og Valdik er en såkaldt ground-keeper, hvilket svarer til vicevært eller pedel. Hans job består i vedligeholdelse af fabrikkens tekniske udstyr.

På Universitetet i Krakow, Jagiellonsa, har vi aftalt at interviewe tre personer: Studerende Agnieszka og Aleksa, begge 21, og Dr. Maria, 46. Agnieszka studerer sociologi og Aleksa læser på europæiske studier. Maria er doktor i hebraisk poesi.

Interviewene udføres sådan, at vi deler os op i to grupper af tre personer. Dette sparer dels tid, og så forestiller vi os, at det virker mindre skræmmende at sidde overfor tre personer end seks. I interviewsituationen er der så én, der agerer hovedinterviewer mens de to andre, der er til stede tager noter og skyder ind i tilfælde af, at de fornemmer, at der er udlagt noget interessant, der må forfølges, eller hvis der er noget hovedintervieweren glemmer.

Ved hjemkomst har vi besluttet at alle interviewene, på nær ekspertinterviewene, transskriberes. Dette gør dels, at de bliver nemmere at arbejde med i den efterfølgende tolkning; interviewet bliver mere overskueligt, og i analysen er interessante citater lige til at pille ud. I tilfælde af at andre skal arbejde med rapporten, er det desuden rart at have interviewene på skrift.

2.5 Det kvalitative interviews fejlkilder
I metode-afsnittet har vi fastlagt nogle retningslinier for vores undersøgelsesdesign og redegjort for det kvalitative interviews videnskabsteoretiske status. Vi vil nu følge op på dette ved at sammenholde det med gennemførelsen af vores interviews i Polen.

Af de syv interviews der blev foretaget, foregik fire på fabrikken Trelleborg Sealing Solutions og tre på Jagollian University i Krakow. Interviewene på fabrikken foregik i arbejdstiden mandag d. 4. april, hvor vi interviewede to unge medarbejdere, Krzysztof og Anita, og to lidt ældre, Jaskabrowska og Valdik. For at overvinde sprogbarrieren fik vi stillet to engelsktalende ingeniører til rådighed af fabrik-
ken. Disse fungerede som tolke. Som gruppe delte vi os i to, sådan at vi ved hvert interview var to gruppendlemmer til stede. Dette gjorde vi bevidst, eftersom det var vores overbevisning, at det ville være skadeligt for den samtale, som interviewet jo er, hvis interviewpersonen blev for intimideret af at sidde overfor en hel gruppe af mennesker.

Omrunding interviewets set-up skal det også nævnes, at interviewene blev foretaget i henholdsvis et mødeplads og et kontor. Der var altså en vis tryghed forbundet med, at samtalen udelukkende hørtes af de personer, der var til stede i lokalet, dvs. interviewpersonen, to grup pendlemmer og tolken. Omdemnd er vi heller ikke blinde for, at også en vis utryghed gør sig gældende her: Det kunne tænkes, at en værkfører som Valdik og en kvalitetstester som Joskabrowska ikke har deres daglige gang i et sådant kontomiljø, og derfor kunne føle sig på udebane her. En anden hæmmende faktor for interviewet kan være, at medarbejdernes udsagn tolkedes af en anden medarbejder på fabrikken, nemlig de to ingeniører. At tolken og interviewpersonen færdes på samme arbejdsplads kunne betyde, at interviewpersonen ville være mere tilbageholden med at dele ud af personlige holdninger, hvis han/hun ikke ønskede at indvie tolken i dette.

Naturligvis indgik der som begyndelse på ethvert interview en kort brie fing, der garanterede enhver interviewperson anonymitet og fastslå, at personen til enhver tid kunne undlade at svare på spørgsmålene. Men derudover er det ikke vores fornemmelse, at interviewene bar præg af en sådan utryghed for interviewpersonerne.11

En reel fejlkilde ved fabriks-interviewenes udførelse er dog brugen af tolk. Da det kvalitative interviews styrke, jf. metode-afsnittet, blandt andet består i muligheden for at blive del af den sociale virkelighedskonstruktion, som interviewpersonen befinder sig i, må tolken siges at være en hindring i dette: Hans oversættelse

11 Et Eksempel på dette er, at interviewpersonen Krzystof bl.a. udtrykte sin utilfredshed med lønnen for det arbejde, han udførte.
vil næsten uanset præcision være farvet. Med andre ord altid i sig selv en tolkning, der så igen vil blive tolket i bearbejdningen og analysen af interviewene. En del af forståelsen af afsenderens udsagn vil derfor gå tabt. Da vi heller ikke brugte uddannede tolke, men ingeniører, hvis oversættelser ikke kan forventes at have samme faglige standard, forstærkes dette yderligere.

Ved de tre interviews på universitetet i Krakow gør denne problemstilling sig ikke på samme måde gældende: De to studerende i henholdsvis European Studies og sociologi, samt professor i hebraisk Dr. Maria Kantor, kunne begå sig på engelsk. At det naturligvis havde været helt optimalt at udføre disse interviews på personernes modersmål, står klart, men det er imidlertid vores fornemmelse, at samtalen på engelsk ikke i nævneværdig grad hæmmede de tre personer. I øvrigt var proceduren ved disse interviews denne samme: Vi sad også her et par gruppemedlemmer i enrum med interviewpersonen, gav den samme briefing osv. Trods forskellen omkring brugen af tolk, er interviewene udført på en tilfredsstillende ensartet vis. Det er derfor muligt at sammenligne deres udsagnsmæssige indhold uden at bryde med Steinar Kvale's opstilling af retningslinier for det semi-strukturerede kvalitative interview.

Som sådan erkender vi der her nævnte fejlkilder, men vi er samtidig overbeviste om, at vi trods disse vil kunne tolke en pålidelig essens ud af vores interviews, og som med de nævnte forbehold vil kunne bruges til at besvare vores problemstilling.

3. REDEGØRELSE FOR POLENS HISTORIE

“We are a very historical nation. We feel passionate about this.”

- Mr. Kaczinsky, Institute of Public affairs, Warszawa.

Under vores besøg i Polen, har vi fået det indtryk, at polakker er stolte af deres nationalitet, modersmål og kultur. Der synes at være en stærk følelse af identitet i Polen. Man kan fra et historisk perspektiv undre sig over hvordan det er lykkedes polakkerne at holde fast i deres kultur. Taget i betragtning at Polen i 123 år ikke har eksisteret
som stat, for kort tid efter at blive underlagt et fremmed regime i 45 år i form af kommunismen, er det tankevækkende, at der den dag i dag eksisterer et selvstændigt Polen. For at få en opfattelse af de elementer som danner grundlag for polsk identitet og kultur, har vi valgt at kaste blikket tilbage i tiden og lave en kort redegørelse af Polens historie. Da det i denne opgave ikke er vores mål at redegøre for Polens absolu- lutte historiske udvikling, har vi valgt at nævne de begivenheder, vi mener er essentielle for forståelsen af polsk identitet. Der er især lagt vægt på det 20. århundrede.

Vores redegørelse indebærer en kort gennemgang af Polens tid som stormagt i middelalderen, heretter tiden under det østrig-ungarske rige og disse to perioders betydning for polsk identitetsskabelse, de to verdenskrige samt mellemkrigstiden, Polens politiske udvikling efter 1945, herunder en forklaring af Polens forhold til den katolske kirke og et afsnit om det politiske parti Solidaritet og dets betydning. Til sidst vil vi prøve at skildre Polens forhold til EU, landets motiver for at indgå i fællesskabet, og hvilke problemer der opstår i denne sammenhæng.

Dette afsnit er bearbejdet ud fra Søren Riishøjs tekster om Østeuropæisk og polsk udvikling gennem de sidste hundrede år.

3.1 Polen som stormagt i middelalderen
I middelalderen udgjorde Polen sammen med Litauen en stormagt i Europa. Dette var et rige der strakte sig helt fra Østersøen ned til Sortehavet.\textsuperscript{12} I 1600-tallet begyndte der dog en tilbagegang af stormagten, blandt andet på grund af ustabilitet i landets politiske struktur. Selv om at denne storhedstid ligger flere hundrede år tilbage, mener Riishøj at den, den dag i dag, har stor betydning for den nationale stolthed og selvfølelse i Polen.\textsuperscript{13} Dr. Maria om emnet:

\begin{quote}
Dr. M.: “I would say that the centuries of independence was much more important than those years without independence”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{12} Riishøj (2002) s. 19
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid. s. 19
Intv.: “So do you think that there is some kind of longing for the great period of Poland, I mean back in the 16th and 17th century?”

Dr. M.: “Well, of course sentimentally, but we know realistically that history will not come back because otherwise half of Europe would be Polish. Poland was a big country, a big kingdom and a great kingdom with a great king.”

Intv.: “But my impression is that in the last 100 years, Poles have always believed that they would gain their independence again some day.”

Dr. M.: “Christianity was brought here in 966 (...) the first king was coroneted here in Cracow in 1025. So you know for 17 centuries, so lets say 700 years of independence (...) it is a lot, it is (...) We remember those years of suppression, we do remember.”

Dr. Maria mener altså at polakkerne, trods deres 123 år uden uafhængighed, bêtholdte troen på et selvstændigt Polen, fordi landet engang havde været en stormagt. Denne storhedstid har afgørende betydning for polakkernes tro på selvstyre og har spillet en stor rolle i de drivkræfter der op gennem historien har kæmpet for den polske stat.

3.2 Polen under fremmedherredømme

I slutningen af 1600 tallet blev Polen underlagt Det Habsburgske Rige der i 1867, hvor Ungarn fik stor indflydelse inden for kejserriget, blev til dobbeltonarkiet Østrig-Ungarn.¹⁴ Den følgende periode fik stor betydning for landets udvikling politisk, økonomisk og kulturelt. Riis høj mener, at denne periode var med til at forme, hvordan den polske befolkning tænker og handler.¹⁵

¹⁴ Ibid. s. 19
¹⁵ Ibid. s. 18
I slutningen af 1700-tallet skete der en tredeling af Polen; henholdsvis Rusland, Preussen og Østrig-Ungarn indtog hver en del af landet og fra 1795 til 1918 eksisterede der ingen polsk stat (se landkortet overfor\textsuperscript{16}). Polakkerne blev blot en af de mange etniske grupper som de tre lande omfattede i 1800-tallet.\textsuperscript{17}

Som en modreaktion på dette opstod der i 1800-tallet polsk nationalisme, i form af selvstændige bevægelser, der tog udgangspunkt i en dyrkelse af sproget. Målet var at få mere medbestemmelse inden for rammerne af det Østrig-ungarske rige. Bevægelserne kunne dog kun dyrkes i emigrantkredse i Paris, fordi de åbenlyst modarbejdede kejserstyret. Disse nationalister støttede også oprør i Polen (på det geografiske område vi i dag betegner Polen), som fandt sted sideløbende med de store europæiske revolutioner i 1830-31 og 1848.\textsuperscript{18} Noget der spillede en stor rolle og virkede som samlingspunkt for polakkerne, var den katolske kirke. Under udenlandsk besættelse synes den at stå som et symbol på uafhængighed.\textsuperscript{19} Kirkens position i Polen uddybes nedenfor. Mange polakker flygtede efter tredelingen til Frankrig og trods alle forsøg

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{16} Lund (1999) s. 336
  \item \textsuperscript{17} Nielsen (2002) s. 124
  \item \textsuperscript{18} Riishøj (2002) s. 19
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid. s. 20
\end{itemize}
hos delingsmagterne på at udrydde alt hvad der var polsk, lykkedes det polakkerne at holde fast i deres kultur.

Efter Første Verdenskrig, hvor Østrig-Ungarn, Tyskland og Rusland havde lidt nederlag, eksisterede der en trussel mod østeuropæernes nationale afhængighed. For at tilgodese nationale og etniske spørgsmål og ligeledes at sikre den europæiske fred og undgå, at Første Verdenskrigs rædsler gentog sig, blev der i Versailles i 1919 vedtaget en genoprettelse af de Baltiske stater tællende Polen, Tjekkoslovakiet og en række af Balkan landene. Disse opnåede selvstændighed, og hermed kom europepakortet til at se markant anderledes ud\(^{20}\)

### 3.3 Mellemkrigstiden og 2. Verdenskrig


\(^{20}\) Thomsen, Jørgensen (1990) s. 7
\(^{21}\) Riishøj (2002) s. 20
selfstyre. Da Hitler i 1939 rykkede ind i Polen medførte dette en fransk og engelsk krigserklæring til Tyskland. Under tyskernes overfald på USSR i 1941 kom hele det Polske territorium dog under tysk styre.  

Ud over de kolossale materielle tab led Polen også enorme menneskelige tab; det samlede befolkningstab var på 11 millioner (omkomne ved krigshandlinger eller kz-lejre, tvangsforflyttede, flygtede samt indbyggere i de afstående områder). Landets skæbne blev fastlagt af stormagterne i større grad end af landet selv; ved stormagtkonferencen i Jalta i 1945 blev følgende vedtaget: USSR beholdt de engang polsk erobrede områder i Ukraine og Hviderusland. Polen fik til gengæld kompensation i vest på Tysklands bekostning (se ovenstående kort). Denne status rokkedes der ikke ved siden hen.

3.4 Kommunisme i Polen

Da Storbritannien, USSR og USA i Jalta blev enige om, hvad mange polakker ville betragte som at forære Polen til Sovjetunionen, betød det at landet, til trods for at det ikke var en del af Sovjetunionen, i efterkrigstiden fik en social, økonomisk og politisk struktur efter Sovjetisk model. Modellen indebar, et ledende kommunistisk parti, en

---

22 Thomsen, Jørgensen (1990) s. 10
23 Lund (1999) s. 337
24 Riishøj (2002) s. 21
fagforening underlagt den politiske styring, opbygningen af og satsningen på sværindustri, samt udenrigspolitik rettet ind efter de sovjetiske ønsker\textsuperscript{25}. Indførelsen af ét-partistyret skete gennem manipulation ved parlamentsvalg, forbud mod andre partier og tvangssammenlægning mellem kommunistiske og socialdemokratiske partier.\textsuperscript{26} Alligevel udgjorde Polen i forhold til andre Østeuropæiske lande underlagt Soviet Unionen en markant undtagelse på flere områder, herunder særligt to:

- Det lykkedes aldrig det kommunistiske parti at gennemføre kollektiviseringen af landbruget. Enkelte tyske områder i vest og nord var enestående om en succes på dette punkt. I store dele af Polen måtte partiet simpelthen opgive at kollektivisere i 1950’erne, og landet fik derfor en masse forholdsvis små familiebrug. Til trods for at disse symboliserede en modstand mod styret blev de tålt men ikke støttet. Resultatet blev, at Polen i dag har et uforholdsmæssigt stort antal små lavteknologiske og ikke effektive landbrug. 25 % af befolkningen ernærer sig ved landbrug, selvom det kun udgør 5 % af BNP.\textsuperscript{27}

- For det andet opgav styret den stramme kontrol af kulturlivet. Det polske kulturliv udfoldede sig temmelig anderledes end f.eks. i nabolandet Tjekkoslovakiet, for ikke at tale om Sovjetunionen, hvor der for eksempel var en skarp kontrol og dermed censur på dette område.\textsuperscript{28}

Man kan spørge sig selv, hvorfor sådanne symboler på modstand mod styret fik lov at overleve i en totalitær stat?

En del af forklaringen til dette skal endnu en gang findes i den katolske kirkes stærke position. Det kommunistiske styre var nødt til at gå på kompromis med kirken, der

\textsuperscript{25} Nielsen (2002) s. 125
\textsuperscript{26} Riishøj (2002) s. 21
\textsuperscript{27} Nielsen (2002) s. 125
\textsuperscript{28} Ibid. s. 126
stod fast på sine krav, og således for eftertiden er blevet betragtet som det polske landbrugs skytsengel. Styret anerkendte, at kirken med dens ekstreme opbakning i befolkningen var en uerstattelig garant for social ro og orden.29 Som Stalin indrømmede overfor Churchill: ”At påføre polakkerne kommunisme ville svare til at sætte sadlen på en ko.”

3.5 Faser i Polens politiske udvikling fra 1945 - 89

Perioden 1945-89 var præget af politisk ustabilitet og som et forsøg på at give et indtryk af, hvorfor polakker i dag har en tillid til staten, der nærmer sig det minimale, skildres polens politiske udvikling her i faser delt op efter den politiske struktur. Denne opdeling bliver fremført af Jens Jørgen Nielsen i bogen Østudvidelsen under overfladen.30 Vi finder, at den er nyttig, når der skal dannes overblik over Polens udvikling i sidste halvdel af det 20. århundrede, og det følgende afsnit er skrevet med udgangspunkt i den.

3.5.1 1945-48

I tiden efter Anden Verdenskrig rykkedes Polens grænser vestpå, hvilket resulterede i store folkevandringer af tyskere der rejste længere mod vest og blev erstattet af Polakker fra øst.


29 Nielsen (2002) s. 123
30 Nielsen (2002)
Landets første leder efter krigen blev Władysław Gomułka (fra Polens forenede arbejderparti PZPR), der med regeringen førte en forholdsvis åben politik og opnåede en bredere opbakning blandt befolkningen.

3.5.2 1948-56

3.5.3 1956-70

3.5.4 1970-81

---

31 Afledt af Tito navn på Jugoslaviens tidligere statschef; dannet efter Jugoslaviens brud med Kominform 1948; den i Jugoslavien udviklede form for socialism. (Nudansk ordbog, 1987, Politikens forlag, s. 974)

3.5.5 1981-89


Som følge af at regeringen ledede landet håbløst både økonomisk og politisk, oplevede Polen i 1980’erne endnu en forværret økonomisk situation, men derudover oplevede landet også et socialt og moralsk forfald. Det kom til udtryk i form af at handlen på det sorte marked øgedes markant i disse år, og det var ikke mindst partifolk, der benyttede sig af eller stod i spidsen for dette. De sociale skel voksede og arbejdsløsheden steg yderligere. Antallet af psykiske lidelser voksede også i disse

32 Lund (1999) s. 338

\textbf{3.6 Solidaritet}

Solidaritet var den første frie fagforening i østblokken, og et symbol på håb og tro på fremtiden for polakkerne. Og den var først og fremmest præget af katolicismen.

Fagforeningen opstod tilbage i august 1980 hvor omfattende strejker brod ud på det enorme Lenin Skibsværft i Gdansk, på opfordring af en nydannet gruppe "De frie fagforeninger". Den døvende regering måtte herefter se sig tvunget til at gå til forhandlingsbordet. Under disse strejker opstod ordet solidaritetsstrejke, og navnet Solidaritet (på polsk: Solidarność) var snart blevet hæftet på fagforeningsbevægelsen. Inden længe var deres logo i Polen et ligeså almindeligt syn på gaden, som Coca Cola.\textsuperscript{34} Den nye stærke bevægelse fik til at starte med den historisk karismatiske elektriker Lech Wałęsa til leder og inden længe havde 80 % af de polske arbejderre tilsluttet sig bevægelsen, hvilket vil sige godt 10 millioner medlemmer. Desuden opstod der også et mindre bonde-solidaritetsparti. Når man tager Solidaritets størrelse i betragtning i denne periode, kan det ikke komme bag på nogen at de ti millioner Solidaritetsmedlemmer har repræsenteret en bred vifte af holdninger med alt fra de konfronterende folk til de mere forsonende. I bund og grund har det nok været Wałęsas karismatiske autoritet der holdt dem på en moderat og balanceret kurs i kampen om at

\textsuperscript{33} Nielsen (2002) s. 131

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid. s. 131
opnå en vis grad af politisk harmoni med regeringen. Lech Wałęsa havde i øvrigt altid stået frem som troende katolik og haft mange af kirkens folk blandt sine rådgivere.

Som sagt blev der efter 1980 etableret et meget tæt netværk mellem Solidaritet og kirken, hvilket betød at Solidaritet havde nemmere ved at nå ud til befolkningen.


Frem til 1989 forbød Solidgefort forbudt. Året før var regeringen begyndt at forhandle med Solidaritet for at få stoppet uroen på arbejdsmarkedet. I denne sammenhæng havde Solidaritet anet en mulighed for ophævelse af de gældende forbud mod fagbevægelser. Da det blev aktuelt var der ingen hindringer for en ny legalisering af Solidaritet. Og da de igen stillede op til valget i april 1989 fik de en stor sejr med 99 ud af 100 pladser i parlamentet. Dog skal det nævnes, at der før valget var indgået en aftale, der betød at Kommunistpartiet på forhånd var sikret et flertal i parlamentet. I årene siden er Solidaritets popularitet svinget markant. Og selvom den formelle magt lå hos Kommunistpartiet, så kom den reelle magt i stigende grad til at ligge hos Solidaritet og den katolske kirke.35

3.7 Den katolske kirke

I Polen har den romersk-katolske kirke haft en betydning og indflydelse som ellers ikke er karakteristisk for kommunistiske lande. Siden dens introduktion i 966 har den katolske kirke historisk spillet den rolle, som stater har gjort i andre lande. Kirken var et samlingspunkt for polakkerne, mens de var under fremmed herredømme og den var ikke blot en religiøs magtfaktor, men i ligeså høj grad en politisk.36

35 Kitaj (1991) s. 90-93
36 Ibid. s. 84

Selvom kirken siden 1994 begyndte at miste en del af sin popularitet, som resultat af blandt andet abortforbudet og undervisningspligten i folkeskolerne, så regner man i dag med at 80 % af den polske befolkning er troende katolikker. Og der kan ikke herske nogen tvivl om at den nyligt afdøde polske pave John Paul II i høj grad har styrket kirkens position i hans hjemland. Faktisk er præster gået hen og blevet en eksportvare, eftersom en fjerdedel af alle katolske præster i dag, oprindeligt er fra Polen.

Med befolkningens massive kirkegang og deres utallige religiøse motiver i hverdagen kan man blandt andet se det stærke tag kirken har i befolkningen. Dette skyldes formentlig at kirken har kanaliseret den modstand mod styret, som det ikke har været muligt at formulere ad anden vej. Yderligere har kirken udover den rent religiøse tjeneste altid udført et stort socialt arbejde overfor den dårligst stillede del af befolkningen.

3.8 Polen efter 1989

I juni 1989 udløste det polske valgresultat væsentlige forandringer, der i slutningen af året ledte til det første dødsstød for kommunismens kollaps henover Østeuropa. I dette år begyndte Polen at ændre sin udenrigspolitik; de anerkendte nu ikke blot Israel og Vatikanet, men landet fik også Østeuropas første ikke-kommunistiske statsmini-

37 Thomsen, Jørgensen (1990) s. 17


3.9 Polens vej ind i NATO og EU

Da Polen i 1998 ønskede at søge optagelse i EU udløste det en del debat i landet. Dels vedrørende anvendelsen af de tilskud, som Polen ville modtage i tilfælde af en eventuel optagelse og fordi EU krævede en modernisering af landbruget.

I 1999 blev Polen optaget som fuldgyldigt medlem af NATO-alliancen. Som det fremgår af dette afsnit er polakkernes erfaringer med statslig stabilitet nærmest smertelig,38 og derfor var NATO-medlemskabet et af det nye Polens første udenrigspolitiske prioriteter. Det kunne betragtes som eneste garanti for den polske

38 Nielsen (2002) s. 123
stats sikkerhed. Et andet vigtigt aspekt er at Polens medlemskab af NATO har givet dem en psykologisk sikkerhed i forhold til det Rusland, som mange stadig nærer dyb mistillid til.\(^{39}\)


Selvom Polen stadig ligger inde for de samme grænser, som det var tilfældet i 1989, så er alle de opgrænsende nationer nu forandret. Hvor der før blot var tale om de tre naboer: DDR, Tjekkoslovakiet og Sovjetunionen, er der nu pludselig syv selvstændige lande: Tyskland, Tjekkiet, Slovakiet, Hviderusland, Ukraine, Rusland og Litauen.

3.9.1 Polen i EU: Tilpasning via økonomiske reformer

Dette historiske indblik kan hjælpe os med at forstå ”hvorfor polakkerne har en udbredt mistro til staten, næsten uanset hvilken fane, der vejer over den, og hvorfor tilliden til kirken er så stor som den er” som Jens Jørgen Nielsen skriver. Vi vil i det følgende prøve at afdække Polens udvikling i retning af EU, og forsøge at nå til en opfattelse af, hvordan de andre EU-lande har set på Polen.

Men hvorfor er det vigtigt for Polen at blive medlem af EU?

Håbet til EU er, ifølge Jens Jørgen Nielsen, hos de fleste polakker at de vil blive betragtet som ligeværdige medlemmer af den europæiske familie.\(^ {40}\) Dette kommer af, at polakkerne er blevet set på som andenrangs borgere i de hundreder af år, hvor Polen var underlagt fremmede magter. Denne kendsgerning smitter ifølge Jens Jørgen Niel-

\(^ {39}\) Ibid. s. 123  
\(^ {40}\) Ibid. s. 124
sen også af på polakkernes opfattelse af EU i dag: Når et svagt stigende antal polakker de senere år er ved at blive skeptiske overfor EU, handler det netop om, at de stadig føler sig behandlet som en andenrangsnation og ikke om, at de nødvendigvis synes, at EU projektet er en dårlig idé.  

Polen har sammen med andre lande i ”Central- og Østeuropa siden 1989 gennemført en ”anticipatorisk tilpasning” til EU, forstået på den måde at landene har gennemført en omkostningsfyldt tilpasning til EU i forventningen om, men uden garanti for medlemskab.” Dette er sket gennem markedsøkonomiske reformer, og nogen har ligefrem betragtet disse som et slags kirurgisk snit i det store polske legeme: Patienten (det gamle system) gennemgår en operation, hvorunder det gamle system nedbrydes og de nye regler og love indføres.  

Disse nye foranstaltninger har sigtet på at afbalancere Polens økonomiske og sociale struktur i forhold til de nuværende EU-medlemsstater, det vil sige udviklingen imod det liberale demokrati og dets markedsøkonomi. Hvis vi skal blive i den kirurgiske terminologi, så kan der ikke herske tvivl om, at der har været stor smerte forbundet med indgrebet. Således har det politiske opbrud medført en række problematiske ændringer i den politiske kultur: Korruptionen og kriminaliteten svækkede tilliden til, om ikke selve det demokratiske princip, så i hvert fald til de politiske ledere og institutioner som parlamenter og domstole. 

Den økonomiske tilpasning har dog også haft betydning for de andre EU-lande. Således skal både tyske og franske politikere have haft dens opdragende virkning i sinde, når de op gennem 90’erne har bakket op om Polens reformlinje, uden dog at stille landet garanti for indlemmelse i EU. En anden begrundelse for udvidelsen var desuden, set fra Bruxelles, en tro på at flere medlemslande i sig selv ville give EU-
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samarbejdet økonomiske og sikkerhedspolitiske fordele i tillid til følgerne af adgangen til det indre marked og styrkelsen af båndene til vesten og især Europa.

Udover rent økonomiske reformer har de postkommunistiske lande skullet opbygge en ny national identitet, eftersom det ikke kan betvivles, at en række værdier forbundet med det kommunistiske styre har måttet kasseres efter overgangen til kapitalisme og markedsøkonomi. Her spiller det faktum, at de postkommunistiske lande har lidt under fraværet af stærke civile samfund ifølge Jens Jørgen Nielsen en vis rolle.
4. TEORI

Denne del er helliget en redegørelse af de teoretiske begreber fællesskabsidentitet, social identitet, nation og Europa som supranationalt fællesskab. Vi vil forsøge at skabe overblik over nogle af de teorier, der vedrører begreberne, for senere at kunne diskutere dem i forhold til vores empiri.

4.1 Introduktion til begrebet identitet

Allerførst vil det være på sin plads at introducere begrebet identitet og bagefter den særlige kollektive eller sociale identitet, som vi senere skal undersøge i form af begrebet nationalism.

Identitet kommer af det latinske ord ”idem”, der betyder ”det samme”, og begrebet kan defineres som ”de træk ved en person, der tilsammen kendetegner eller afgrænser person som forskellig fra andre.” Identitet kommer af det latinske ord ”idem”, der betyder ”det samme”, og begrebet kan defineres som ”de træk ved en person, der tilsammen kendetegner eller afgrænser person som forskellig fra andre.” Begrebet er naturligvis behandlet udførligt i mange videnskabelige sammenhænge, men især Stuart Hall, den engelske kultursociolog, har behandlet begrebet ud fra et kulturvidenskabeligt perspektiv. Han peger på, at identitet er noget mere flygtigt, end den gængse definition ovenfor antyder:

> Identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiplicity constructed across different often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions. They are subject to radical historicizations, and constantly in the process of change and transformation.

Især indenfor sociologien har man lagt vægt på, at det ikke kun er hos individet, man finder identitet. Det gør man også blandt grupper og fællesskaber i det hele taget, og

46 Vi er her inspireret af projektrapporten Europe in the Making, der på lignende vis tager afsæt i definitionen på identitet.
47 Den store danske encyklopædi, bd. 9, s. 232
48 Stuart Hall 1996: questions of cultural identity, s. 4 (trykt i ovennævnte projektrapport: Europe in the Making)
her kan man tale om en speciel kollektiv identitet, der definerer tilhørsforholdet til en gruppe eller et fællesskab. Det er denne form for identitet, vi ønsker at behandle, når den optræder indenfor størrelserne nationalt fællesskab og supranationalt fællesskab (EU/Europa).

4.2 Cedermans model over skoler indenfor nationsforskningen
Lars-Erik Cederman er amerikansk professor i statskundskab, og udbreder sig i værket *Constructing Europe’s Identity* fra 2001 om forskellige tilgange til skabelsen af politisk identitet. I nedenstående figurer beskriver han to forskellige retninger. Den første retning omhandler identitet i forhold til essentialisme/konstruktivismes-tanken, mens den anden fokuserer på forholdet mellem skabelsen af identitet i forhold til nationalstat/større fællesskaber.

Indenfor kulturstudier definerer *partikularisme* kultur som en etnisk kerne, som et empirisk faktum, der kan blot-lægges ved indgående studier. Denne kerne er essensen af en specifik kultur og al meningsfuldhed findes i dette grundlæggende stabile verdensbillede. Essentialismetanken bygger på denne kulturforsætelse, og mener derfor, at nationalstaten er skabt på baggrund af en oprindelig kultur, og derfor må politisk identitet også bunde i denne kulturelle kerne. I forhold til ovenstående figur foregår udveksling mellem kultur og politik kun i retningen kultur → politik.


4.2.1 Fire perspektiver på supra-national identitet
Tillige har Cederman en anden model (se nedenstående), der beskriver fire forskellige teoretiske opfattelser af nationalstaten enten som et blivende politisk fænomen, eller som et politisk fællesskab der vil overtages af nye styreformer, det være sig supra-nationale fællesskaber som EU eller helt nye og anderledes strukturer. Teorier om identitetsdannelse kan herudfra groft inddeles i fire kategorier: Ethnonationalisme, Post-nationalisme, Pan-nationalisme og ”Begrænset integration” (oprindeligt ”bounded integration”).

50 Ibid, ifølge teoretikeren Anne Knudsen.
Fælles for ethno-nationalister er, at politisk identitet kun kan fungere med stærke bånd til nationens kultur, og at nationen er opstået ud fra en før-moderne etnisk kerne. Politiske ændringer fordrer kulturel udvikling for at være legitim. Multikulturelle nationer vil derfor være sværere at samle under en nation, da tilknytningen til flere kulturkerner anses for problematisk, og medfører svagere identificering. Ideen om supra-nationale fællesskaber afvises som politisk legitim, efter som et sådant fællesskab ikke tager afsæt i en fælles kultur. ( Lidt paradoksalt går nogle ethno-nationalister ind for EU, med den taktiske bagtanke, at EU styrker national identitet.) Smith kategoriseres som ethno-nationalist.

Post-nationalister tager det modsatte standpunkt, og holder på, at politisk identitet tager afsæt i det faktum, at nationen er et moderne, konstrueret fænomen, navnlig dannet på baggrund af moderne kommunikation. Således er forholdet mellem politisk identitet ikke baseret på en særlig kultur. Kultur kan fungere som understøttende for politik, men er ikke definerende. Omvendt kan man sige, at politik kan redefinere kultur, hvilket åbner op for muligheden for, at et supra-nationalt fællesskab kan konstruere den politiske identitet, og omforme borgerens tilknytning til national-statens til identificering med eksempelvis EU.

En tredje tilgang til politisk identitet ses, i det Cederman kalder Pan-nationalisme. Her er der tale om en essentialistisk forståelse af politisk samarbejde, men udover nationens grænser. En større fælles kultur er et muligt udgangspunkt for et større samarbejde. Samuel Huntington er fortaler for pan-nationalisme med sin bog "Clash
of civilisations”, hvor netop civilisationer på tværs af statsgrænser er et eksempel på kulturelt fællesskab. EU vil kunne legitimeres som projekt med udgangspunkt i en fælles europæisk kultur, og denne supra-nationale politiske identitet ville kunne fungere samtidig med den nationale politiske identitet, så at sige bygge ovenpå, og være et billede på multipel identitet. Huntington skildrer EU’s legitimitet:
“The European community rests on the shared foundations of European culture and Western Christianity”.


4.3 Essentialisme og konstruktivisme
Hvorledes begrebet nation defineres, og hvordan en politisk identitet når til sin opståen, er utvivlsomt dette områdes mest omstredte spørgsmål. Der kan, som nævnt ovenfor, siges at eksistere en tødelse indenfor forskningen af nationalism og med en grov skelnen, opdeles de to retninger i to kategorier, hvor Smith kan placeres under essentialisme, og Anderson under konstruktivisme (Smith arbejder imidlertid med
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51 Construction Europes Identity, s. 16
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nogle lidt andre begreber, og betegner sig selv som etnosymbolist og Anderson som modernist).


Essentialisternes tilgang til problemstillingen er noget anderledes og de argumenterer netop for, at nationen skabes på baggrund af det kulturelle råmateriale. Nationen er en omformning af det, der tidligere var en ethnie. Nationen er konkret baseret på eksisterende ethnier og principielt defineret herudfra.

4.4 Anthony D. Smith

Anthony D. Smith er professor i etnicitet og nationalisme på "The European Institute at the London School of Economics". Smith var elev af Ernest Gellner, og har gennem tiden forsøgt at udbede de fejl og mangler, han mener, den modernistiske teori indeholder. Gellner tilhører den modernistiske position, som han deler med blandt andre Anderson. I modsætning hertil, betegner Smith sig selv som Etnosymbolist, eller Ethnonationalist, som Cederman betegner det.

Smith skelner imellem "subjektive og objektive" faktorer i teoretikernes definition af nationen, og i måden hvorpå den opstår. Det spænder fra dem, som lægger vægt på de subjektive elementer, så som holdninger, opfattelser og følelser, til dem der betoner de objektive elementer, som sprog, religion, skikke, territorium og institutioner.

53 Smith (2003), s. 24.
Smith betoner imidlertid vigtigheden af at kombinere både de subjektive og de objektive faktorer, fordi nationen som fællesskab, ikke lader sig beskrive udelukkende indenfor en af kategorierne. Fokuserer man udelukkende på de objektive faktorer, vil man udelade visse nationer. Hvis man derimod kun anser de subjektive faktorer for definerende, er det svært at adskille nationen som fællesskab fra andre kollektive fællesskaber, såsom regioner, stammer og imperier. Smith påpeger derfor, at interessante og brugbare definitioner af nationen bør spænde over det han kalder ”objektive-subjektive spektrum”.


I definitionen af begrebet nationalism er der yderligere uenighed mellem de to skoler. Anderson afviser at nationalism skulle være en politisk ideologi. Denne opfattelse kan Smith ikke imødekomme, idet han mener, at nationalism er andet og mere end nationale følelser og nationalistisk ideologi. Nationalisme er nationens stræben efter enhed, autonomi og sandhed (autenticitet), og skal opfattes som en politisk religion. Nationalisme er nationens eller fællesskabets forsøg på at mobilisere
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gruppen i form af offentlig og politiseret kultur, og herigennem opnå magt. Ifølge Smith forsøger nationalismen at skabe nationer, der bygger på både religiøse og etniske fællesskaber. For at kunne eksistere i samspillet med forandringer indenfor nutidige politiske, økonomiske og kulturelle forhold, kan symboler for det nationale udvælges og genfortolkes, såsom myter, symboler, koder, traditioner og erindringer.\(^{58}\) Disse symboler kommer således til at fungere som bindeled mellem den oprindelige etniske kerne, og disse nye forhold. "Dette kan betyde en større eller mindre grad af udvælgelse (...) men altid indenfor eksisterende kulturers og fællesskabers målestok og autentiske ånd."\(^{59}\) Her understreges, at en genfortolkning af symboler, altid vil ske på den kulturelle kernes præmisser, og ikke i konstruktivistisk øjemed, jævnfør de trykte figurer i afsnittet om Cederman.

På trods af mange modsætninger mellem essentialister og konstruktivister er der imidlertid enighed om, at: "Nationen er ikke en stat og den er ikke et etnisk fællesskab."\(^{60}\) Stat og nation må ikke forveksles, da staten skal forstås som en selvstyrende institution, som er i stand til at forpligtet folket og sætte regler indenfor det specifikke territorium. Om nationen siger Smith, at den "er følte og levede fællesskaber, hvis medlemmer deler hjemland og kultur."\(^{61}\)

Det der, ifølge Smith, adskiller det etniske fællesskab fra nationen, er at det som regel ikke har en politisk referent og oftest mangler en offentlig kultur. Etniske fællesskaber besidder nødvendigvis heller ikke et territorialt område, eksempelvis jøderne under 2. verdenskrig. For at en nation kan organisere sig som nation, må den have været i besiddelse af sit eget hjemland i et længere stykke tid. Desuden er det nødvendigt at udvikle en offentlig kultur og have en vis form for selvbestemmelse for at kunne opnå nationstatus.

\(^{58}\) Ibid. s. 183
\(^{59}\) Ibid. s. 183
\(^{60}\) Ibid. s. 24
\(^{61}\) Ibid. s. 25
"Idealtypen af ethnie, med sin løsere organisering, er snarere en fællesbetegnelse, mens nationen er mere specifik."\textsuperscript{62} Smith opstiller forskellene mellem ethnier og nationer på følgende måde:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnie</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eget navn</td>
<td>Eget navn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fælles myter vedr. oprindelse osv.</td>
<td>Fælles myter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fælles erindringer</td>
<td>Fælles historie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakteristiske kulturelle træk</td>
<td>Fælles offentlig kultur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbindelse til hjemland</td>
<td>Beboelse af hjemland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En vis grad af solidaritet (hos eliten)</td>
<td>Fælles rettigheder og pligter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Enkelt økonomi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.4.1 Etnosymbolisme**

Det, der ifølge Smith karakteriserer etnosymbolismen, er vigtigheden af langtidsanalyser. Det er vigtigt for forståelsen af nationer, at se dem i lyset af historien og analyse sociale og kulturelle mønstre over længere perioder. Etnosymbolismen bestræber sig på at klargøre, hvordan tidligere former for fælles identitet har indflydelse på nationers opståen på trods af bevidstheden om brud og diskontinuitet gennem historien.\textsuperscript{63} For at kunne danne sig et billede af nationens tilblivelse, må man udføre undersøgelser over flere generationer eller endda århundreder. Kun gennem disse langtidsanalyser er det muligt for områdets teoretikere at afdække de "komplicerede forhold mellem fortid, nutid og fremtid samt ethnier og nationernes plads i historien."\textsuperscript{64} På den måde mener Smith desuden, at man undgår at se tidligere tiders forhold og politik i lyset af vor tids fælles mål og nationalistiske bestræbelser. Det er nødvendigt at forstå historien på dens egne præmisser, og ikke på anakronistisk vis, ved at bruge den

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. s. 28
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid. s. 84
\textsuperscript{64} Ibid. s. 84


Når Anderson flygtigt berører følelsesmæssige aspekter af nationalismen, og forklarer opofrelse for nationen, som et uegennytligt forhold og som en ædel handling, mener Smith at det er det modsatte der gør sig gældende: Individets identitet og overlevelse afhænger netop af det nationale fællesskab, og derfor disse stærke følelsesmæssige bånd: ”... it is because we know that our interest, indeed our very identities and survival, are bound up with the nation, that we feel such devotion to the nation and are prepared to make such sacrifices for it when it is in danger.”

En anden fælles interesse indenfor etnosymbolisme er ifølge Smith, at nationers forhold til ethnier er sammensat. Der eksisterer to forskellige vinklinger i opfattelsen af samspillet mellem nation og ethminer. Der lægges dels vægt på, at nationer er specialiserede ethnier, i den forstand at de er territoriale, politiserede og masseoffentlige. Desuden er opfattelsen den, at nationer og ethnier begge er former for fælles kulturel identitet, som i samme periode kan eksistere ved siden af hinanden, eller endda konkurrere med hinanden. Her er der altså tale om, at flere ethnier kan eksistere indenfor en nations territoriale og politiske område.

Afslutningsvis betoner Smith at etnosymbolske tilgange, "(...)på grund af deres interesse for etniske og nationale identiteters folkelige, moralske og følelsesmæssige dimensioner, kan hjælpe os til at forstå både vedholdenheden og transforma-
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tionerne af disse kollektive kulturelle identiteter."\(^{66}\) Ved at sætte nationale identiteter i relation til vore tidligere etniske symboler, påviser etnosymbolismen den betydning fælles symboler, erindringer og myter har for os i dag. Det er også med til at forklare, intensiteten og essensen i mange etniske konflikter i moderne tid, og forklarer til dels det faste greb nationalismen kan have i mange mennesker på trods af politiske og økonomiske udviklinger. De symbolske spørgsmål og konflikter er rodfastet i mange mennesker, og det gør dem derfor ligeledes svære at løse. Jerusalems status er et godt eksempel på noget sådant. "Etmosymboliske tilgange insisterer på behovet for at placere de moderne nationers opstæn i sammenhæng med tidligere kollektive, kulturelle identiteter i førmoderne perioder."

Smith er altså overvejende af den opfattelse at der må ligge ethnier til grund for dannelsen af nationen, og netop her adskiller han sig væsentligt fra den konstruktivistiske tanke om nationen som noget moderne. Han afviser imidlertid ikke nationalismens, ideologiens, bevægelsens og symbolikkens modernitet. Heller ikke at de fleste nationer er dannet i relativ moderne tid, han interesserer sig dog for muligheden af nationens opståen forud for nationalismen. Det der dog er karakteristisk for Smith er hans opfattelse af, "at tidligere og ofte førmoderne etniske bånd og ethnier har påvirket og dannet grundlag for senere nationer og nationalismer."\(^{67}\)

4.4.2 Skellet mellem individuel og kollektiv identitet.

Smith pointerer vigtigheden af at skelne mellem 2 identitetsniveauer: Individuelle og kollektive identiteter. Den individuelle identitet er relativt dynamisk og fri, og kan forstås som multipel. Det er muligt at identificere sig med flere fællesskaber på en gang, eksempelvis som mor, arbejdsgiver, dansker, europæer og så videre. Den kulturelle kollektive identitet derimod, er karakteriseret ved mere faste elementer, såsom

\(^{66}\) Smith (2003) s. 85
\(^{67}\) Ibid. s. 87
historiske begivenheder, erindringer, traditioner, sprog og myter, og således bliver den kollektive identitet mere vedvarende.

Nationen som kollektiv identitet adskiller sig fra andre typer af fællesskaber, så som interessegrupper, regioner og klasser, fordi de er mere kortvarige. De opløses eksempelvis, når de har nået deres mål.

Smith beskæftiger sig, som etnosymbolist, med den kollektive identitet, idet han betrætger fællesskaber over lange historiske perioder og nødvendigvis må have fokus på fælles identiteter.

4.5 Benedict Anderson

Benedict Anderson studerer nationen, som en af de første i starten af 1980’erne, og diskuterer den som forestillet fællesskab i sit værk ”Imagined Communities.”

Han definerer nationen således:”…it is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”68 Denne definition underbygges med en redegørelse af, hvordan nationen i et historisk perspektiv blev legitimeret som socialt konstituerende.

Nationen er, i modsætning til tidligere mindre samfundsgropper, af en sådan størrelse, at den enkelte borger umuligt kan have kendskab til hele befolkningen. Borgerne lever anonyme i samfundet, og af den grund må individet forestille sig, hvem og hvad denne nation, dette fællesskab, består af. Der lægges således vægt på den subjektive opfattelse, det vil sige de kognitive aspekter af, hvordan nationen erkendes.

Nationen skal forstås som afgrænset, eftersom nationen i sagens natur ikke kan eksistere, uden andre nationer at afgrænse sig fra. Eksklusionen er definerende for ideen om, hvem der inkluderes i nationen.

68 Anderson (1991), s. 6
I et historisk perspektiv sker dette skift fra mindre lokalsamfund til nation i Oplysningstiden og omkring den franske revolution, hvor religiøse fællesskaber og enevældet mister legitimitet, og hvor frihed er ideale. Nationen udspringer i denne kontekst som *suveræn* og konstituerer en ny social orden, som den enkelte borger kan identificere sig med.

Nationalisme ligger dybere i mennesket end politisk ideologi, er noget man fødes til, som noget naturligt og objektivt, nærmest familiært (jævnført udtrykket ”Motherland”), som man kan nære uselvisk kærlighed for (og er villig til at dø for), i kraft af det ubetingede medlemskab af nationen. Nationalisme beskæftiger sig, på linje med religion, med at skabe kontinuitet, en sammenhæng mellem liv og død, omdanner tilfældigheder til skæbne (for eksempel at dø for nationen), og her adskiller nationalisme sig ifølge Anderson fra politisk ideologi, som netop ikke har til formål at give svar på sådanne spørgsmål.69

Dying for one’s country which usually one does not choose, assumes a moral grandeur which dying for the Labour Party, the American Medical Association, or perhaps even Amnesty International can not rival, for these are all bodies one can join or leave at easy will. 70

Desuden kan medlemskab af nationen ikke hierarkiseres, - man kan ifølge Anderson ikke være mere eller mindre medlem af nationen, og derfor er nationalisme at forstå som et horisontalt kammeratligt fællesskab.

### 4.5.1 Nationens forgængere: Kristendommen og Enevælden

Mange sammenfaldende historiske begivenheder har indflydelse på nationens opståen. Anderson fokuserer på to former for kulturelle systemer, der begge gik forud for

69 Anderson påpeger dog, at revolutioner i en politisk ideologis ånd, på samme måde som for nationen, kan mobilisere kræfter der får mennesket til at ofre sit liv, berettiget af en forestilling om ideologiens sandhed og retfærdighed.

70 Anderson (1991), s. 144
nationen, og som på mange punkter fungerede som referencerammer på samme måde, som nationen gør det i dag: Enevælden og kristendommen som religiøst og transnationalt fællesskab.

Eksklusion af ”det fremmede”, er essentielt for etableringen af nationen, og som parallel til hertil, peger Anderson på kristendommen som religiøst fællesskab. Opdagelsen af den nye verden udvidede europæernes kulturelle og geografiske perspektiv, hvorved kristendommen blev stillet op overfor andre store religiøse fællesskaber, med den effekt, at en territorialisering af verden, på baggrund af religion, tog sin begyndelse:

(...)i beskrivelsen af de kristnes tro som den ”sandeste” snarere end ”sand”, kan vi begynde at øjne kimen til en territorialisering af trosretninger der forudaner mange nationalisters sprog (”vores” nation er ”den bedste” – i et konkurrerende sammenligneligt felt).71

Her påpeges skellet mellem os og dem, navnlig med fokus på forskellighedens rivaliserende karakter, - eksklusionen har hierarkiserende og selvhylsende undertoner, og dette fænomen gør sig ligeledes gældende for opfattelsen af nationen.

Et andet interessant fænomen, der ligeledes bevirker territorialisering, men her indenfor Europas grænser, er overgangen fra brugen af latin til brugen af modersmål. Anderson understreger sprogets vigtighed i forbindelse med identifikation med et forestillet fællesskab. Kristendommen, som religiøst transnationalt fællesskab, var i høj grad understøttet af latin, der som heligt sprog var udbredt i hele Europa, og var det eneste sprog anvendt til undervisning. Dette forestillede fællesskabs udbredelse afhæng således i høj grad af kommunikation i forhold til overlevering af kristendommens budskab, og var i øvrigt det første eksempel i historien, på forestillingen af Europa som fællesskab, et kristendommens kontinent.

71Anderson (2001) s. 60
4.5.2 Trykkapitalismens opståen og Enevældens fald

Da modersmål overtog latins rolle som undervisningssprog, og kommunikationen indenfor nationen øgedes i takt med trykkeriernes mere omfangsrige produktion pga. kapitalismens udbredelse, (og netop trykte skrifter på modersmål fordi her var et langt større marked), blev nationen som forestillet fællesskab i samme takt mere populær. På trods af forskellige dialekter indenfor den enkelte nation, forenedes medlemmerne gennem det trykte sprog, og ideen om de andre medlemmer eller ”læsefæller”, som Anderson kalder det, fandt grobund. Modersmålet indenfor nationen samles af trykkapitalismen, dels fordi det trykte sprog danner et hierarki imellem landets dialekter, således at de dialekter, der i udtale lægger tættest på det skrevne sprog, idealiseres. Og dels fordi modersmålet ikke forandres med samme letthed, når sproget materialiseres som tekst. Det trykte sprog kommer til at virke fastholdende og bevarende.

Denne samling under samme nation, med et sprog der homogeniseres i højere og højere grad, vil dels forme individets forestilling om nationen indadtil men også, i vore øjne, udgrænse dialekter, der lægger nær tilstødende nationers sprog, og på denne måde territorialisere og skabe den partikulære nationalitet, med en klarere forestilling af nationen og dens afgrænsning.

Det er dog vigtigt at forstå, at sproget i sig selv ikke er et symbol på nationalitet, og ikke som sådan fungerer ekskluderende men nærmere inkluderende. Enhver kan tildele sig et sprog. Et fælles sprog fungerer som mediator for forestillingen om et fællesskab. ”Tryksprog opfinder nationalisme, ikke noget særligt sprog i sig selv.”

En anden faktor, der bevirkede territorialitet, var Enevælden og dets opstående relevans for dannelsen af nationalstaten. Anderson fremhæver, hvor-

---

72 Ibid. s. 190 (vores kursivering)
dan kongerigets grænser generelt var ”porøse og utydelige”73, som følge af den sociale opbygning med en centralmagt legitimeret af det guddommelige, modsat nationalstaten, som legitimeres af borgerne. Nationalstaten må i højere grad have kendskab til borgerskabets udbredelse gennem definerede grænser.

4.5.3 Tid

En helt anden dimension, der ligeledes kommer til at konstituere nationen, er en ændret forståelse af begrebet tid. Opfattelsen af tid ændres fra at være simultan på tværs af fortid og nutid, til at være simultan på tværs af homogen, tom tid, forstået på den måde, at fortid, nutid og fremtid nu kan adskilles, navnlig på grund af urets og kalenderens opfindelse. Historien forstås nu som: ”an endless chain of cause and effect.”74, og det bliver muligt at forestille simultane handlinger til samme tid, hvilket åbner op for forestillingen om nationen. Anderson giver et eksempel med avisen, som dels medierer mellem en nations borger, men også hvordan ideen om en hel nation, der på rituel vis læser de samme nyheder på samme tid, er med til at styrke forestillingen om det nationale fællesskab.

The idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogenous, empty time is a precise analogue of the idea of the nation, which also is conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history.75

Overgangen til nationalstaten sker på meget forskellige præmisser indenfor de forskellige nationer. Efter Den franske Revolution går en bølge af folkelig nationalismes igennem Europa i 1820’erne, hvilket truer de eksisterende dynastier. ”Officiel nationalism” konstrueredes af dynastiske magtgrupper for, på strategisk vis, at samle og legitimere centralmagt; dels i tilfælde med imperialistiske nationers store riger, med

73 Ibid. s. 62
74 Ibid. s. 23
75 Ibid. s. 26

Som eksempel på en sidste bølge indenfor dannelse af nationer, beskriver Anderson omdannelsen af kolonistater til nationalstater, hvor kolonimagternes egentlige bestræbelser på at indføre ”officiel nationalism”, skaber grobund for den enkelte nations løsrivelse. Faktorer som øget mobilitet, undervisning, og hermed øgede læsefærdigheder og sprogkundskaber, landkortet (både politisk og historisk) som logo for nationen, folketællinger og museet bliver enten symboler på nationen eller skaber grobund for nationalistiske bevægelser. Den nye nation kan lettere forestilles. Disse hændelserstilfældighed og koloniens konstruerede fællesskab, der medfører nationers opståen på tværs af oprindelig kulturbasse, (for eksempel Indonesien der oprindeligt var flere sub-kulturer fordelt på tusindvis af øer), viser os Andersons konstruktivistiske tilgang til nationens opståen.

Konkluderende kan det opsummeres, at Anderson mener, at nationen er et produkt af historien, en konstruktion som var uundgåelig. Andersons teori bliver interessant når vi forsøger at forstå, hvordan den enkelte nation kan forestilles (eller fremstilles af magthaverne), og når det tages i betragtning, hvilke faktorer Anderson
historisk set opfatter som medierende for denne opfattelse, såsom øget mobilitet, kommunikation, uddannelse, ændret forståelse af tid, religioner og dynastiers forfald med mere. I forhold til nationens aktualitet i dag, er det således interessant at forholde sig til nogle af disse faktorer, og undersøge hvilken rolle de spiller i dag.

4.6 Det nationale fællesskab i netværkssamfundet

”Natio” kommer af verbet ”nascor” (jeg er født), og henviser til troen på en fælles oprindelse⁷⁶. Begrebet "nation" blev brugt om de studerende på universiteterne, der kom fra samme geografiske område. Efter den franske revolution, hvor suveræniten gik fra kongen til folket, blev nationen et politisk defineret kollektiv og i den efterfølgende tidsalder, nationalismens tidsalder (fra sidst i 1700-tallet til vor tid⁷⁷), var ”nation” uløseligt koblet sammen med bestræbelsen på at skabe en tilhørende stat⁷⁸.


⁷⁶ Andersen, Heine, Kaspersen (2004) s. 499
⁷⁷ Ibid. s. 498
⁷⁸ Ibid. s. 498
⁷⁹ Ibid. s. 513
Hos Anderson skabes nationen altså med denne nye tids-dimension, men nationen bliver imidlertid også udfordret, da denne tid-rum udstrækning i takt med globaliseringen opløses.


### 4.6.1 Polakker som transmigranter

Vor tid kunne globalt set betegnes en migrationens tidsalder. Dette kan forstås som, at der, i takt med globaliseringen, er tale om et stigende antal skift af opholdssteder, hvilket kan begrundes med, at verden så at sige bliver mindre gennem transporttekno-

80 Giddens (1997), s. 59
81 Ibid. s. 60
82 Ibid. s. 60

Vi skal senere overveje, hvordan den her skitserede udvikling har indflydelse på vores problemstilling.

4.7 Nationen som symbolsk fællesskab

Thomas Hylland Eriksen bruger i sin bog *Ethnicity and nationalism*. Benedict Anderson og Ernest Gellner’s teoretiske ansatser til at betone vigtigheden af at betragte nationen som fællesskab bygget på symboler. Hylland ser dette som et del af det, som Michael Billig andetsteds har kaldt ”banal nationalism”. Det er værd at se nærmere på denne reproduktion af myter og symboler indenfor nationen, eftersom den gør sig gældende i den livsverden, som beboerne i en nation befinder sig i. Dermed kan den banale nationalism siges, at repræsentere et perspektiv på nationen, der er lidt anderledes end Anderson og Gellner’s teorier, som beskuer nationen fra oven og analyserer den som helhed.

---

83 Andersen, Heine (2004) s. 306
84 Ibid. s. 306
85 Se afsnit 5.2
86 Eriksen (2002)
Desuden er dette fokus på nationen i hverdagen vigtigt for dette projekts hovedformål - undersøgelsen af muligt europæisk fællesskab gennem kvalitative interviews i Polen. Det kvalitative interviews styrke er jo netop evnen til at trænge ind i den sociale virkelighed, i en given persons livsverden. Med andre ord den arena, hvor den nationale symbolisme, som Hylland beskriver, har sit virke.

Forudsætningen for at tale om nationen som et symbolsk fællesskab, kommer ifølge Hylland af en skelnen mellem tradition and traditionalisme: "Nationalism, which is frequently a traditionalistic ideology, may glorify and recodify an ostensibly ancient tradition shared by the ancestors of the members of the nation, but it does not re-create that tradition. It reifies in the same way the Hurons reified their supposed tradition."87 Dette ligger i forlængelse af Andersons hovedpointe om nationen som et forestillet fællesskab: Når en nation skal forklare sin tradition og sin historie, må denne forklaring uundgåeligt blive en forestilling af traditionen, eftersom historien vil blive behandlet på de normative præmisser, der kendegner den moderne nation. At enhver genskabelse er en nyskabelse viser Hylland gennem eksemplet med Norges opståen som selvstændig nation i starten af det 20. århundrede:

Members of the city bourgeoisie travelled to remote valleys in search ’authentic Norwegian culture’, brought elements from it back the city and presented them as the authentic expression of Norwegianness. Folk costumes, painted floral patterns (rosemaling), traditional folk music and peasant food became national symbols even to people, who had not grown up with such customs. Actually it was the city dwellers, not the peasants who decided that reified aspects of peasant culture should be ‘national culture’. A national heroic history was established.88

Eksempel med hvordan traditionel bondekultur omskabes og sættes i en ny national (faktisk urbaniseret) kontekst, betegner den generelle tendens til omtolkning, der tri-

87 Ibid. s. 100
88 Ibid. s. 100
ves i et ethvert fællesskab og således også det nationale. Pointen er dog her, at selve omfortolkningen er så radikal, at den bryder med den historiske virkelighed.

Som Hylland forklarer, så var der så godt som intet historisk belæg for at betegne rosemaling som specielt norsk, ikke mindst fordi billedmotiverne var af sydlandske druefrugter. Derfor må man, hvis man følger Hylland og Anderson, slutte, at man her ikke kan tale om rekonstruktion af tradition, men om en fremadrettet konstruktion. Karakteristisk for en national kultur er således, at den som udgangspunkt altid vil være skabt på baggrund af en politisk vilje blandt eksempelvis magthavere. Dette gør sig også gældende omkring udbredelsen af et standardiseret sprog, der i Andersons øjne i høj grad er med til at konstituere et nationalt fællesskab: Skelnen mellem dialekt og selvstændigt sprog er efter lingvistisk målestok ofte flydende, hvorfor det siges, at ”a language is a dialect backed by an army”89.

4.7.1 Nationale symboler som fællesskabskonstruktion


Denne vilje til at betragte kulturelle genstande som, den sociale virkelighed de representerer og ikke som det, de er i sig selv, har i øvrigt visse paralleller til den sociale konstruktivisme, der gør sig gældende indenfor eksempelvis sociologien. Dér vil man tale om, at interaktioner mellem individer i høj grad har symbolsk karak-

89 Ibid. s. 103
Vi ser altså, at Hyllands behandling af det nationale fællesskabs kultur kan have visse paralleller til sociologers opfattelse af individets nære fællesskaber. Dette gør sig imidlertid også gældende for Benedict Andersons tese om forestillede fællesskaber, på hvilken Hyllands analyse af kulturelle symboler hovedsagelig hviler. At dette er tilfældet kan ses af, at Hyllands symbolverden bliver til på baggrund af Andersons begreb om nationen, som den historiske afløser for kirken.

Anderson citeres af Hylland for at sige, at nationalisme burde klassificeres sammen med metaforisk slægtskab og religion, i stedet for at betragte den som en ideologi. Heri ligger Andersons argument om, at nationen giver mening til både liv og død, og derfor tilbyder individet den mening med tilværelse, der tidligere var kirkens domæne.

Indholdet i de national-kulturelle symboler, Hylland omtaler, er præcis det samme: Rosemalingen giver ikke nødvendigvis mening, når den betragtes som et logisk udtryk for norskhed, men som symbol giver den mening i den sociale virkelighed, et givent individ befinder sig.

4.7.2 Hyllands forhold til Anderson og essentialismen

Som vi har set, er der en sammenhæng mellem konstruktivismens generelle betragtning af nationen som et forestillet fællesskab og den symbolske ”hverdagsnationalisme”, som Hylland beskriver. Denne sammenhæng mellem det som man groft kunne kalde makro- og mikroperspektivet er vigtig, hvis den konstruktivistiske opfattelse skal fungere som helhedsbillede af nationen. Hvis man skal karakterisere den konstruktivistiske teori ud fra Cedermans model⁹¹, kan man påpege, at den dynamik, der eksisterer mellem det kulturelle råmateriale og den politiske identitet, også (og måske

⁹⁰ Vi kan eksempelvis nævne E. Goffmans symbolske interaktionisme.
⁹¹ Se afsnit 4.2
især) må gælde på et individniveau. Det konstruerede nationale fællesskab må i høj grad hvile på de enkelt borgeres identifikation med nationen. Og som vi har set i det norske eksempel betegner de kulturelle symboler i høj grad den følelse af norskhed, som et nationalt tilhørsforhold består af.

Det er imidlertid vigtigt at slå fast, at en essentialistisk tilgang til forståelsen af et nationalt fællesskab heller ikke ignorerer kulturelle symbolers betydning. Anthony D. Smith påpeger, at han selv og andre ”etnosymbolister (...) ikke har opfattet nationsdannelsesprocessen som en konstruktion eller en bevidst ”opfindelse”, men snarere som en *genfortolkning* af allerede eksisterende kulturelle motiver og en *rekonstruktion* af tidligere etniske bånd og følelser” 92. En essentialistisk teori anerkender altså også eksistensen af et symbolsk fællesskab, uenigheden ligger i højere grad i, hvorvidt disse symboler bryder med en historisk baggrund eller blot rekonstrueres i overensstemmelse med denne.

Begge tilganges opfattelse af kulturelle symbolers vigtighed for individets kollektive identitet og fællesskabsfølelse, viser sig at være centraelt i forhold til dette projekts opgave. Da vores empiriske undersøgelse af polakkers fællesskabsfølelse er baseret på det kvalitative interviews metode, vil de udtryk for social identitet, som fremkommer, unøgelig at være på dette individniveau.

### 4.8 Fællesskab, nation, Europa

I det foregående har vi præsenteret de to skoler, som i de sidste tyve års forskning i begreberne nation og nationalism groft sagt lader sig dele i. Til fælles har de to tilgange, at de betragter nationen som et fællesskab, der, selvom det delvist er abstrakt, alligevel har nogle træk, der gør, at det kan sammenlignes med andre fællesskaber. Selvom udgangspunktet for en nation blandt andet er, at man ikke kender samtlige medborgere, trives en del af de samme mekanismer, som indenfor sociologien kendes

---

92 Smith (2003) s. 117

Denne grove opridsning af teoretiske standpunkter i forhold til begrebet ”nation” kan hjælpe til at klargøre, hvordan begrebet ”Europa” kan opfattes indenfor samme forståelsesramme. Fælles for de to størrelser er deres nødvendige ydre begrensning. Anderson anfører, at man ikke kan definere en given nation uden også at definere dens grænser, og således vil en verdensomspændende nation være sin egen selvmodsigelse. Hvis man undersøger, hvordan begrebet ”Europa” historisk set er blevet brugt, vil det vise sig, at dette heller ikke er et begreb, der består i sig selv. Gerard Delanty har behandlet Europa i en sådan kulturhistorisk kontekst. 93 Han konkluderer, at Europa som kulturel størrelse altid har stået i opposition til eksempelvis den muslimske nærorient. Han står således i opposition til de teoretikere, der mener, at visse værdier ligefrem kan siges at være særlige for Europa, og at ”Europa” som begreb bygger på tankegodset fra Renæssancen og Oplysningstiden. 94 Delanty ser en anden forklaring på sammenhængen mellem begrebet Europa og Renæssancen i 14-1500-tallet.

Det var nemlig i Renæssancens højtid, at de kristne europæere blev udfordret af muslimsk fremmarch, hvad overtagelsen af Konstantinopel i 1453 og Mauernes besættelse af dele af den iberiske halvø også vidner om. En renæssancetanke om det forenede Europa bundet sammen af den kulturelle arv fra Antikken, skal altså ifølge Delanty ses som en slags ideologisk oprustning:

At about this time the idea of Europe began to replace Christendom as a cultural frame of reference for the construction of new forms of identifications. In this

94 Her henvises ofte til de rettigheder, der under slagordet frihed, lighed og broderskab blev grundlovsfæstnet i den franske forfatning efter revolutionen i 1789.
transformation Europe no longer signified a geographical area but a system of values\textsuperscript{95}

Delanty peger altså på det, som han andetsteds kalder ”geografisk moralisation”\textsuperscript{96}, og som han i øvrigt mener også gør sig gældende indenfor nationer. Det han beskriver er altså den fædrelandsmyte, der holder en given nation for moralsk overlegen, og som altså også skulle betegne Europa som kulturhistorisk begreb. Europa fortsætter som modpol til muslimsk ukristelighed efter kristendommen bliver fortrængt af humanismen blandt de europæiske samfundsformer. At begrebet Europa er et eliteprojekt er også en af Delantys pointer, og han fremhæver, at der i de brede befolkningsgruppers bevidsthed ikke historisk har eksisteret et begreb som ”Europa”. Og dette på trods af, at Europa som sagt har floreret som elitært begreb i de sidste firehundrede år.

Under alle omstændigheder er det interessant at kigge på postulatet om begreberts indre modsætning. At Europa kun består i syntesen mellem sit selvbillede og det orientalske modbillede. Hvis vi holder fast i Andersons tanke om nationens afgrænsethed og Smiths tanke om et ”navngivet fællesskab” viser parallellen sig. ”The Exclusion of the Other” er et fast begreb indenfor diskussionen af et nationalt fællesskab, og gør sig altså også gældende, når man, i hvert fald historisk, skal behandle begrebet Europa. Dette giver i hvert fald anledning til at tro, at et eventuelt europæisk fællesskab på nogle punkter vil ligne modellen af et nationalt fællesskab.

I denne sammenhæng er det altså værd at diskutere, om et supra- eller transnationalt fællesskab kan belyses ligesom et nationalt.

4.8.1 Jolyon Howorth: At være og at gøre i Europa

\textsuperscript{95} Delanty (1995) Kap. 1: The Ambivalence of Europe: A Theoretical Introduction
\textsuperscript{96} Delanty (1995) s. 30, (vores oversættelse)
Jolyon Howorth analyserer i ”Why Europe? Problems of culture and identity” udviklingen af Europa siden Anden Verdenskrig. Han bygger sin analyse på en grundforudsætning om, at mennesker interagerer sammen med to hovedformål: ”To be together and to do together” (se nedenstående figur). Til det første regner han ”the deeper communicative dimensions of collectivity”, det vil sige sprog, værdier, følelse, og til den anden struktur, hierarki og institutioner. Gennem historien har disse to størrelser påvirket hinanden gensidigt, og er også faldet sammen indenfor middelalderens kommune og indenfor de moderne europeiske nationalstater, der jo både er kendetegnet ved en vis kulturel sammenhængskraft og politiske og juridiske institutioner. Dette sammenfald af dimensionerne er, hvad Howorth benævner som sand politisk kultur.

Howorths vurdering er, at Europa ikke på nuværende tidspunkt har denne kultur, og således udelukkende består som ”doing” via de institutioner, der er samlet under EU. Iblant medlemmerne af EU har kun Frankrig i Howorths analyse fuldt ud haft vilje til at kombinere de to dimensioner. Ifølge Howorth kommer dette sig af, at Frankrig i modsætning til Storbritannien hurtigt ind så, at ”Europe was the only show in town” i en postkolonial verden. Tyskland er først efter genforeningen begyndt at anerkende deres historie som del af Europa. Vigtigt er, at vi i skellet mellem being and doing kan skimte noget af den samme deling mellem essentialisme og konstruktivism, uden at

97 Andrew, Crook, Waller (2000) s. 88 (herfra er figuren også hentet)
98 Ibid s. 87, fig. 7.1
vi dog skal underkende forskellene. Howorth kalder selv doing for det funktionelle niveau, mens being repræsenterer det essentielle.\textsuperscript{99} Tilsvarende er essensen i ”at være” konsensus, mens den i ”at gøre” er flertal.

Ud fra en konstruktivistisk opfattelse af nationale og transnationale fællesskaber ville man være tilbøjelig til at betone det funktionelle aspekts værdi. Ikke at en konstruktivist ville underkende vigtigheden af en identitet som being, men han ville anføre, at denne som regel ville følge en udvikling i doing. Dette er, hvad Cederman og andre har kaldt ”the Spill-over effect”, et begreb, der betegner en tro på, at eksempelvis øget politisk eller økonomisk samarbejde med tiden vil medføre en stærkere følelse af identitet og fællesskab. Omvendt vil en essentialist påpege, at being altid vil gå forud for doing, i hvert fald, hvis det funktionelle fællesskab skal kunne stabilisere sig og overleve på sigt.

4.8.2 Mulighederne for at konstruere en fælles-europæisk identitet

Andetsteds i antologien ”Why Europe?” spørger Aleksandar Pavkovic ind til, hvordan man kunne konstruere et europæisk fællesskab, såfremt man som Howorth mener, at begrebet Europæisk identitet ikke eksisterer på nuværende tidspunkt.\textsuperscript{100} Først peger han dog på et par væsensforskelle fra det nationale fællesskabs identitetsbygning. Ifølge Benedict Anderson er et af de stærkeste symboler på nationen som metafysisk fællesskab den ukendte soldats tomme grav. Som et symbol på den menige borgers ædle offer udtrykker disse monumenter essensen i det nationale fællesskab: At det er ufravigeligt og transcenderer menneskets fødsel og død. Ud fra dette eksempel kan national bevidsthed siges i høj grad at bestå i en historisk bevidsthed om nationen militære sejre og nederlag.

Uden at nævne Anderson mener Pavkovic, at sådanne fortællinger om nationale blodsudgydelser er utænkelige i en europeisk sammenhæng, alene fordi de

\textsuperscript{99} Vi overtager i resten af opgaven termen det ”funktionelle” fra Howorth, og bruger den som betegnelse for det politiske eller økonomiske doing-perspektiv. Det funktionelle niveau skal altså forstås indenfor denne nævnte kontekst.

\textsuperscript{100} Andrew, Crook, Waller (2000) Kap. 9
undergraver fællesskabet: "The intolerant and thus war-oriented nationalism is not only incompatible with an inclusive European identity, but is also destructive of peace and the well-being of all people in Europe."\textsuperscript{101} Det ville være absurd, hvis de europæiske nationalstater skulle styrke båndene imellem sig ved at dyrke tidligere tiders krige og forbrydelser mod hinanden. Hvis man som Anderson blandt andet vægter krigshistorie og national værnepligt som konstituerende for nationalt fællesskab, er vi her vidne til en grundlæggende forskel på en national identitet og en transnational identitet som i et tilfælde som Europa. Det lader sig ikke gøre i Europas tilfælde, og skulle man skrive en fælles europæisk krigshistorie uden indbyrdes krig og had, ville denne stride mod, de værdier som ellers betegnes europæiske; frihed, lighed og broderskab.\textsuperscript{102} Skal europæisk historie tælle som fællesskabssymbol, skal den være af en anden substans end dem, der blandt andet har været med til at demarkere Europas nationer. Pavkovic efterprøver også andre mulige fællesskabsmarkører, der ville kunne bruges som nationale symboler, som Hylland beskrev dem: En mulighed kunne være en erkendelse af en fælles europæisk kulturarv gennem en opregning af meritter spændende fra Mozart til Michelangelo og Miguel de Cervantes. Pavkovic kritiserer imidlertid et sådant forsøg, idet en kulturel kanon aldrig i sig selv vil kunne bestemme, hvad der er gældende som kulturel norm, men kun kan sige noget om, hvad vi ønsker, skal være gældende.\textsuperscript{103} I øvrigt mener Pavkovic, at sådanne kanoner i national sammenhæng ikke forsøger at bekræfte national kultur, men er til for at illustrere et niveau af kulturel ypperlighed.

Som vi har set, lader et europæisk fællesskab sig til en vis grad altså behandle som et nationalt, selvom visse forskelle, hvad angår fællesskabsmarkører, gør sig gældende. Denne indsigt vil vi forsøge at bruge, når vi til slut skal overveje muligheden for/eksistensen af en europæisk fællesskabsfølelse blandt polakker.

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid. s. 117
\textsuperscript{102} Pavkovic refererer her til en "euro-supranational" historiker Edgar Morin og dennes værk 	extit{Penser l’Europe} fra 1990. Den nævnte krigshistorie kunne ifølge Pavkovic indeholde sejren over hunnerkongen Attila, befriselsen af det osmaninsk-besatte Wien osv.
\textsuperscript{103} Andrew, Crook, Waller (2000) s. 122
5. DISKUSSION
Vi vil nu behandle indholdet af de kvalitative interviews tematisk og holde dem op imod den historiske og teoretiske redegørelse, som allerede foreligger. Vi vil herefter diskutere dem i rammen af vores problemformulering.

5.1 Polen som nationalt fællesskab
Begrebet kultur er en omdiskuteret størrelse, netop fordi det er så svært at definere, hvad det indeholder. Et af målene med interviewene var, at forsøge at klarlægge, hvorvidt polakkernes tilknytning til nationen som fællesskab, herunder polsk kultur, har stor betydning for deres identitet. Dette er interessant i forbindelse med overgangen til EU som et nyt og større fællesskab, fordi vi ønskede at undersøge, om EU opfattes som mere end blot et økonomisk og politisk fællesskab. Vi ville gerne med disse 7 kvalitative interview, undersøge hvordan vores interviewpersoner opfatter det nye fællesskab, og om der på nogen måde sker en ændring i forhold til individets identitet via medlemskabet. Derfor er det også vigtigt at forholde sig til tilknytningen til det nuværende mest markante kulturelle fællesskab: Nationen.

Vi lod interviewpersonerne om tolkningen af vore spørgsmål og således selv definere kulturbegrebet: *What is Polish culture to you?*

Her søgte vi dels at finde ud af hvilke symboler, der forbindes med polsk kultur, jævnfør afsnittet ”Nationen som symbolsk fællesskab” ovenfor. Som beskrevet i det nævnte afsnit er disse symboler vigtige i opretholdelsen af et nationalt fællesskab. De kan forstås som udtryk for den sociale virkelighed, som det nationale fællesskab er skabt i, og derfor er de ofte af forskellig karakter. I interviewene gik en vis opfattelse af generelle tendenser hos en national stereotype igen, og det er vores opfattelse, at disse også kan betragtes som symboler i lighed med dem Smith og Hyl-land-Eriksen beskæftiger sig med.

Polakkernes historie vidner om megen lidelse, og netop styrken til alligevel at kunne bevare nationen, giver anledning til en karakteristik af nationen som et
samlet hele via stereotyper eller symboler funderet i historien. Der gives her tre eksempler på tendenser hos den polske stereotype: Krzystof: "Polish society is not easy to brake"\textsuperscript{104}, Joskabrowska: "She says that Polish are, maybe not brave, but, they fight very good."\textsuperscript{105} og Dr. Kantor "(…)that is a characteristic of the polish people, in terms of some historical event, we could mobilise ourselves very quickly.” Dr. Kantor mener altså at hvis der er behov for det, er det for polakkerne intet problem med en hurtigt mobilisation\textsuperscript{106}

Denne evne til hurtigt at mobilisere sig, kan være et udtryk for en vis solidaritet imellem polakker, men også for en fundamental forståelse for nødvendigheden heraf i lyset af historien.

Et eksempel på hurtig mobilisering, oplevede vi i øvrigt med egne øjne under vores ophold i Krakow. Dagen efter Pave Johannes Paul II’s død kom en enorm mængde unge fodboldfans skrålende over det centrale torv, og samledes foran en større kirke, hvor de stolt viste deres fodboldhalstørkklærer med deres respektive fodboldholds logoer frem. Der var tale om 2 rivaliserende fangrupper, som til dagligt er kendt for deres voldelige indbyrdes kampe, før nylig med døden til følge for en ung mand.

Denne aften manifesterede de netop denne hurtige mobilisering og forening, som et symbol på deres respekt for den afdøde Pave. Her var vi vidner til, på den ene side af pladsen, en imponerende kirke, hvor en højtidelig messe fandt sted, samtidig med, den næsten uhyggelige mængders gjaldende råb fra den anden side af pladsen, næsten overdøvede præsten. Med danske øjne virkede denne scene nærmest absurd, og sammenhængen mellem en højtidelig messe, og en flok skrålende fodboldfans var ikke ligefrem indlysende. Men folk der trådte ud af kirken synes at trække på smilebåndet, - denne forsamling virkede ikke stødende, men var meningsfuld også for kir-

\textsuperscript{104} Krzystof (for dette og andre citater fra andre interviewene: Se bilag 8.5 under de nævnte navne)
\textsuperscript{105} Joskabrowska
\textsuperscript{106} Dr. Kantor
Dr. Maria Kantor kommenterede ved interviewet dagen efter på samme begivenhed:

...like last night when 25,000 football fans got together, that was not planned. In America you must plan for 25,000 people to get together, here it took a day to get them together, right?...that is a characteristic of the polish people, in terms of some historical event, we could mobilise ourselves very quickly.

Dette interessante miks af religion og fodbold, må kunne sige os noget mere om polsk identitet end evnen til at kunne mobilisere sig hurtigt. Først og fremmest er det tydeligt, at Paven har fungeret som et ikon for polsk identitet, og som en repræsentant for fædrelandet. Valdik: “(…)the Pope was from Poland. So he feels that he is very proud of him as being a Polish man, that somebody from Poland is so well-known, that he is a kind a father for all over the world.”

For det andet var Paven kendt for at være de unges ven, og her sås netop en manifestation af religionens betydning for en troende ung sub-kultur.

Når unge mennesker knytter sig til et fodboldhold i så høj grad, kan det ses som et udtryk for stærke bånd til et forestillet fællesskab, en subkultur, der kan være identitetsskabende. I forhold til Andersons tanke om forestillede fællesskaber, er det let at se de tydelige symboler, der repræsenterer dette fællesskab: Klubbens symbol på halstørklæderne, de fælles slagsange (jævnfør Andersons idé om nationalsangen som symbol på nationen), ritualet på stadion hver weekend, hvor det rent visuelt understreges hvad fællesskabet er, og så videre.

Når så dette fællesskab benyttes i en helt anden kontekst, nemlig til at manifestere Pavens død og hans betydning, sættes disse to former for fællesskaber på linje med hinanden, og kommer på den måde ligeledes til at sige noget om det religiøse fællesskabs (eller i hvert fald Pavens) betydning for polsk ungdoms identitet. Måske

---

107 Valdik
kunne man endda vove den påstand, at Paven har mere fundamental betydning, og netop derfor har relationen til ham magten til at ændre på konstellationen mellem to voldelige fodbolddagrupper. Derudover er det måske også meget sigende, at fodboldfællesskabet fungerer mere ekspressivt, og at denne tradition måske bedre repræsenterer ungdommen som formidler af deres budskab end det religiøse fællesskab.

5.1.1 Manifestation af polsk kultur
I forbindelse med fodboldbegivenheden, kan det, som sagt, undre én som dansker, at det ikke vækker stort røre. Der synes at være en udbredt tolerance omkring fænomenet og i sammenhæng kommer man umiddelbart til at tænke på at Mr. Kaczinsky bemærkede, hvordan patriotisme er et modefænomen i Polen for tiden. Ikke at patriotisme må forveksles med nationalism i negativ forstand, som noget udelukkende, hierarkiserende, men netop i form af fædrelandskærlighed som både Anderson og Smith beskriver den. Denne patriotisme manifesteres forskelligt indenfor forskellige generationer:

The older generations go and vote, and the younger generations support the football team, go to church-meetings and join scout-organisations… …but there is mutual respect between generations. There is no fight between them.108

Manifestationen taler altså dels til den ældre generation på grund af det religiøse fællesskab, men herigennem også til det nationale fællesskab, idet der må siges at ligge en religiøs kerne i det at være polsk.

Flere af vores interviewpersoner nævner i forbindelse med udfærdigelsen af EU-forfatningen, at de ønsker at den indbefatter et afsnit om religion, hvori Europa defineres som en kristen størrelse. Det virker som om dette er en problemstilling de

108 Mr. Kaczinsky (medarbejder på Institute of Public Affairs i Warszawa, se afsnit 2.4)
fleste polakker er enige om. Visse aktuelle emner er altså med til at forene polakker trods f.eks. store forskelle indenfor landets rammer rent politisk.

Alekxa: We are diverged and we always quarrel with each other, but in such things (…) even politicians who are on the left side, not so religious and who don’t say anything about religion: “Yes there should be something about God in the beginning of the constitution”.

På dette område adskiller Polen sig tydeligt fra Nordvesteuropæisk tænkning i forholdet mellem kirke og politik, hvor eksempelvis danske politikere ikke i lige så høj grad vil insistere på kristendommens rolle i forhold til EU's kulturelle rødder. Kirkens rolle som nationens beskyttende institution og politiske fortaler under kommunismen kan tænkes at have gjort koblingen mellem politik og kirke normal. Dette kan forklare polakkernes mindre sekulære syn på indholdet af en politisk forfatning. At det særligt var vores akademiske segment der udtalte sig om forfatningen, er måske nok et tegn på elitens større viden på området, men står i kontrast til vores uudfoldede tese om den akademiske polak som mindre religiøs, og understreger religionens forankring i alle dele af polsk kultur.

5.1.2 Det historiske aspekt

Historie er en anden meget vigtig faktor for nationen, og er et emne der dækker bredt over flere aspekter. Mr. Kaczinsky forklarede, hvordan polakker er særligt historie-orienterede, og hvordan det eksempelvis ikke er unormalt at unge polakker, når de samles i fritiden, diskuterer historie: ”We are a very historical nation. We feel passion-ate about this.”¹⁰⁹ Netop denne passion for historien er interessant, for hvorfor er historien tilsyneladende så vigtig for polakker?

¹⁰⁹ Mr. Kaczinsky

*Aleksa:* I think identity should be build from the basic level, from the people. I think it's connected with the way the Polish nation was build. Because it wasn't like the on west side that it was a country before and the nation-state create identity. Because we didn't have a country for a long time so our identity was the basic for us. Not the country.

Polen som nation er altså ikke opstået, som en funktionel ”spill-over” effekt af nationalstatens dannelse, men mere i takt med Smiths teori, modelleret ud fra en allerede eksisterende ethnie. Den polske nations opståen kan altså underbygge rigtigheden af den essentialistiske teori om ”la longue durée”, det vil sige de lange linjer som den nuværende polske kultur trækker tilbage i tiden.

Den senere historie, med besættelse under Anden Verdenskrig, og herefter Polen under kommunistisk styre har givetvis været medvirkende til, at polsk identitet,
historisk set, er baseret på modstand mod og forskellighed fra overherredømmet - på det nationen ikke er.

Efter 1989 gør dette forhold sig stadig gældende. En tydelig tendens er, at polske politikere og den polske regering, den dag i dag, anses for korrupte, uansvarlige og inkompentence

Alekya: I think that my teacher said (...) that Polish mentality is really connected with the way the nation identity was build, because we were always against our government in history. Right now we feel against our policies, our politics. Because it was our history and it’s very difficult for us to identify ourselves with our government, just like Iraq for example (...) we need to be against something, like our government right now.

Denne generelle mistillid, synes at være et produkt af historien, og er blevet en indgroet holdning hos polakkerne. Mistillid er nærmest et typisk karaktertræk. Der er en længsel efter politisk stabilitet, og økonomisk fremgang, og der hersker en bemærkelsesværdig EU-optimisme, dels på økonomiske områder, men også i forhold til politisk kultur:

Is it rightly understood that he finds the EU Government less corrupt than the Polish one?
(Krzystof) Yes. He would trust EU more than the Polish one. If he was supposed to trust his money to either the Polish government or the EU, then he would choose the EU.
But, there are also Polish politicians in the EU...
He didn’t say that he would trust the Polish politicians in the EU!

Det er altså en tendens til, at polakker ser sig selv i modsætning til deres regering. Dog styrker dagens situation ikke nødvendigvis det nationale fællesskab. Demokra-
tisk valgte politikere skaber en større sammenhæng mellem borger og stat, eftersom de er repræsentanter for nationen. Derfor er opposition til den polske regering i dag ikke på samme måde definerende for den polske nation, som oppositionen til de tidligere regimer var det. Nationen som fællesskab må i dag mere skabes udfra, hvem polakkerne er, og ikke i så høj grad ud fra modsætningsforholdet mellem magteliten og den brede befolkning.

5.1.3 Systemtransition og kløft mellem generationer


De unge mener typisk om de ældre, at der er en stor mentalitetsforskels og at det er svært for dem at ændre deres "way of thinking". Der fortælles (med forståelse) om den ældre generations stagnation og manglende evne til fornyelse:

*Why do you think that older people are more pessimistic and superstitious? Do you have a theory about that?*

Krzystof: It is because of the communism in Poland. All the older people grew up under communism in Poland, and all these promises never kept, and(...)The older people have been lied to all the time. They have become distrustfull. And it is very hard for a person to change from one moment to another
Desuden lægges der vægt på forskellen mellem kommunismens omsorg for de ældre og svage i samfundet og det nuværende kapitalistiske mindre solidariske opbygning:

The most bad thing is that there is a group of older people in Poland, who have no ability to change themselves to fit new way of life. And this is a disadvantage. They have no possibility to increase their knowledge, nobody looks after them now, there are no programs and they are left alone. And the situation became more and more difficult. (...) they live in a completely different world. ¹¹⁰

Under kommunismen blev det sociale sikkerhedsnet etableret i kraft af at virksomhederne var en del af socialpolitikken, og de sikrede ikke alene de ansatte fast arbejde og løn, men ofte også børnepasning, bolig og forbrugsgoder. Knyttet til virksomhederne var som regel også feriehjem, hospitaler og klinikker. "There were plenty of things you could get from the government. You could go on holiday and the company would pay" ¹¹¹ Desuden var priserne på almindelige fødevarer lave i kraft af, at de i høj grad var subsidierede. Denne økonomiske støtte på dagligvarer udgjorde en del af den daværende sociale hjælp.


Den type politik skabte imidlertid en ny type mennesker. Statsafhængige arbejdere og en statsafhængig middelklasse. For de fleste blev den sociale sikkerhed

¹¹⁰ Anita
¹¹¹ Joska Browska
prioriteret højere end selvstændighed og risikotagen. Der skabtes en afhængighed til staten, som gjorde borgerne forvænte med disse goder hvilket kan siges at være fordelagtigt for et totalitært styre, men hæmmende for et nyt politisk samfund, der skal prøve kræfter med markedsøkonomi.

5.1.4 Værdi- og moralmodifikation

Den ældre generation lægger, som nævnt ovenfor, vægt på at der blandt ungdommen er sket en ændring i værdier og at der så at sige er tale om andre moralopfattelser. De begrunder det b.la. med den lynhurtige transition fra socialisme til kapitalisme, som de unge ikke var tilstrækkeligt rustede til. Der er i systemtransformationen sket et, efter den ældre generations mening, værditab som b.la. fører til en manglende interesse for religionen. Der gives desuden udtryk for, at mindre fritid betyder mindre tid til familien, og i forlængelse heraf, mindre tid til opdragelse i den ældre generations ånd.

Anita: The main change is now the most important thing for everybody is money and sometimes you have to sacrifice to get money. You forget about your family and even you forget about yourself. You don’t care about yourself, about your emotion, about your appearance, whatever, about some other thing related to you. And sometimes it’s to late to do something for you, your family, your friends, because you spend all life in big rush, but it wasn’t in the past, so now everything is faster quicker and everything becomes demand, because it’s very hard to get enough money for life, and everyone is very busy to work or do something to get… something… things to live.

I vores interview har vi også set et eksempel på, at de unge selv mener det er vanskeligt at finde byggeklodserne til identitetsdannelse, når der ikke findes en negativ modpol at spille den op imod.
Aleksa: Yes because it's more difficult for us to find our identity because we don't have anything that differs so much. Like United States and Europe, like Europe and Turkey for example. Our parents and country and communism. We don't have anything to say no to. Build our own identity. It's a problem.

På samme måde var det tydeligt, at både yngre og ældre i Polen gik meget op i deres religion. Her aner man en tendens til svagere tilknytning til kirken, som institution, hos den yngre generation. Her kan ses en parallel til kapitel 7: ”The last wave” i Andersons ”Imagined Communities”, hvor uddannelse til de koloniserede indonesere, og evnen til at læse, medfører at der udbredes bevidsthed om revolutioner i Frankrig og USA. Dette inspirerer, og fører på sigt til revolutioner og selvstændighed. Der kan drages en parallel hertil hos den yngre generation af polacker, som er vokset op efter 1989 og herefter har skabt en større selvbevidsthed i form af et udbygget og forbedret uddannelsessessystem. Den yngre generation har modtaget en mere objektiv uddannelse end den ældre generation, og langt flere polacker uddannes i dag end under kommunismen112

Desuden har transitionen til markeds økonomi, medført kapitalistiske værdier, som i højre grad bygger på individualisme og en tendens til hele tiden at skulle være bedre og opnå højre resultater. Det udviklede netværksamfund bevirker, at folk er mere oplyste og derfor også mere kritisk indstillet. De yngre polacker er derfor skolet i en mere kritisk og selvstændig tilgang til verden, som ligeledes har indflydelse på de unges mening om kirken som institution. Krzystof:”Young people do believe in God and Jesus and all those Catholic things connected to the church, but they don’t believe in church as an institution, so they do not practice..”

Og i interviewet med Aleksa:

112 Mr. Kaczinsky: Af den unge generation er ca. 1/3 uddannede, mens 10-11 % har længerevarende uddannelse. I den ældre generation er kun ca. 2-3 % uddannede.
So if I understand you right, you're religious, but for your own sake. And you don’t go to church for a specific priest. It's more the religion and you rather than..."

“It’s more believing, not belonging – something like that.”

Forfølger man denne tanke, forstås det, at religiositeten får en anden rolle i de unges liv. De unge er religiøse, men religion bliver vigtig i en mere spirituel og mindre traditionel form. Hvis dette betyder færre unge i kirkerne¹¹³, vil det, i forhold til Anderssons teori, betyde, at dette religiøse fællesskab bliver sværere at forestille sig.

Måske vil kirken som institution, på sigt miste legitimitet som symbol på nationen, og dermed vil den yngre generation inden for dette område, miste en medierende faktor for det nationale fællesskab, der ellers tidligere har været meget fremtrædende. Det interessante er, om dette betyder at den yngre generation finder nye former for symboler på nationen, eller om båndet til nationen måske bliver svækket?

For at samle op på, hvad vores interviewpersoner mener, polsk kultur er for en størrelse, er der gennemgående to faktorer, der særligt gør sig gældende: En stærk tilknytning til kirken og en lang og kompleks historie. Forholdet til kirken er givet historisk forankret, men må, jævnfør interviewene, betragtes særskilt. Kirken er vigtig i forhold til polakkers selvforståelse med sin status som politisk aktør, i hvert fald til begyndelsen af halvfemserne¹¹⁴, og som opposition til skiftende magthavere gennem tiden. Polakkerne forholder sig altså til en kirke, som er andet og mere end en religiøs institution. Den har dels været en vigtig brik i spillet om Polen og har desuden med sin rolle som bærende søjle i forhold til polsk identitet også været identitetsforankrende. Flere af vores interviewpersoner udtrykte imidlertid en hvis modvilje mod kirken. Måske går kirken ind i en tid, der byder på forandring. I hvert fald har kirkens rolle, på trods af sin status som kulturel støttepille, ændret sig siden kommu-

¹¹³ Mr. Kaczinsky: Den ældre generation er mere konservativ med ca. 80 % ugentlige kirkegængere, mod ca. 55 % hos den yngre generation.
¹¹⁴ Mr. Kaczinsky
nismens fald i Polen i ’89. Overgangen fra kommunisme til kapitalisme, fra regime til demokrati, kan spores i vores interview. Der var en tydelig forskel mellem den yngre og den ældre generation i forhold til de to ovennævnte faktorer; historie og religion.

Denne generationskloft er interessant i forhold til nationen som kollektivt fællesskab. Smiths beskriver hvordan det kollektive fællesskab er bygget på kulturelle elementer, og derfor er et særligt stabilt fællesskab. Men når disse kulturelle elementer, såsom historiske begivenheder og religion, opfattes relativt forskelligt af to generationer, opstår en form for deling af det nationale fællesskab i to, og nationen bliver mindre stabil.

Begge generationer giver udtryk for stor EU-optimisme, men set i lyset af den ovenstående analyse, er det spændende om dette generationsskel kan give anledning til forskellig opfattelse EU, som enten en rent økonomisk og politisk samarbejde, et ”doing-fællesskab”, eller om det ligeledes indeholder kulturelle elementer, det vil sige at EU-pakken fordrer et ”being”-fællesskab. Den yngre generation forstår de nationale symboler på en ny måde, og må derfor også have en anden forestilling om det nationale fællesskab, og man kunne forudsige at ungdommen vil inkludere EU-fællesskabet, som en større del af deres kulturelle identitet.

5.2 Polen på vej mod transnationalisme

Med udgangspunkt i Giddens’ redegørelse for nye kommunikationsformer og massesmediers betydning for begreberne tid og rum\[115\] vil vi nu behandle vores kvalitative interviews. Vi vil undersøge, hvordan nye kommunikationsformer kommer til udtryk i interviewpersonernes liv, og hvad dette generelt betyder for polakkers opfattelse af Europa og europæisk identitet.

Efter Polens systemtransition har landets samfundsmæssige strukturer ændret sig markant. Under kommunismen handlede Polen kun med få andre lande,
hovedsageligt Ukraine og Rusland.\textsuperscript{116} En anden ting, der er væsentlig at nævne i denne sammenhæng er at man under kommunismen ikke kunne forlade landet uden meget besvær. Som medlem af EU, har landets grænser åbnet sig og det er nu en realitet for polakker at få job uden for landets grænser. Polen er så småt ved at blive en del af det internationale arbejdsmarked: Udenlandske investorer opretter virksomheder, og polakker søger i højere grad udenlands efter arbejde. I interviewene kunne næsten alle personer selv forestille sig at arbejde udenlands, Aleksa udtrykker det således:

“I’ll be living in the place where I find a job. You’ll never know.”

“So you’ll just move where ever the jobs are?”

“Yes.”

“Do you consider working somewhere else, like another country in Europe?”

“Yeah, in Spain. I started to learn Spanish(....)It’s warmer than Poland so it’s a good idea to go there.”

Polakkerne er blevet en del af den transmigrante tidsalder og der vil sandsynligvis forekomme en stigende mobilisering og tid-rum udstrækningen vil også for dem ændre karakter. Polakkerne vil altså i større omfang opleve en større relation mellem lokalt engagement og interaktion over afstande, som følge af den stigende samhandel. Da vi spurgte Mr. Kaczinsky om, hvilke effekter EU medlemskabet havde på den almene polak, svarede han:

“It is too early to say. We are more exposed to the outside world: We now have more visitors, and we more often go for holidays. The Euro to Zloty exchange rate has changed in such a way that it is much better for Poles, although this is not the case for the exporters.

\textsuperscript{116} Mr. Kaczinsky
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5.2.1 Massemedier: Europæisering eller globalisering?

I interviewene finder vi blandt andet Valdiks opfattelse af amerikansk tv-kulturs påvirkning af unges virkelighedsfornemmelse:

Bruce Lee is an example. When young people saw Bruce Lee on the television, they went out on the streets and tried to do like Bruce Lee. Their identity was the same as Bruce Lee. So it works like this: Whatever young people see on the screen, they will try to copy in their own lives. They are changing to fit the identity shown on the screen. But the older people they have the experience, they know that this is fiction and not reality that it is the idea of a director or a writer, and they are only entertained by what they see, but young people believe that this could be their way of life.

Her finder vi et typisk eksempel på det Giddens ville kalde en fraværs situation, idet mange unges identitet ikke længere kun bygger på face-to-face-kommunikation, men også denne kommunikation, der overskrider tid og rum. Den virkelighed som Valdik
føler, at den unge generation bliver præsenteret for, kommer i dette og måske i mange andre tilfælde fra ikke fra Polen, endslige fra Europa. Dette har en vis betydning, når vi skal diskutere, hvorvidt polakker har eller vil få en følelse af at tilhøre et europæisk fællesskab. Jolyon Howorth, der som tidligere nævnt undersøger muligheden for europæisk identitet, skriver om dette:

"And it is quite possible, indeed probable, that the EU itself – as a historically generated regional regime – is little more than a staging post on the road to globalization. That process may happen much more swiftly than we can anticipate, with the result that a European identity could well be superseded even before it actually takes shape."

Eksemplet med Bruce Lee siger os, at den påvirkning af polsk identitet, som udøves af massemedier, ikke kun lader sig beskrive som påvirkning fra det øvrige EU, men fra hele vesten som sådan. Altså er det ikke kun et øget samarbejde i Europa gennem EU, men også en mere generel tendens til globalisering af kulturen, der kan tænkes at rykke ved polakkens opfattelse af deres egen identitet. Man kan som Howorth betragte det sådan, at disse to tendenser (til europeanization og globalization) begge kan betragtes som udfordrere eller alternativer til nationen og national identitet. På sin vis kan de også siges at være konkurrenter, i det omfang at deres indhold er forskelligt.

Men her er det værd at overveje, hvordan man kan skille de to ting ad. Vi har i det foregående fulgt Giddens’ redegørelse for, hvordan nye kommunikationsveje fører til opløsningen af nær og fjern-relationer og gør verden mere global. Man kan dog kritisere brugen af begrebet globalisering ved det faktum, at den kun udspiller sig i de dele af verden, hvor disse nye kommunikationsformer er slået igennem som følge af teknologisk udvikling. Med andre ord kan man kun tale om ophævelsen af nær-fjern-relationerne i Europa og Amerika, samt blandt en lille elite i verdens øvrige na-
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tioner. Hvis den globaliseringsproces som Giddens omtaler i virkeligheden er centre-ret i omkring Vesten, så åbner spørgsmålet sig om den ikke i store dele falder sammen med påvirkningen mod en europæisk identitet. Hvis polakker på tv er vidne til amerikansk velstand og overflod, tænker de så denne velstand som anderledes end europæisk, altså som specielt amerikansk? I Vesteuropa er påvirkningen fra eksempelvis den amerikanske kultur også gældende, og derfor bliver det svært at tale om europæisk kulturpåvirkning uden indirekte at tale om en amerikansk eller global påvirkning.

Alt i alt kan vi sige, at Polen som nation ikke er upåvirket af den kommunikationsstrøm, som Giddens omtaler. Vores interviews viser, at den kulturelle påvirkning gennem blandt andet massemedier spiller en rolle for polakker i hverdagen. Dens indhold påvirker polsk identitet, men mere tvivlsomt er, i hvilken retning: Man kan vælge at se det sådan, at eksempelvis amerikansk kultur vil overdøve en særlig europæisk kultur, og dermed svække polakkers følelse af at være i et europæisk fællesskab. Heroverfor kan man fremføre, at samme amerikanske kultur også gør sig gældende i det øvrige Europa, og at den har gjort det længe. Således kan man forestille sig, at en europæisk identitet ikke klart kan adskilles fra en mere global kultur.

5.3 Europa på polsk

I vores interviews har vi kredset om emnet EU eller Europa på en række forskellige planer. Vi har forsøgt at italesætte interviewpersonernes forhold til EU/Europa i dagligdagen, deres overvejelser til forhold til Polens folkeafstemning i 2002 og deres mere abstrakte tanker og holdninger vedrørende deres følelse af identitet som europæer eller østeuropæer eller polak. Vi spørger nu, hvad kan disse svar sige om polakkers europæiske fællesskabsfølelse?
5.3.1 Being and doing

Udfra Jolyon Howorths to perspektiver på et muligt europæisk fællesskab, kan vi karakterisere interviewpersonernes udsagn omkring Europa og EU. Som det ligger i det kvalitative interviews natur, så er de tanker og holdninger, der er kommet frem, meget forskellige og udgør, set fra oven, en broget, heterogen masse. Hvis vi imidlertid bevæger os lidt ned i perspektiv, kan vi iagttagte visse tendenser: En del af interviewpersonerne lægger vægt på EU's økonomiske perspektiv, mens andre direkte siger, at dette ikke burde spille nogen rolle, men at EU i stedet skal betragtes som et projekt, der forsøger at få lande og kulturer til at samvirke.

Til den første kategori hører eksempelvis Valdiks betoning af EU's mange siderede indvirkning på arbejdssituationen for den enkelte polak:

“…all investors in Poland or company owners which have factories here know that in Poland there is a very big unemployment, and they employ you for very poor wages, so they use the situation for themselves, and they treat people like cheap labour, and Valdik’s impression of this is bad”

Ligeledes går hans bekymringer ved EU og Polens rolle i Europa på økonomiske konsekvenser: “The main danger for Poland, which Valdik has noticed for the future, is pushing Poland in terms of amounts or quantities, let say how much you can produce… milk or other things. So he does not agree with some regulations from the EU, that you are supposed to produce this and this.”

Det er indlysende, at EU i høj grad er et institutionelt samarbejde i Valdiks øjne. Han lægger vægt på udvekslingen af arbejdskraft, og som noget typisk polsk bemærker han, at polakkerne er gode specialister. Det vil dog ikke være retfærdigt at påstå, at Valdik ikke også ser en kulturel udveksling som følge af samarbejdet mellem EU-staterne: Dette giver sig blandt andet udslag i anderledes omtanke for miljøet og ændrede alkoholvaner som følge af det øgede antal udskænkningstester.

118 Disse to er: Being og Doing, der er beskrevet i afsnittet "Fællesskab, Nation, Europa", og som repræsenterer henholdsvis en handlingsmæssig og identitetsmæssig opfattelse af et supranationalt fællesskab.
Det er imidlertid karakteristisk, at han sætter disse værdier i forbindelse med et funktionelt perspektiv på EU. Interessant er her hans iagttagelse af, at polakker, som følge af inspiration fra blandt andet Tyskland nu i højere grad interesserer sig for miljøet og affaldssortering. Dette er vel, hvad man kunne kalde for afsmitning af normer. Hvor­dan kan man betegne denne afsmitning indenfor rammerne af being/doing?


Både et identitetsmæssigt og funktionelt perspektiv kan aflæses af eksemplet med polakkens forhold til miljø. Men det er tydeligt, at doing her træder i forgrunden, eftersom miljøbevidstheden sættes i forbindelse med et ønske om at leve op til nogle politiske foranstaltninger, og ikke er et mål i sig selv.

Den tendens som vi lod Valdik eksemplificere, modsvares af en anden tendens, der gør sig gældende hos især de to studerende, Aleksa og Agnieszka, og hos Dr. Kantor. Her bliver det – ofte bevidst – fremhævet, at EU diskussionen ikke bør dreje sig om økonomi: Agnieszka:

"People just don’t think about EU as a great thing that can connect Europe and make it stronger in the world. They just think of the EU as a way for them to be able to go working abroad or they worry if some foreigners will come and take their land or that the eggs will be more expensive"

Dette er – udover at være en tilkendegivelse af vigtigheden af being-perspektivet – også en erklæring om, at afsenderen ikke ønsker at blive slået i hart-

Som nævnt har det noget at sige, hvilken uddannelsesbaggrund interviewpersonerne har i forhold til deres opfattelse af EU som kulturklub eller institutionelt samarbejde. Groft skitseret kan man sige, at interviewpersonerne på fabrikken, primært de ældre, lægger større vægt på det økonomiske samarbejde, mens de unge, og specielt de unge studerende, i højere grad vægter samarbejdets konsekvenser for en fælles identitet og kultur.

5.3.2 Center og periferi i being/doing-diskussionen

De to tendenser, der indenfor interviewpersonerne læner sig mod henholdsvis en betoning af doing og being-dimensionen, kan belyses ud fra spørgsmålet: Hvor føler du, at Polen hører til: Til Østeuropa eller Centraleuropa?

Dette spørgsmål blev stillet til samtlige personer, og det handler i høj grad om man i forbindelse med Europa kan tale om center eller periferi. Der blev i spørgsmålet ikke lagt op til om dette skulle forstås i en kulturel, politisk eller bare
geografisk forstand. Dette skyldes, at vi i høj grad selv ville lade interviewpersonerne besvare dette, eftersom det ville sige noget om deres følelse af Europa som sådan.

Det viser, at dette spørgsmål er knyttet til det forrige, nemlig omkring den basale opdeling af doing og being. I høj grad kan man sige, at første er med til at gøre sidste inddeling mulig. Der er nemlig igen delte meninger om dette, men fælles for dem, der betegner Polen som et Østeuropæisk land, er at de også i høj grad fokuserer på EU som et doing-fællesskab. Joska Browska: ”She still feels that we are closer to the eastern countries. [...] so she says her idea is that we are somehow in front of the eastern European countries, but we are still behind Western Europe.”

Derimod er de, som trækker being-dimensionen frem, ikke i tvivl om Polens plads som del af Centraleuropa: Dr. Kantor:

It depends on what basis you define your feeling of being European, you know. For me.. I’m historical, geographically in Europe, and Poland has always been in Europe so for me there is no scale for being more or less European. You are either European or not.

Der kan ikke herske tvivl om, at Joska Browska, når hun siger ”behind” og ”in front” refererer til en økonomisk skala. Taget i betragtning af, at spørgsmålet var åbent og således ikke af sig selv sporede de interviewede ind på en økonomisk opdeling i øst og central, er dette et meget stærkt udsagn om at denne tankegang er en fast del af disse personers diskurs om Europa. Den gradbøjning som Joska Browska anlægger modsvares af Dr. Kantors vilje til kategorisk at afvise at tale om udfra periferi/center-opdelingen.
5.4 Exclusion of the other

Dette afsnit behandler interviewpersonernes opfattelse af Europas ydre grænser. Når man taler om nationen, skal den forstås som afgrænset, eftersom en nation i sagens natur ikke kan eksistere, uden andre nationer at afgrænse sig fra. Dette kan ses i forhold til Andersons teori om det forestillede nationale fællesskab, som er naturligt afgrænset. Som tidligere nævnt,119 bruger vi om denne afgrænsning begrebet "exclusion of the other". Når vores interviewpersoner forholder sig til Polens placering i Europa, må de ligeledes have en opfattelse af, hvad Europa er, men i lige så høj grad hvem der ekskluderer, altså hvad Europa ikke er.

Vi ønskede at undersøge, hvor Europas grænser, ifølge polsk opfattelse, går, og om forståelsen af Europa som et økonomisk/politisk eller et kulturelt fællesskab havde indflydelse herpå?

5.4.1 Polens naboer mod øst – Europa i et EU-perspektiv

Under interviewene, forsøgte vi at nå til en forståelse af, hvor polakkerne "placere" Europas østlige grænser. I besvarelsen af dette var der en klar tendens til at begrense Europa i form af EU, dog var Norge og Schweiz inkluderet, og Polens medlemskab af EU har også på individniveau skabt nye opfattelser af de politiske grænser mod øst.

I et historisk perspektiv har Polen været sine østlige naboer overlegen. Som Mr. Kaczinsky udtrykker det: “We have some kind of a patriarchic perspective on the nations who are living east from us, and those countries are: Lithuania, Belarus and Ukrainians. (...)At least for 700 years we have been patronising them.”120

Polen kunne for mindre end 20 år siden lettere identificere sig med for eksempel Litauen, Hviderusland og Ukraine, der tidligere var en del af den kommunistiske blok og herunder samme økonomiske og politiske systemer. Efter murens fald
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har Polen igen patroniserende rolle, om end på en anden måde end for 700 år siden. Økonomisk og politisk er landet et foregangsland, og dette har, med Polens EU-medlemskab siden maj 2004, skabt en endnu klarere grænse til de østlige naboer. Derfor er det for den enkelte polak lettere at sætte fingeren på forskellen mellem Polen og de øvrige tidligere kommunistiske lande i dag. Hvor denne skelnen måske tidligere var svær at definere, virker de politiske optagelseskrav i forbindelse med EU som konkret demarkationslinie mellem landene. Krzystof har derfor ikke svært ved at definere, hvad Europa er: 

"(...) there are some changes made in Ukraine made towards EU. It looks like they strongly want to join the EU. In Belarus and Russia, you have got something totally different. It looks like there is still dictatorship there”. Her understeges via udgrænsningen et fælles Europa som et "doing"-fællesskab.

5.4.2 Den religiøse faktor set i lyset af Huntingtons civilisationsmodel.


Aleksa: I think we should be tolerant, and try to work about policy for immigrants for example. But I think that if you want to create a strong Europe and to be able to speak one voice of Europe, we should think more about identity and about who to identify with Turkey for example. People from Europe have problems when we speak about religion because of the stronger position from
France for example. There are more religious countries or less… It’s not so important maybe. But when we think about Islam also, for me, we should be tolerant, but we should think more egoistic about our own identity. We should try to create something strong, and not try to put everything in one place.

Denne synsvinkel leder os tilbage til afsnittet om Cederman, herunder Huntington's "Clash of civilisations". Huntington er pan-nationalist i den forstand, at han netop bygger sin "verdensopdeling" på civilisationer, hvor religion er en definerende faktor. Man kan derfor dele verden op i religiøse civilisationer, hvor Europa defineres som en civilisation grundlagt på kristendommen. At skabe fællesskaber på tværs af disse civilisationer vil i følge Huntington være problematisk.

Denne opfattelse stemmer overens med Agnieszkas opfattelse af polakkers tilhøringsforhold til Europa. Hun føler sig knyttet til den kristne religion, og siger:"they feel a little confused about Turkey, because this is religion. This is my top theory: Religion is everything."121 Desuden siger Krzystof:

The main difference is the religion. Personally he don't mind Turkish people, but in his opinion Poland and Turkey have nothing in common. 
So he doesn’t consider Turkey to be a part of Europe?
Yes, but only geographically. They have a different culture and religion. But it might be fun there!"122

Det er interessant, at Krzystof er bevidst om Tyrkiets faktiske geografiske placering i Europa, men at han kan ikke identificere sig med den tyrkiske religion og kultur. Han betragter altså Europas grænser på to måder. En der udelukkende definerer Europa geografisk, og en der afgrænser det i forhold til kulturelle og religiøse værdier. Den

121 Agnieska
122 Krzystof
sidste kan altså sættes i forhold til Huntingtons civilisationsmodel, og sættes i forbindelse med EU.

5.4.3 Rusland – en del af Europa?
Rusland, indtil Uralbjergene, er en del af det geografiske Europa, men ekskluderer af nogle interviewpersoner. Aleksa går så vidt som til at afskære Hviderusland fra Europa, udelukkende fordi det ligger for tæt på Rusland.

Interviewer: I wouldn’t say that Russia is a part of Europe at all. (...) No. It’s so different, the mentality. No way.
Aleksa: Okay. What do you think is a part of Europe? On that side?
Interviewer: On that side? I would say that Ukraine is a part of Europe.
Aleksa: What about Belarus for example?
Interviewer: No not now. No. I think they need a lot of time to be just like European country. They are to close to Russia. I’m just like: no no no Russia. (ler) No friends of the Russians.123

Det der gør sig gældende for polakkernes lidt anstrengte forhold til Rusland kan skyldes flere ting. For det første spiller historien givetvis en stor rolle. Det faktum, at Polen har været under sovjetisk diktatur, udgør en stor del af den skepsis mod Rusland, der eksisterer i Polen i dag. En anden problemstilling, der kommer til udtryk, er deres overbevisning om, at Europa og demokrati unægteligt må gå hånd i hånd. Demokratiske rettigheder forbindes ikke med Rusland, men derimod med Europa. Polakkerne definerer altså deres europæiske fællesskab i form af demokrati, og her mener flere, at Rusland må udelukkes. Mr. Kaczinsky siger endvidere, at Polens forhold til Rusland er ”extremely tough! They hate us, we hate them basically. On the political level it’s almost a Cold War.”
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Det at definere Europa i form af eksklusion af noget andet, har vist sig at have mange ansigter. Formålet med dette afsnit er at afdække hvilke modpoler polakkerne ser til et europæisk fællesskab. De negative faktorer der ekskluderes, siger os noget om de positive faktorer, der inkluderes. Nogle definerer Europa i form af EU, altså ud fra et politisk og økonomisk perspektiv. En anden gruppe ser grænserne med religiøse briller og mener at Europas civilisation må forklares ud fra de kristne værdier. Den sidste position mener, at Europas lande nødvendigvis må være demokratiske, og at Rusland derfor ikke kan betragtes som værende europæisk.

Disse kendsgerninger besvarer vores indledende spørgsmål, om hvorvidt økonomiske/politiske og kulturelle faktorer har betydning for polakkernes afgrænsning af Europa. Disse faktorer spiller i høj grad ind, og er definerende for om de interviewede anskuer Europa som et enten "doing"- eller "being"- fællesskab.

5.5 Diskussion af de empiriske undersøgelser i forhold til fire perspektiver på et supranationale fællesskab.

5.5.1 "Begrenset integration"
Det er "begrenset integration"-perspektivets tanke, at det konstruerede nationale fællesskab er så stærkt, at et supranationale fællesskab kun kan fungere som et supplement til dette. I forhold til vores problemstilling betyder denne teori, at hvis polakker skal føle sig som del af et europæisk fællesskab, så vil denne fællesskabsfølelse eller identitet blive begrenset af identiteten som polak. Hvordan er så mulighederne for dette udfra vores empiriske undersøgelser?

5.5.2 Postnationalisme


Som vi har set det hos Hylland-Eriksen, så blev de nationale symboler konstrueret på et politisk (top)plan, for derefter at træde i funktion for samfundet som helhed. Den dynamiske dialektik mellem politik og kultur, tager udgangspunkt i en politisk konstruktion styres fra toppen og ned. Men i Polens tilfælde tyder vores empiriske undersøgelser på, at denne påvirkning oppefra og ned ikke fungerede på samme måde, fordi der simpelthen ikke var samme sammenhæng mellem det politiske styre og den polske identitet. Dette gjorde, at polsk identitet tværtimod blev styrket i oppositionen til politisk styring, i stedet for at lade sig diktere af den.

Naturligvis kan man betragte det modpolære forhold mellem polsk identitet og polsk regering under for eksempel kommunismen som endnu et udtryk for sammenhængen mellem kultur og politik. Det er blot vores pointe, at samspillet mellem disse størrelser i Polens tilfælde er af anderledes karakter. Dette er vigtigt, fordi postnationalismen forudsætter en traditionel konstruktivistisk dynamik i en konstruktion af et europæisk fællesskab: Doing-samarbejde i for eksempel EU’s institutioner.
vil medføre ændring i det brede folkelige fællesskaber og dette vil resultere i et europæisk being-fællesskab, sådan at dette helt vil overtage nationens rolle. Hvis dette skulle gælde i Polens tilfælde kunne det tænkes at spille ind, at landets nationale fællesskab ikke helt følger denne model, hvor politik konstruerer kultur. Hvis dette alligevel var tilfældet, så ville en polsk bevægelse mod supranation ikke være parallel med bevægelsen mod nation, sådan som det ellers er postnationalismens overbevisning.


5.5.2 Etnonationalisme

Et ethnonationalistisk syn på et supranationalt fællesskab bygger som tidligere nævnt på Anthony D. Smiths ethnosymbolitiske standpunkt. En væsentlig pointe, som vi har uddraget fra vores empiri, er, at Polens opståen som nation på nogle punkter stemmer overens Smiths idé om en ubrudt linie mellem ethnie og nation: konstrukti-
vismens ide om politisk konstruktion af et nationalt fællesskab, er i Polens tilfælde sat ud af kraft, idet der over lang tid ikke har været kongruens mellem politisk styre og den brede befolkning.

I Smiths perspektiv ville den polske nations relation til et før-moderne fællesskab være til at få øje på: Årtiers fravær af politisk styring af identiteten gør, at polsk identitet har kunnet trække på blandt andet bevidstheden om, at Polen for 700 år siden var et mægtigt kongerige. Således kan den polske nations opståen med relativ lethed tolkes ind i en essentialisitisk opfattelse af nationen, men spørgsmålet er, om en udvikling henimod en supranational stat vil ligne udviklingen imod nationen, og hvis den gør, om den så vil kunne beskrives tilfredsstillende med ethnonationale briller.

Vores empiriske undersøgelser viser blandt andet, at den polske nation påvirkes af en række forskellige faktorer, der især siden systemtransitionen har gjort sig gældende. Dette gælder som tidligere nævnt øget mobilitet og grænseoverskridende kommunikation (herunder en generationskløft, der er større end i andre vesteuropæiske lande) og ikke mindst en forholdsvis ny politisk kultur, der bygger på markedsøkonomi og liberalt demokrati. Smith og etnonationalismen må som udgangspunkt afvise, at disse faktorer vil ændre drastisk på det nationale fællesskab. Man kan imidlertid argumentere for, at disse ting er kvalitative ændringer, der generelt vil indvirke på den måde, fællesskaber dannes. Tager man for eksempel den Polens nye demokratiske kultur, så er den måde, hvorpå der nu er sammenhæng mellem politik og kultur kvalitativt anderledes, end under for eksempel kommunismen. Derfor har vi i vores analyse vurderet, at man ikke kan sammenligne polakkernes modvilje til deres nuværende regering med deres historiske opposition til kommunismen. Hvis dette skifte så markant bryder med polsk historie, kan man ikke udelukke, at den polske nation i disse år også vil ændre karakter, således at en konstruktivistisk teori bedre ville kunne forklare dens karakter.
Hertil kommer, at forskellen mellem den unge og den ældre generations værdier også giver grund til at tro, at der kan opstå kvalitative ændringer i den måde polakker opfatter fællesskaber på i fremtiden. Desuden tæller det også, at Polens udvikling som nation på grund af de mange års fremmedherredømme er forskellig fra andre europæiske nationer, for eksempel i Vesteuropa. Såfremt disse øvrige europæiske nationer er opstået på en måde, der ikke i samme grad kan forklares med en essentialistisk opfattelse, kan dette tænkes at have indflydelse på Polen. Forholdet mellem kultur og identitet indenfor den franske nation kan for eksempel give anledning til, at Polakkens forhold til et supranational identitet ændrer sig, eftersom franskmændene i så fald også ville være del af polakkernes europæiske identitet.

5.5.4 Pan-nationalisme


Den gradvise historiske udvikling gælder også i dag, og derfor pan-nationalismen tror på eksistensen af et supranationalt fællesskab bygget på en kulturel kerne. I tråd med Samuel Huntington's tese om Europa som bærende en fælles kristen arv, kan man argumentere for, at nationen vil blive afløst af et større fællesskab, der i

Den reelle mulighed for et sådant fællesskab er dog sandsynligvis ikke særlig stor, eftersom polakkers religiositet er enestående i forhold resten af EU’s medlemslande. Desuden skal det nævnes, at interviewenes afdækning af en generationssløft også gør sig gældende i forhold til religiositet: Den unge generation ser i nogen grad Paven som et nationalt symbol, og ikke som overhoved for Europa og verdens forenede katolikker. Det kan muligvis tolkes som et tegn på, at religion hos de unge ikke i så høj grad tæller som samlende faktor for en europæisk identitet.
6. Konklusion

Det har været dette projekts opgave at afdække polakkernes forhold til deres eget nationale fællesskab og til et europæisk fællesskab. Ud fra kvalitative interviews udført i Polen forsøger vi at svare på dette. Vi diskuterer herefter, hvordan vores empiriske erfaringer skal forstås indenfor den teoretiske ramme, der omkranser vores problemstilling.

Diskussionen peger blandt andet på en række karakterististiske og tendenser indenfor det nationale fællesskab i Polen.

Den polske nations opståen kan tolkes som i overensstemmelse med et essentialistisk princip: Den polske nation forbindes ikke med nationalstatens opståen, men er modelleret over en ethnie, det vil sige en kerne af fælles kulturelt råmateriale.

Den unge generation er ikke i lige så høj grad knyttet til nationale symboler som kirken og historien, som den ældre. Dette vil, jævnfør Anthony D. Smith’s ethnonationalistiske teori medføre, at det kulturelt baserede nationale fællesskab vil blive mindre stabilt.

Nye kommunikationsformer indvirker ligeledes på Polen som nation. Massemedier og øget vilje til at være mobil på arbejdsmarkedet gør, at polakkernes kontakt med andre nationer og kulturer vokser. Med udgangspunkt i massemediernes påvirkning kan det overvejes, om deres indflydelse bringer Polen nærmere andre europæiske kulturer eller de er udtryk for en påvirkning, der rækker ud over Europa, for eksempel en amerikanisering eller en globalisering.

Når polakker skal forholde sig til et europæisk fællesskab udtrykkes der groft sagt to perspektiver. Det ene er, at Europa forstås som politisk samarbejde i form af EU. Her er økonomisk og politisk udvikling af stor betydning. Det andet er, at Europa forstås som kulturelt fællesskab i form af kristendom. Her lægges der vægt på en oprindelig fælles-europæisk kultur. Disse to perspektiver er i høj grad bestemmende for, hvor Polen placeres i forhold til Vesteuropa. Polakker, der ser Europa som et politisk og økonomisk samarbejde gennem EU, har tendens til at opfatte Polen som
en del af Østeuropa, mens de polacker, der ser Europa som et kristent fællesskab, har tendens til at opfatte Polen som en del af Centraleuropa. Dette skyldes, at et økonomisk syn i højere grad lægger op til en hierarkisering af medlemslandene (og således en rangering af Vesteuropa over de nye medlemslande), mens de kristne værdier ikke i lige høj grad lader sig beskrive relativt. Opfattelsen af det europæiske fællesskabs karakter er i høj grad bestemmende for, hvem der lukkes ude eller står i opposition til fællesskabet. Her fungerer blandt andet religion, demokrati og økonomi som demarkerende kriterier.


Konklusionen på dette er, at de fire perspektiver hver især er bestemmende for, hvordan man kan karakterisere polakkers følelse af at være del af europæisk fællesskab. Imidlertid er de som teorier ufuldendte og kan, som vi har set, kritisieres.

Vi ønsker at slutte af med en personlig vurdering af, hvordan polakkerne forholder sig til et europæisk fællesskab, og i hvor høj grad det kulturelle aspekt vægtes i forhold til økonomisk og politisk samarbejde.

I Vesteuropa og i Danmark vurderes Polens rolle i EU ofte ud fra et økonomisk perspektiv, og dette betyder, at landet indirekte bliver betragtet som en slags
andenrangsnation i EU. Det er vores overbevisning, at denne diskurs også spiller en rolle, når polakker diskuterer EU og Europa. Visheden om, at Polen økonomisk set halter efter Vesteuropa, bevirker, at polakkerne bliver nødt til at kigge anderledes på EU-samarbejdet. For at kunne se sig selv som et fuldgyldigt medlemsland, må de i højere grad fokusere på samarbejdets forankring i fælles identitet og kultur. Dette er blevet vores overbevisning efter behandlingen af de empiriske undersøgelser.

Polske politikere nyder så godt som ingen tillid i den polske befolkning, og dette er ligeledes afgørende i forholdet til EU. Mistilliden gælder ikke kun den siddende regering, men til dels også hele det parlamentariske demokratis evne til at rette op på en stor arbejdsløshed og store sociale problemer. Dette problem er i Polen langt større end i Vesteuropa, og vil være afgørende for, hvordan polakker på længere sigt vil betragte det europæiske samarbejde i EU. Hvis man skal håbe på en mere tillidsfuld polsk holdning til EU, klynger dette håb sig til, at polakkerne netop tiltror det europæiske fællesskab det, som de ikke længere forventer af deres egne politikere.
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8. BILAG

8.1 Dimensionsforankring

Rapporten har genstandsområdet polsk kultur og europæisk kultur i bred forstand, og dækker altså "krydset" "ikke nordisk kulturområde".

Vores primærlitteratur har overvejende været på engelsk, ligesom vores interview er foretaget og behandlet på engelsk. Derfor opfylder rapporten kravet vedrørende "krydset" "fremmedsprog".

8.2 Abstract/Summary
Abstract:
Rapporten undersøger gennem en række kvalitative interviews af polacker, hvordan man i Polen forholder sig til henholdsvis det nationale fællesskab og EU. Nærmere bestemt om polacker føler sig som en del europæiske fællesskab og hvis ikke, hvad muligheden er for, at de kommer til at gøre det. Interviewene er foretaget i Krakow, Polen. Problemstillingen belyses teoretisk med inddragelse af to teoretikere, Anthony D. Smith og Benedict Anderson, som behandler begrebet nation. De repræsenterer retningerne essentialisme (Smith) og konstruktivism (Anderson). Teorierne holdes i
rapportens diskussionsdel op imod polakkernes opfattelse, sådan som de kommer til udtryk i vores kvalitative undersøgelse. Diskussionen munder ud i en vurdering af, hvordan et europæisk fællesskab kan karakteriseres.

Summary:
This report revolves around the subject of polish integration in the EU. Specifically whether poles feel like being a part of the EU, and, if not, whether it is possible that they will in the future. The question will be investigated through a series of qualitative interviews conducted in Cracow, Poland. Theoretically the problem will be looked upon through points of view represented by two theorists who have worked with the term "nation". These are Anthony D. Smith who is our representative of essentialism and Benedict Andersen representing constructivism. Their theories will be held subject to the Poles' view on the matter as expressed in the interviews. The discussion culminates in our interpretation of how the European community can be characterized.

8.3 Arbejdsproses
rapporten igennem, dels funderet i teori om kvalitative interview. Desuden lå arbejdet med at læse teori og vendede, når et ledigt øjeblik meldte sig.

Turen var planlagt til at skulle vare en uge og forløb godt; vi kom hjem med god, anvendelig empiri.

Den efterfølgende uge var helliget besvarelsen af mindre rapporter, som skulle udarbejdes i forbindelse med semesterkurserne. Det efterlod os ingen tid til at arbejde med projektet, hvilket der ellers var brug for, da vi havde besluttet, at transskribere samtlige interview. Dette viste sig at være en tidskrævende proces, som vi måtte bruge hele den efterfølgende uge på.

Herefter var vi imidlertid klar til at gå i gang med at skrive rapporten. Skriveprocessen forløb i det store hele godt. Dette skyldtes primært grundig planlægning tidligt i forløbet. Både hvad angår opgavens struktur og disponering af tid var vi godt klædt på. Overordnet kan man sige, at fordelen ved at arbejde med en problemstilling som vores er, at man allerede tidligt i forløbet må have et klart billede af hvordan rapporten i det store hele kommer til at se ud, hvilket gør det senere projektarbejde nemmere at gå til.

Hvis vi skal nævne et forhold, hvor processen kunne forbedres, var der i hvert fald ét ting, der ville være rar, at gøre anderledes i forbindelse med delingen af teoribyrden. Det forhold at vi var i tidsnød betød nemlig, at vi var nødt til at dele os ind i undergrupper, som hver arbejdede med sin teorigren. Dette var dog ikke kun et spørgsmål om tid, men mindre grupper har det med at fungere bedre, i hvert fald i forhold til redegørende afsnit. I forbindelse med de diskuterende afsnit, fandt vi imidlertid ud af, at det ville have været bedre, hvis der havde været et større overlap af teorikendskab. På denne måde ville alle have haft lejlighed til at skyde ind i forhold til de forskellige diskuterende afsnit, og vi ville måske have opnået en rigere diskussion. Som sagt tillod tiden os ikke alle at dele samme teorikendskab, men lektien kan være brugbar i forbindelse med et senere projekt.
Et forhold der yderligere spillede ind i forhold til vores mangel på tid var, at vi havde planlagt endnu en studietur til Polen, for yderligere at øge vores kendskab til polsk kultur op til eksamen.

I alt har vores arbejde i forbindelse med indsamling af empiri ”stjålet” fire uger af vores skrivetid. Vi føler imidlertid, at der er kommet en god rapport ud af det, trods alt, og at de mange uger med koncentreret arbejde har været en lektion i sig selv.

8.4 Interviewguide

Briefing i forbindelse med interview:

We are a group of students from the University of Roskilde. We are studying human science, and we are currently working on a project called Eastern Europe – Culture and Identity. We have chosen to come to Poland and do interviews with Poles, because we are interested in knowing, how Poles feel about being part of a European project such as the EU. Therefore we have a number of matters that we would to hear your opinion about. We will be asking you some questions, and it is our hope that you will do your best to answer them. You do not have be an expert in anything for answering these questions – we believe that most people will have an opinion on these matters. However, we want you to know that it is also okay, if you don’t have anything to say to a certain question. We fully respect that, especially because these questions can be difficult to answer. The only thing we ask of you is to speak your mind. Furthermore we can assure that you will be fully anonymous, when you answer our questions. No information will be passed on, and we only record your answers, so we can use your precise words in our project). And of course you can at any time choose not to answer our questions, if you for instance find them too personal.

Punkter
1. Kommunisme
2. Kirken
3. Polen –geografisk kulturel enhed?
4. Europa –fælles europæisk identitet?
5. Generationskløft
6. Europa
7. Akademikere kontra arbejdere

Spørgsmål

Hvilket miljø kommer du fra

Uddannelse

Politisk overbevisning dig – forældre

1. Kommunisme

• Hvad betyder kommunisme for dig
• Hvilken betydning har det for dig i dag
• Hvordan oplevede du transitionen?
• Fra Sovjet til polak?
• Dit syn på tiden under sovjet?
• Værdier under sovjet?

2. Kirken

• Hvilke forhold spiller kirken i dit liv?
• Hvordan opfattede du kirkens rolle før og efter transitionen?
• Har kirken nogen indflydelse på dine politiske beslutninger?

3. Polen –kulturel og geografisk enhed

• Hvad vil det sige/hvad indebærer det at være polsk?
• Hvad betyder det at være polsk for dig?
• Historisk indflydelse på polsk identitet. Hvilken betydning ha den historiske udvikling for din opfattelse af at være polak?
• Forbinder du nogen bestemte værdier eller holdninger med det at være polak?
• Hvad er klisteret mellem polakker som nation – hvem er ikke en del af det sel-skab?
• Exclusion of the other
• Eksisterer der en særlig polsk kultur?
• Er der nogen grupper der mindre accepteret end andre?
• Kan man føle sig som europæer og polak samtidig?

4. Europæisk identitet

• Føler du nogen tilknytning til Europa?
• Polen er blevet indlemmet i EU. Føler du dig som borger i EU/som europæer?
• Kan man føle sig som europæer og polak samtidig?
• Er der nogle lande der ikke bør være en del af EU?
• Bør der være en fælles europæisk identitet?

5. Generationskløft

• Oplever du at der er en udsagt generationskløft?
• Hvis ja, hvorfor – skyldes den eventuelt systemskiftet i ’89?

6. Europa

• Hvad betyder det for dig at være en del af EU
• Hvad er dine håb til EU

7. Akademikere kontra arbejdere

• Hvad betyder uddannelse for position i samfundet, for din fremtid for dine mul-
ligheder?
• Er uddannelsesmulighederne forbundet med dit personlige miljø?

8.5 Transskriberinger af interviews

Kvindelig fabriksarbejder – Anita, Trelleborg – Sealing Solutions.
What is your job here at the factory?
Anita is working in the logistic department, she is responsible for the producing in the Polish market.

What is your educational background?
It was what we in Poland call intermediate school. It is a school where you finish your mature exam… So intermediate level.

What about your parents and their background?
The same.

How long have you been working here?
One year…

And are you from this area?
Yes, Anita was born here in Bielsko.

Have you ever travelled outside of Poland?
Yes, in Germany. Germany is the only country.

Can you tell me if you ever when you travelled had a strong feeling of being from Poland? Have you ever been in a situation where you felt particularly proud of being Polish?
Yes. Anita told that when she was in Germany she was recognized as a catholic and a Pole between people who were not Catholics, but Protestants. They appreciated very much her deep religion and her being Catholic and it was the moment when she was proud to be from Poland, and to be recognized as a believer. This was very nice to her to be seen in a positive and not as many Germans see Poles as stealing their cars or drinking a lot.

Is that something that you are very ashamed of this bad reputation that Poles have in other countries?
Yes, Anita is sometimes ashamed that Poles have a bad reputation.

If you were to characterize Poles, what would you say they had in common?
Anita’s opinion Polish people are very…”hot”… very consequent to get to the target. Sometimes they are ready to fight to gain what they want, but sometimes they are in
quarrel. Sometimes they do not agree with each other, but in a critical time or moment they are together. And one word to describe this is solidarity. This is a strong side of Poland, they have possibility to be together, but maybe not in their common life, but when it is critical...like in history.

Is this something that is special for Poles compared to other Europeans?
This is very difficult to say, because you should know the other nations, you should know their history, not only the history in Poland. In order to compare it with other nationalities.

Do you consider yourself as a Pole only or also as a European?
For Anita it is two things to be Polish and European. There is nothing against these two things you can be a Pole and on the same level you can be European, so there is no split between the two.

How would you explain Polish identity? Is there something you could say, “this is Polish identity”? ...[If it is too difficult to answer, we will come back to this later]. Ok.

So now that Poland is member of the EU...is this changed something in your everyday life?
Anita says that her life is the same now as it was before the membership. So, no changes in everyday life.

But how do you feel about being part of this new community? Are you positive or negative?
Positive, yes, positive...

Can I ask you if you voted in the referendum in 2002? And if so what you voted?
Anita voted in favor.

Which things did you vote on basis of? What made you vote in favor? Was it for example economical benefits or a hope to be part of this big gathering of countries? The main to support the Polish joining of the EU was for Anita to be recognized as a civilization from the East, to be a member of Europe, to have access to other countries, to have free power and to be fully part of the European community and be recognized as such. So not so much the economical perspective.

But do you fear any bad consequences of the membership? The most bad thing is that there is a group of older people in Poland, who have no ability to change themselves to fit new way of life. And this is a disadvantage. They
have no possibility to increase their knowledge, nobody looks after them now, there are no programs and they are left alone. And the situation became more and more difficult. So the EU for them is not very social, because they live in a completely different world.

Do you think that this membership will change Polish identity? Now that the West is perhaps closer to Poland? Will it change in the future? In perhaps 30 years? In Anita’s opinion there is some big risk of loss of culture and our identity, because mentally we are still running towards the West. We think that everything in the West is much better than anything here. So there is a big risk, because after some years we will forget what Polish identity is, and we start to be like this new culture, forgetting the past.

Have you ever considered working abroad in the future?
Yes, I have

Where do you mostly get your information about the EU?
The most information Anita gets is from television or the papers or from church [Do you feel that you get enough information or would you like to be better informed about the EU?]. No, Anita thinks she has enough information.

Do you consider yourself as a central European country or an Eastern European country?
Anita feels that she lives in a central European country. [Tolken spørger fra Anita, der undrer sig over spørgsmålet].

We just wanted to know if this feeling has changed, as Poland became part of the EU, because for example a lot of people from the Western part of Europe still think of Poland as part of the Eastern Block our impression is that perhaps Poles felt differently about this…
But ok then. Has the EU membership changed the way you look at Poland’s eastern neighbours, like Ukraine for example?
In Anita’s opinion the thing that the eastern countries have in common was communism. Nothing else.

But can you point out something that European have in common?
This is difficult to say because we are so different….we want to create one group of people, and we want to be together…but maybe not a future as one identity, but maybe a desire to be one.

Do you think that Polish culture fits easily into European culture?
This depends. If you mean young people and their culture, there is no problem for them to fit to the rest of the European culture, but the older people they have problem with the European culture, because of their mentality, their way of thinking is different and this way is not easy to join with the European culture. [But is Polish culture very different to cultures of the other countries in Europe?]. Anita feels that we are different and in each country there is a separate culture, but it is more a feeling than it is knowledge, so it is very difficult to describe or to explain.

To ask you about something completely different: Does religion play a big role in your life?
Yes.

In which way?
Religion appears in her everyday life, because she is trying to live through life and be a religious person.

Is the Catholic Church and being a Catholic a great part being a Pole or of Polish identity?
In Anita’s opinion Catholicism is very important for Polish identity and for her personally it is very important and a big part of her identity as a Pole.

You said that the church helped you with information about the EU. Do you often look to the church for information on Politics?
First of all Anita would like to explain to you guys that she is not a person who goes to the church for all information, it is nothing like this. But the church and the Catholicism in Poland is like a quite a big force on the political scene. And the church has big impact, it is loud voice on the political scene, and the politicians are very ... they have respect the church and very often there is a opposite mind between the church and the politicians, and the church has also big impact on the people. Sometimes the church has the power to make people vote for something, or to do something or not to do something. [So is this a good or a bad thing..?]. The position of church in Poland can be assessed in two ways: Being important on the political scene is a good thing, when consider for example the changing of some rules in your life, say, marriage, so breaking some rules, which the church is trying to protect. And it is good that the church does this and says we do not agree on this and we do not think it should be allowed. But if the church trying to talk about some typical political issues it is bad. The church should be quiet when are some typical political issues, like economics and such...

Do you think that the young generation is less religious than the older one?
She used to think so, but last weekend made her change her mind and now she will not say that there is a difference. [Are thinking about the death of the Pope?]. Yes, that is what has changed.

Are you happy that young people have respect for religion and participate in the traditions connected with the church? You could say yes and you could say no. It is difficult to say.

(båndet skiftes)

We have talked a little bit about communism, and the time during communism. Did you learn a lot about communistic period in school? She says yes, there was something about communist period at school, but not very much. History class is focused on very, very old history, but whatever it was about communist it was in a positive way. There was not much information, or a lot of information, about nearest times, changes from the last time, because, as I understand, when she finished school it was the end of the communist period, so there was no time to creating new version of history.

May I ask how old you are?
26 years.

How did you experience the change from communism to capitalism? Was there something you remember changed radically in your life?
(Anita griner)

What’s so funny?
(She was surprised because my face sometimes shocked. Some people, well, it’s not exactly what I think, but my friends they know me much more, so they know better what I have on my mind, she not exactly what I show (huh?) I’m tired, it was my face… Sorry…) About the question, generally the big change … it is the queues and the shops that she remembers, when she had to stay in the queues to buy shoes or coffee or something else. After communism collapsed this changed. You can buy anything. You don’t have to spend half days in the huge queues.

What about the memory of communism… I mean is it something you focus a lot on when you are with your friends – is it something you talk about?
Yes, she has some opportunities to talk about communism. Most times these conversations are with older people. They gave her all her knowledge of this time. Very often, or even every time, people in this type of conversation tries to compare present time with the communist time, she noticed that many people found a lot of good
things in communism in opposite to the current times where they have problems with jobs, unemployment, money and they are talking about the secure (?)
She mentions that one of the main topics in these conversations is the jobs the employment. In the past in the communism it was (?) not to work. To being unemployed it was (?) you had no other choice.

If she should talk about things that have improved since communism what would that be? I mean things that are better now than back then...
She thinks the biggest change is the possibility to do everything everybody want. There is almost nothing that could be not had or they couldn’t do if they really want. There is nobody who does not let them do it. So, generally, the freedom. The very big meeting of the (?), and this is the big change. In the past the country was like war castle and nobody could go abroad. Now it’s your own choice.

Was anything better back then that it is today?
It was very hard to buy something, to get something... normal things, which you need to live. After all you can get it somehow, but was not so much very poor people. Now you can see the poor people living on the edge.

So, so, I mean, no, it wasn’t, I mean, what did I wanted to say. I mean there wasn’t a lot for every, for people, but the stuff that was everybody was sharing, and everybody had a small bit...?
Yes, more or less, yes. As I understand there was no big difference between people. Not a lot of people very rich and not a lot of people very poor.

So you think that history has a great influence on how you think of yourself as a Pole, polish identity, do you think that, for example, your idea of being Polish from that of your parents, because your parents have been citizens in a communist society, whereas you have been an adult in post communism, or after communism?
This is related. The Polish identity for her is related with being catholic, and it weren’t like this in the past during the communists. The communist government was (?) catholicist. If you felt oppression from the government from your religious life you feel...

Rejected?
No, you feel more engaged in your original life. You try to be against this. You will not let anybody change your mind, so the Polish identity (?) communism was stronger than now, because people tried to be against government, and people tried to stand and be resistant not to let them kill their identity as Catholics. It was very restricted to be a Pole, but now there is no force trying to tie this with church. People
they do not care about their identity, or, it is not as strong as it was in the past. I don’t know if I explained this…

So you were saying that in the past being a Pole was emotionally something with being religious or something with cultural in heritage, whereas now it is perhaps more being a citizen in an area we call Poland?
Yes, this is exactly like you said. In the past the being Pole was closer to being catholic, and now it’s not so strongly connected.

Do you see any similarities… do you think about the European Union being (?) than the Soviet Union? Do you see similarities between the Soviet Union and the European Union?
In her opinion you can appeal some similarities. There is a kind of domination over Poland now. Now it is European domination in the past it was Russian domination. The difference is that in the Russian domination we were included to the Russian group of… soul, let’s say by force –nobody asks us. This time it is our decision. It’s our choice.

So, we only have a few questions left. It’s very quick this time. So… We wanted to talk to you a bit about… do you feel that there is a generation gap in Poland between the elder and the younger generation. Say, let’s say, religion or the fact that one has been brought up in communism, you’re the one after communism. Do you feel that there is a conflict between the generations?
Yes there is a gap between the generations, the younger and older generation in Poland. And is related to this that older people used to live in communism, and now sometimes older people they remember, or they go back, and they see the past time, communist time, as something good. They remember security, they remember the (?), even if they had problems in the past, the same problems have they right now it was problem all of people. But not they are left alone with their problems, and they feel that problem is only my own. There is no… between people feeling that something is common. Now everything seems single, individual, and some people think that this was good time. It is this generation older people opinion. Younger people they disagree, and they are saying that these times are better, but there is a quarrel between the generations it is only difference in opinion. Nobody is saying you are right or you are not right.

So it’s not, like, an open conflict. It’s just a different view.
Yes.
Do you think that there has been a change of values in the Polish society in the last fifteen years or so...? I mean, was something valued more before than today, let’s say, family or jobs... has that changed?
The main change is now the most important thing for everybody is money and sometimes you have to (?) to get money. You forget about your family and even you forget about yourself. You don’t care about yourself, about your emotion, about your appearance, whatever, about some other thing related to you. And sometimes it’s too late to do something for you, your family, your friends, because you spend all life in big rush, but it wasn’t in the past, so now everything is faster quicker and everything becomes demand, because it’s very hard to get enough money for life, and everyone is very busy to work or do something to get, problems or something, things to live. But the cost is sometimes people which you like to be close to them or you like to have them close to you, but you have no time to keep this relationship, very close. Sometimes you even forget about this.

Okay... The last question is what is your hopes for the future?
Some people say that pessimistic is an optimistic experience.

(Griner) That’s one way to look at it.
She’s optimistic.

Is there something you hope will happen in the future?
She hopes that one day there will be, in Poland, so good situation, so nobody will go abroad to find a job, and everyone could find a job here, could work here and get by. And the life standard will be the same as somewhere else in the rest of western countries.
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What is your job here at the factory?
First he started as an extrudor operator.

For how long have you worked here?
Now his job has changed, he is a foreman. A little bit higher in the hierarchy. Three years at the factory.

What kind of education do you have?
Primary school here in Birschow (?). Secondary school, a mechanical school, but only the first step. His first job was a lathe-operator (?), metal-worker.
Can you tell us about your background? 
He was born here Birschow, and always lived here. He has been married for 7 years and has 2 children. His mother is still alive, and his father died 4 years ago.

What does his mother do? Does she still work? 
His mother is retired, but she was working in the production-part of a retailer. In the factory-part. 
His wife is working now. She is the manager of a food-store.

How old are you? 
31.

I would like to know what he does in his free-time, when he is off work? 
He takes care of the kids. The wife is working. Their shifts are changing. Otherwise he likes to play football.

So his family is really important to him? 
The most important!

*We will talk a bit about Poland and Polish culture now.*

*Have you ever travelled outside of Poland? And where have you been?*
Yes. He was in Austria twice. Last time a year ago. He has an aunt there. Germany once.

Is that just vacation? 
In Austria it was a week holiday, with the family. In Germany he went to buy a car.

When he is with his aunt in Austria, does he feel very different, him bringing his Polish culture, to his Austrian aunt? 
Yes, he felt the difference. But it is not that he is different, because he is the same all the time. Their culture is different.

Is his aunt Austrian or does she still feel Polish? 
The auntie is of Polish origin, but she lived in Austria for 20 years, and now she has an Austrian citizenship. And she is a little bit more Austrian now.

When he goes to Austria to visit her, what is it that feels different? 
The difference he noticed was that people were nicer, more polite. Just people you met on the streets. Generally the streets are cleaner than in Poland. This is Krystof's view.
Can you ask him, does he feel that the Polish people are a bit more closed, or maybe a bit more...

*Open? Like a bit xenophobic maybe... or afraid of other nations?*

He is basically not a racist. Maybe in the past there was a bit of fear against other nations, people were a bit afraid of other nations. But now they are a little bit familiarised with it. So he wouldn’t say it is like a fear of other people from other nations. But it is a little bit distance between.

Can you ask him why it was like that before, that people had this fear of other nations?
He says that, as a communist country, we were a few steps back, and the Western Europe was many steps ahead. For us everything was new, and what is new is stressful and strange. So we even didn’t know that some things may be done in better ways. Now when we joined the EU it is even better, because other nations start to take Poland and Polish people into account.

Why is it important that people take Poland into consideration?
We are a part of a greater community, we should also be taken into account, as other members have their citizens and diplomats in the council. We also have our diplomats in the council. Our boys should be taken into consideration as much as other countries.’

What is it that Poland can give other countries in Europe?
Food !(laugh)
Good workers as good specialists. People who know how to work hard, people who want to work hard, and who are good at what they are doing.
He has got a few friends who went to England, who were lucky and found a job. And now when they returned, they tell that employees in UK they take them seriously, take them into account, because they are good at what they are doing.

What about the wages. Are they being paid less than the british workers?
They were underpaid, and they worked more hours. But they were satisfied, because they were paid much more than here in Poland. Germany is not a good place to go to work, because ... He is only talking about legal work.

Could you tell me a little about what is Polish culture, what is particular Polish? For example that you have hard workers.
Hard workers, also that they are religious. (thinks...)

Could be history...
History is very important to the Polish people. He talks about the great impact of history on Polish culture. Because of the 2 World Wars, Polish people have greatly suffered in both. Also, close to this city, we have Auschwitz-Birkenau. 

*It is a sad place, a very sad monument*

But he says that Polish people can shake all these things off, and just look ahead. And he thinks that the Polish society is not easy to brake.

So it’s like a strong people?
Yes, this is what I think he says. Because like from history, many wars, many things, and we still rise.

So this is something that connects Polish people, like make them stick together?
Yes, and now we have got a great example, well the situation is not great, but the Pope died, everybody has just gathered, and you can see it now on TV, radio, everywhere. All the people are united.

Our condolences...

*When you think about history, what episodes mean something to you, to your feeling of being Polish?*

Auschwitz because it is so close, and that it happened, so many people died in one place. This is the base. Warsaw uprising, when Germans were occupying Warsaw. For him this uprising, many kids were involved and fought the Germans.

Many acts of bravery I think in history.

*We are trying to find out, what is Polish culture, what is the Polish identity? So if you compare a Pole and an Austrian, what would be the differences, what would characterise the Pole, would he be happy, hospitable?*

drinking (griner) is your view of Poland that Poles are very similar to Russians, do you think that we are heavy drinkers?
No no because I have this idea of you as very religious and I don't combine your religion with heavy drinking.

I'm asking this question because even in our minds we have this point of view that Poles are, let’s say, not heavy drinkers but good drinkers, and there are only one nation that can drink more than us and that is the Russians.

Even Krzysztof says that he heard this statement, of Polish people and Russian people, that they are good drinkers. But now it is diminishing. Polish people are more cultural, so their personal culture is better now. Even in his neighbourhood, because he
lives in the flat-blocks. His area is a bit more different, more cultural, it is cleaner, so it has changed somehow for him.

Why has it changed?
The Polish nation is a very joyful nation. We like to play, we like to party. Our weddings are very happy, very musical, plenty of music, plenty of dancing. Is it the same(?)

Yeah.
His cousin had a wedding, not very long ago, and at this wedding there were some people from Germany, strict Germans. Afterwards they said that it was the first time they were at such a wedding. They had had their own wedding, but they are very different to our weddings.

More formal?
Yes, very formal. It is like you follow rules, ba-ba-ba, and that is it.

We were talking about comparances with Russians. Is it embaressing to be compared to Russians?
He studied Russian language for three years, because he was obliged to, it was obligatory. For him it is not embarrassing to be compared to Russians, or to be put on the one side (set som en østeuropæisk helhed). But if somebody would say, let’s say from Odra, which is our western border, everything is Eastern-Europe, and it is almost Russia, then he would feel offended.
So I think his Polish nationality is very strong with him, but he doesn’t feel offended if compared with Russia.
In his place of living, there are some Russians as well. And they are normal people, they work, they live, they farm. This is a very similar situation with Russia and Poland. The Russians are coming to Poland for economical reasons, to earn money. And it is very much the same for Poles when they go to western countries to work. The worst thing that can happen, is when you are abroad, and you are one of a kind. If you do something wrong, and somebody sees it, then it is very easy to stick a label to you.

So does he consider it a problem that Russians or Eastern Europeans come here?
As long as it is legal, and as long as their behaviour is appropriate it is OK. if it is economical for them, good for them, then it is not a problem. The high unemployment in Poland, hasn’t got anything to do with the Russians that come here and work here. It is the Polish Government that made this happen.

Do you have a lot of trust in the Polish government?
No.

Why?
He absolutely has no trust in the Polish Government. The reason is that lately in the media, many affairs, bad situations: The Government has been pushing forward stories to the Newspaper, by corruption. Also there is an affair connected to gasoline, and also some corruption connected to insurance-companies. It looks like we have been robbed. Those powerful people were stealing from us, even almost officially. It is only happening these days, that people discover what happened. The first thing that needs to happen in Poland, is to clean the mess up-stairs in the Government. They have to get rid of all those bad people, and then it will also come down (affect the rest of the country), and it will be better for the Polish citizens.

What do you feel about the politics in the EU? Do you have the same mistrust in them?
He doesn’t mistrust the EU Government, but there is always a but. The EU Government had too many issues with Poland, that is the problem.

What do you mean "issues." Problems or ?
Yes. Too many problems with Poland in general.

There are some funny things about EU. Legislation things. How can a carrot be a fruit?
This is something that is making difficulties for Polish farmers. Another thing was that EU-members were afraid of Poland, when we were joining the EU. Maybe all the Poles would cross the borders, and take the jobs of the citizens. But it didn’t happen. Only individuals went abroad looking for food, but it wasn’t like a great movement.

Is it rightly understood that he finds the EU Government less corrupt than the Polish one?
Yes. He would trust EU more than the Polish one. If he was supposed to trust his money to either the Polish government or the EU, then he would choose the EU:

But, there are also Polish politicians in the EU...
He didn’t say that he would trust the Polish politicians in the EU!

Do you consider yourself as Polish or European? Or both maybe?
From those three, the best would be both. A little bit of both. Not much European for him, but his children will definitely be more European than he is. But if he goes
abroad, and they ask him if he is European citizen, he would state very strongly that he is European.

Let’s say you went to the USA or Africa, you would say you were European?
Yes. It is not important where in the world he would go, he would always say that he is both European and Polish.

First Polish and then European?
To say that he is European, he would have to be asked directly: Are you European? But otherwise he would say: Polish.

So first Polish and then European?
Yes

He want’s to know if it’s cold in Denmark?
Yeah, it is a bit colder, but almost the same. A bit darker as well. The sun goes down earlier.

So you would say that you are European? So what is it that we in Europe have in common? Can you give some examples? And why does he feel European?
A simple fact. We have joined the EU. Poland is on the European continent. It is simple that he cannot say that he is from Asia!

But anyway. If he was to say something that we have in common, some common culture, what would that be?
Not yet. He didn’t leave Europe, he didn’t experience Europe enough to be able to tell whether we have something in common.

But is it all due to the European Union? Didn’t he feel like he was a part of Europe before Poland obtained membership?
Poland is almost like a boarder of Europe.

Belarus and Ukraine, are they part of Europe eventhough they are not a part of the EU? Maybe even Russia?
Ukraine, yes, because there are some changes in Ukraine made towards EU. It looks like they strongly want to join EU. In Belarus and Russia, you have got something totally different. It looks like there is still dictatorship there. It is very small, tiny, and it is not spoken out loud in public, but looks like dictatorship.

Does that mean that was Europeans have in common is democracy?
Yes.
Does he consider himself Eastern- or Central-european?

He would consider himself Eastern-european, because Poland is on the Eastern side of the border. Polish and Slovakia have this in common that they are situated on the Eastern side of Europe, so their citizens should be Eastern-europeans. But when his children grow up, they will probably consider themselves Central-europeans, but only when they go to the West. Or maybe EU expands to the East, then we will be like Central Europe.

What about Turkey? Is that a part of European culture? Should it be a part of the EU, like you say that Belarus shouldn’t?

The main difference is the religion. Personally he don’t mind Turkish people, but in his opinion Poland and Turkey have nothing in common.

So he doesn’t consider Turkey to be a part of Europe?

Yes, but only geographically. They have a different culture and religion. But it might be fun there!

Now when Poland has become a member of the EU, has this had any effect on your personal life?

Yes. Finally they are fixing the roads. But he has a strong belief that everything in connection will happen positively in the future, there will be no negative aspects in connection with the EU. And his children will have a better life.

Is this only economically, that your wages will rise?

Not only money. Also there will be tourism. Beautiful sea, beautiful mountains, and make it useful for tourism.

What is interesting here in Poland?

Zakopane, Winichka, Wavel in Cracow. Historical places.

Did you vote?

Yes, he voted yes.

So you said that there isn’t going to be any negative aspects. Didn’t you have any fear at all before joining the EU?

There are always some fears and concerns...

We heard that some very religious people were afraid of an invasion of homosexuals. Or, that Poland would be invaded by Eastern-europeans. That Polish agriculture would collapse...
He mentions Polish agriculture.
In Polish tradition we have something a bit similar to fast-food, like Big Mac, or whatever... It is traditional Polish. We call it "small gastronomy", where you can get traditional Polish meals. Like sour cabbage. He heard that those things are not allowed in the EU, that those sort of things are not allowed on the streets.
There were many fears that Polish milk from Polish cows couldn’t be exported. But we have witnessed that all these milking companies that have adopted to legislation, they have actually prospered and are prospering quite well.

So these fears were irrelevant?
They were oversized. The older generations are much more conservative, so they don’t easily change. And they have had it strongly put [indoktrineret] into their minds, that it can’t be any better. Older people don’t know that it can get any better.

Why do older people have this opinion?
His Granny always told him, don’t do this, don’t do that, they are not telling the truth, it won’t get any better. In Poland things will only get worse. His Granny’s experience is, she lived for so many years, and all the promises that were made, that everything will be better from now on, were just promises, they weren’t true, nothing actually happened. So he says, that older people are more pessimistic.

Or maybe more careful?
No. Only pessimistic. And superstitious also.

Why do you think that older people are more pessimistic and superstitious? Do you have a theory about that?
It is because of the communism in Poland. All the older people grew up under communism in Poland, and all these promises never kept, and...

(afbrydelse)

The older people have been lied to all the time. They have become distrustful. And it is very hard for a person to change from one moment to another.

From one way of thinking to another?
Exactly.

Is there anything else that creates this generation-gap?
There aren’t many other things. The major thing is that the older generation grew up under communism. Almost every situation in Krzysztofs life is commented by his Granny. And she usually says something like: "Well in my time, nobody was thinking
about cars" – those sort of things. His view is, that for older people the change to democracy went too fast. It wasn’t in steps, so people weren’t prepared for democracy. It was just communism and – cut – democracy. And it was just like: empty shelves in the shop, and then the next day everything was full of goods.
And we both remember when our mothers took us to the queues. Because when the grown-up was with a child, then there was one portion of the goods for the grown-up, and then half of the portion was for the child. So there were some strange situations where people borrowed a children to each-other just to have a little bit more. Because everything was portioned. You could have money, but you couldn’t buy a sausage if you didn’t have a small piece of paper saying that you can actually buy it. So everything was rationized.
Fruit like oranges and bananas were only for Christmas time. In Polish we have a word "frikas", which is something unusual, something delicious, really really good, that you will only try once, twice per lifetime.
For him it is impossible to think about going back, to resign from all those good things. But older people say, in socialism, there was nothing in the stall, but it was better. And when you ask why it was better, they explain that, you would stay in the cue, and stand and stand, but until you buy.

But why do older people like this better?
Older people haven’t got a lot of money now. Their pensions are very low. When you work for 30, 40 or sometimes even 50 years you end up with very small pensions. And if you are not lucky enough to have good children that will take care of you, take you to the house or whatever, then you will end up alone with a very little pension, and you will have to pay your appartment or house alone, which is very expensive. So you will end up with a very small portion of this pension for actual living. So everyday you will see shops with shelves full of many different goods, but you can’t get them.

So there is less safety for elder people?
It might be.
Under communism they had their safety insured, now they haven’t. They are not sure what will happen to them.

What have you learned about communism in school?
He doesn’t really remember what he was taught about communism, but he remembers some situations like when Bresniev died, they actually brought a TV to his classroom, and forced them to watch the funeral. Of course the Russian language was obligatory.

After socialism, was he still in school then? And what was the view upon socialism then?
He continued his education after ’89, he was in secondary school. The most physical example of the end of communism, was when he was working, he was doing working practise near the school, and wasn’t paid. They gave him a bread-roll and a small bottle of milk. After the change, they started to pay him a small amount of money.

How did he experience the change from communism to capitalism?
He says that there were some changes. The main thing was food in the shops. And there was a short period, just after the change, maybe ’92 or ’93, when wages were quite good, compared to the prices in the shops. So there was a short period where people could buy many different goods. But then the prices rose, and the wages stayed the same.
His father tried to explain to him, that after the communism break-down in Poland, for the first time he was able to speak his oppinion freely. Under communism it was absolutely prohibited. Krzystof says, that he didn’t understand what his father was trying to say to him, but now he does.

Are there any values left from communism-time?
What kind of values do you mean?
Like strictness or hard work or the feeling that you have to save money, or really enjoy the food..
Yes, but not for everyone. He doesn’t see this in everyone around him, and he doesn’t see this in his children, because they had everything from the start. So the children are familiar with all these things, and there hasn’t been a situation when his children have been missing something. But he knows this feeling, so he knows how to enjoy all the things that he lacked in the past.

How old are his children?
Two boys, 5 and 2 years old.

Do you talk about communism? Is that something that is discussed within the family, or do you try to just forget it?
Not generally. But it is strongly connected with politics, so when somebody starts to talk politics, then it is very often discussed. In the past it was like this.... And now it is like this...

Could you ask him if he sees any similarities between the Soviet Union and the EU?
He doesn’t see any connection.

What we are trying to find out is whether living during socialism will induce some kind of scepticism towards entering such a big union again?
The thing he connects to the Communism is the lies. Although EU is also a big community he doesn’t feel the same. He won’t be lied to anymore. In EU most of the countries are highly advanced, and in Soviet Union most of the countries were way under the standard of living. The culture is also higher in the Western countries.

What does he mean with that?
He says that people in Europe, know how to speak their own opinion, how to speak their own ideas. They are independent. In The Soviet Union, with Russia oppressing, the Poles didn’t know how to speak their own opinions.

And object to the system?
Yes, also. In Russia it is still communism, although they are said to be democratic.

So a big difference is that the EU stands for democracy, compared to the Soviet Union.
Yes.

You said higher culture, and you said that people are more independent...
Yes, also better educated.

So it’s not only that the system control, it is also that they are better educated and can better speak their minds and be critical to the system.
Yes, that is correct. Educated people have better opportunities for their life, and better opportunities to object to what they think is wrong.

Has this got something to do with history as well?
Europe is different to Russia historically.

We will move to the last subject which is religion. Is religion an important part of your life?
Yes it is very important, but for him it is not so straight (strict?). God is important in his life, but he doesn’t go to church every Sunday for instance.

(skifter bånd)

… You were saying?
When he doesn’t go to church on Sundays, because he doesn’t want to or whatever, his mother gets upset and asks why he doesn’t go to church on Sundays.

Does the Catholic Church have an influence on Polish identity?
He says two things… It is very important. For one the Pope was of Polish nationality, and secondly, during communism both the Catholic Church and he were supporting the (?), and were very much interested in democracy and wanted to collapse the existing government.

*Was he more religious before?*
Basically he doesn’t know because he was a child in the time of communism, but he thinks, or feels, that he was more religious in the past, because he was small and his mother was taking him to church every Sunday.

*Does he feel that the older generation is more religious than the younger generation?*
He says that the older generation is definitely more religious than the younger, because he sees examples of this in his family. So his generation is not doing what it should in regards to the church.

*But we were told that a lot of young people are very active in the church doing a lot of arrangements and have all sorts of activities…*
What Krzysztof tries to explain is that there are groups of young people that are organizing next to churches, like “Oasa”, which can be translated as Oasis, which is a group situated next to a church, and they are, perhaps, singing together in church sometimes and organizing choirs – those sorts of things, but he says that in community most of the people are not attending church as they should.

*So the groups of religious young people don’t represent the general youth?*
Yes they do. Krzysztof thinks that these small groups can be seen as representative for the Polish youth.
He gives an example. Sometimes he doesn’t go to church because the head priest of his church is a boring person; he always talks about the same things, he always asks for more money for a new roof or for new parts or whatever, and Krzysztof is bored with this guy, so he’s fed up with going to church. He gives another example of a missionary who just came to Poland from Ethiopia. And this guy sends his message in such a way that there are many, many, many people coming to church to listen to him, and he talks about many different things. He talks of Ethiopia, which is something few people know about, but last time he was there, he talked about the Pope, so he touches upon a variety of subjects, so it doesn’t depend so much on topic, it is…

*The personality of the priest?*
… the personality of the priest. The way he is sending his message to the people. Krzysztof says that the same way of approaching young people was in the Pope, so maybe this is why. [Skal nok forstås sådan, at den etiopiske præst taler til ungdommen på samme måde som Paven gjorde det.]
Because the Pope liked young people...
Yes.

So I just have to be clear on this. Is the younger generation less or more religious than the older generation? Generally he thinks that the younger generation is less religious than the older.

Why do you think that is?
A good example might be that they are not going to church every Sunday. He doesn’t go to church every Sunday and his friends don’t go to church every Sunday, and therefore they are not taking their kids to the church every Sunday.

No, but I mean, if your parents go to church every Sunday, what made this change? How come your parents went a lot to church but you and your generation goes less and less to church?
In churches, and I have to agree because I have a very similar view, modern churches in Poland: There are too many subjects on politics and money, and politics and money is not what the church is about or should be, so this is why he dislikes the church, and maybe many people in my age also think like this. There is a difference between old people and young people because old people are much more used to some situations, and Krzystof says that young people think more, so it is like the example about the priest who has just bought the new car, and the next Sunday from his stage [prædikestol] he asks for some more money for the church. Older people would say: “yes he’s a poor priest, so we should give him the money. Even though we have so little, we should give him money. The young people say that if he wants money for the church then maybe he should sell his old car.

Does he think that it may not be that the young people are less religious but just that they have their religion inside themselves, and they don’t go to church, but they are still believing, but it’s just not in the same way as their parents?

This is a very dangerous question, because this is basically what I think, ahm…. Okay. (alle griner) Fortsætter med at oversætte spørgsmålet

Young people do believe in God and Jesus and all those Catholic things connected to the church, but they don’t believe in church as an institution, so they do not practice... this is why they are not going to church. I remember when I was in church the priest said that if a person does not go to church every Sunday and does not follow the rules of the Catholic Church, then he should not call himself a Catholic.
You should just say this to Krzysztof...
Tolk: This is my view. God is in your heart, not in the church. Personally I hate the traditional church. I have some friends who hate it even more.

Does he (Krzystof) feel the same?
Yes. He feels that they will need to change something, because otherwise they will lose people.

Does that, again, have to do with younger people being better educated?
Generally yes. Education is different from what we’re used to, or different from older families, because you are educated, and it is objective education. You are left alone with facts. They history is being explained as it was, not as some government wants it to be. You are free to think for yourself and have your own ideas. So, yes, they are connected. But also, the speed of life has changed. Life is now much faster. So you think more about your career and your family maybe even less, and those religious things are sometimes pushed aside.

I think we have to finish, so here is the last question… What are your hopes for the future?
Again I digged a little deeper…
In general the best thing will be to continue his work and get a good pay, and a good pay for him would be 3000 szl a month for his family because that would be enough to live without fearing for another day. [Uden at frygte fremtiden rent økonomisk]
And there would be another thing; he wants to go on holiday to Australia.

Would it be offensive to ask how much he earns now?
1500 szl a month, and to that comes 21% tax so it would be about 1200 szl a month.

Any other hopes for the future?
He thinks about working abroad, but it depends on the period. Three month would be too short for him to quit his current job. He says that one year is the period he would try to get, because maybe then he would come home to a higher standard of living.

Where would he want to live?
If he could take his family he wouldn’t mind living abroad. If he had an opportunity to try, and he liked this particular country, no matter what it is, and he feels that it will be safe for the family and that he can live with his family, then it would absolutely not be a problem.

Kvindelig fabriksarbejder - Joska Browska
Trelleborg – Sealing Solutions.
What’s your name?
Joska Browska.

What’s your job here at the factory?
Quality inspector.

That was what we saw earlier?
She’s responsible for everything that is produced. She checks it in process, and then after it is produced it is checked by other ladies, and then she checks it again to have a double check. Then it will be packed and sent.

How long have you been working here?
Two and a half, almost three years.

Would you talk a little bit about your background, where you were born and so forth?
She was born in (Birchkow?) and has a 16 year old daughter.

Does she live in this town?
Yes.

Did you grow up with your parents in Birchkow?
She was brought up only by her mother, and she lived with her for a long, long time, and she also lived with her mother for some time after she got married, but now she lives with her husband and daughter.

Did your mother work?
Her mother worked but only for a short time, because she got ill, and then she got on pension and got money from the government.

What about schooling? What is your schooling background? Did you go to school here?
After primary school, which is locally, she went to a technical secondary school for five years. She gained a (vital?) of technician of clothing – clothing technician.

She made clothes?
Yes, something like that. Unfortunately the clothing business was just collapsing at the time, so she couldn’t find any work.

So she had to do something else?
She has also been working in a travel office. She worked there for three years, mostly for the country tourism, for Poles.
**Poles travelling in Poland?**
Yes, exactly. But then she changed her field of work to quality inspection, but it wasn’t in this company, it was another company that made home appliances. Then there was a six year period of sitting at home, because the company was closed because of the privatization, because it wasn’t a private company. It was like – I don’t really know how to explain this – but some people make a company, and everyone is an owner. It is not collected with stocks, but everybody is an owner, but then the company collapsed, and she stayed home for six years.

**When was that?**
After her daughter’s birth she spent two years on pension for bringing up the kid. The first year was with pension and the second year was without pension and then four years of unemployment.

**Was this after ‘89?**
It was actually in ’89 the company was starting to collapse.

**So it was at ’89.**
It was IN ’89, yes.

**Was it because of the transition from communism to liberal economy?**
It might be connected, because this company was a place that everybody shared. There was a chairman, but in this company there was also the wife of the chairman, the kids of the chairman, the uncle of the chairman, but it was not a family business. No, no, no, but there were plenty of, let’s say, (?) positions. People who were family to the chairman got a job in the company, but often they didn’t show up for work – they were paid by the company, but they didn’t work for the company. This might be the reason why. There were some changes and it was like…When they were redundant in ’89. They were redundant in May. The company was declared bankrupt, but all the things that were happening after the liquidation of the company were taking something like three years.

**What do you do on weekends?**
She spends her time at home. Sometimes she goes to her mother in law just to sit in the garden.

**Do you like sewing, making clothes?**
Absolutely not (griner).
I just thought that maybe you took your education because you liked making clothes...
The education was connected with making clothes, but it was a step before actually sewing. I don’t know how to say this, but it was like…

*Textile production?*
Yes, I think that’s it. Yes it was making the fabric.

*In regards to your education, can you tell me if you had a lot of choices? Did you choose this because it was something you wanted to do?*
There were plenty of opportunities. She initially wanted to do gardening, and she wanted to go to a gardening school, but when she was choosing her school she thought more about future opportunities, because the textile industry in Poland was very good. There were plenty of opportunities for jobs.

*But gardening wasn’t a big... Gardening wouldn’t be her first choice?*
Yes, this she would prefer, because this is something she would like to do, but she did something different. And unfortunately, when she was learning, the textile industry went down.

*Does she like gardening now?*
Yes, she likes to dig in the garden and do all those things, but she doesn’t have a garden herself, because she is in a block of flats. (She has a garden on her balcony). She sometimes does some gardening at her mother in law’s, but she can only go when she has a car.

*Is it in this area?*
It is not very far. Uncles and cousins are not very far – in Rapenitza, which is not very far from Birchaw.

*Did any of her family members go to university?*
No.

*Alright, now, I would like to talk a little bit about Poland and what it means to be Polish.*
*Have you ever travelled outside Poland?*
Yes, she managed to go abroad to Hungary when she was younger for a few days. And the she managed to go to Czech Republic when it was Czechoslovakia. She went with a group of young people. She was only 20 and they were all 18, so it was a very good group (griner). And lately she just visited Hope Springs in Slovakia. The Hungary trip was actually a “buy and sell” trip, which is almost like a trading trip. Offi-
cially it was a trip just to see the country, but everyone brought something they had bought cheaply in Poland to sell in Hungary, and they bought something in Hungary which there wasn’t a lot of in Poland.

For making money?
Yes, exactly. My mother did it also once.

Do you like being in other nations?
Yes, she likes it very much, and sees all the travel channels, national that sort of thing, because if she can’t go abroad she will just watch and dream that she could go to more exotic places.

Can you tell me, when you were travelling, did you ever feel a strong sense of being Polish as compared to, say, being Hungarian?
It is a difficult question, because she hasn’t travelled a lot, but… during the Hungary trip, she felt a little bit ashamed, because of the rest of the group, because she was more into sightseeing than trading, so she felt ashamed because of the other part of the group. They were so … I don’t know the word, but when you want to sell and you insist, like someone saying, you want to buy, and some other says, - no, no, no, I don’t want to buy, - but yes, you do want to buy; and they insist, and they insist, and it is not very nice.

Is that something very Polish to be a little bit like this?
She wouldn’t say this as a general thing for Polish people. She says that some people actually have this saying “shmikauka??””, which is if you are king of something or good at something, let’s say trading, these people usually did have this thing, they were a little bit greedy to insist to a certain (?), but she wouldn’t say this about most of the people.

If you were to characterize Poles in a general way, what would they have in common?
She started to laugh because her opinion is split almost in half because there are people she knows that are generally good and people she know that are generally not very good. She thinks that Polish people are generally rather good, say, specialists. When they are educated in some subject, they are usually very good at it. On the other hand she said that there are people who are not working so hard and who are lazy. She says that she wouldn’t like to think the Polish nation is a hard working one, but she says that now with the young people she sees that it is not so. You wouldn’t see so much tendency to work hard for your benefit. The Polish youth is a little bit easy going.
So she thinks there is some sort of generation gap. Is that what she means? What she says now is that she thinks that her generation is a little bit different, because she has a … how to say… I don’t know the word again … when you price somebody, care about something. Let’s say she has, or her generation has, much more care about work and about money. It is not that they are greedy – that they are “penny-counter”, but they know the value of money. And in the youth now she says that it is a little bit different because the youth now think that when they finish their education or their school – secondary or university – they think they are well educated, they have all the (?) they need, so now they are waiting for the job offer. And if they get, let’s say, less than 1500 szl, then they won’t accept the offer. And there are plenty of Polish young people who are staying with their parents, so the parents are paying for them. This is a problem(?), because she says, she works for, let’s say, for twenty years and doesn’t have these 1500 szl, but she cares about her job, because she remembers when it was hard to get a job, she knows that there is much unemployment, so she has a different attitude towards her job than the youth would have.

So, does she think that the young generation is a bit spoiled? She doesn’t say yes or no, but she says that she thinks that the whole situation in Poland has made some of the young people, let’s say, spoiled, because it is very easy for them, because if they don’t have the job they want or they don’t find a job at all. Somehow the parents are obliged to give them clothing and money and food, those sorts of things. And there are some people who will not look for a job at all, because, let’s say, because it is easy for them. They don’t do anything, they get money from their parents, so it is great – it is a good way of living. You can spend time with your friends and have fun.

Is that very common? What she says is that she hopes, she doesn’t know, but she hopes that this is not the general situation, but she has some friends… there are some people who are in this situation. There are some young people who, if they could, would squeeze their parents to the last drop.

Is that because Poles have more money today than before? She says that she doesn’t know if they have more money than in the past. If I may comment on this I think we actually have less money than we had in the past, because during socialism the situation was that you had a full pocket of money but you had nothing to buy with it. There were many shops, but they were empty. And now it is totally opposite. You have many shops with many goods, but you don’t have the money to buy it.
But why is it then that young people are being lazy, or whatever you call it, how can it be? Why wasn’t it like that before? 
She thinks it is the parents’ fault, because in the past they didn’t buy any things for their kids, because there weren’t many things, and the choices were poor. So there weren’t many things that a child could get from his father. Nowadays there are plenty of things he can buy for his children, and they kind of spoil their kids, and they are used to getting lots of different things from their parents. And as they grow they demand…

Now I would like to ask you what you think is very Polish, or what is Polish culture if you could… is there some symbols or special feelings…? What is Polish to you? (Pause) Maybe it’s easier if you compare to Germany or Hungary…
She talks about how home, let’s say homeland, hills and mountains. She might be somewhere distant, in some distant place, but every time she comes home and sees the mountains and hills she feels home.

But what if you were to say something about all of Poland… Do you think there is a connection between all Poles? (Lang pause) What about for instance Polish history? She says yes. She says that Polish are, maybe not brave, but, they fight very good. But she says, yes, history is important to the Polish people, but it was more so in the past. But now it starts do depreciate and let’s say devaluate for the young people. And she thinks it might be connected with the way of teaching now, because it is different. In the past, when she was in school, the schools didn’t teach you how to think independently, how to form your own ideas.

But when she went to school?
Yes, it was like a portion of ideological ideas were plotted into the text or material, and she had to obey this. She wasn’t allowed to form her own ideas, because she wouldn’t fit into the frame, let’s say, and then she would be dangerous. (Pause). And there is another thing about Polish people, which is that they are very hospitable. Rather happy people, like to have fun.

Does this apply to your neighbour countries as well, or do you think Poles are different in this respect?
Again, it is hard for Joskabrowska to say anything about other countries, because she didn’t travel a lot. But she says that for example when she was abroad, in Slovakia, there was a group of German tourists, and she had this feeling that they don’t know how to actually have fun, and she thinks that it is more common for Polish people to actually have fun together individually… you know, like, gathering around a camp fire, singing, dancing – those sorts of things. It could also be because we are close to
the mountains, so, you could say it is like in the country side, yes, and it differs to the north were you have all those big cities.

So do you think there is a big difference between the north of Poland and the south of Poland or east and west?
That’s hard to say.

Do you consider yourself Polish or European or both?
She started saying that now she is probably both. She feels Polish the most, because she is here. The situation around her has been changed very much, she still feels more Polish than European. The thing that the EU, The European Union, has opened the borders means that she can travel – there is a possibility of travel. She feels that, yes, it is something closer and closer to my heart, but she says that she is still three fourths Polish.

Did she say that exactly?
Yes, three fourths.

Do you think it is going to be bigger the European part in your heart?
She hopes that it will expand, it will grow, it will be bigger, because you have to progress as a person. (Joska Browska taler videre) She says that in her case, in the case of her generation and the former, previous generation it is like, she knows that it is important to visit and go to other countries, but it is somehow limited to her, because her generation didn’t learn English, let’s say, so there is a language barrier, and this is very important, because it is not very easy going abroad and trying to communicate in Polish without knowing the language. So she waits until Kia, her daughter speaks English, and maybe then… Kia is studying for nine years, so she learns nine years of English…

Now that we’ve started talking a little bit about The European Union, I would like to ask you, now that Poland is a part of The European Union, has it had any effect on your life?
To be honest, she says, she didn’t really think about it. She doesn’t feel any changes in her life.

Did she vote?
Yes, she voted. She voted yes.

Why did you vote yes?
She says that she voted yes because she thinks it will bring some changes into her life – some major changes. And those changes she point out as decrease of unemploy-
ment, increase of payment for the people - wages, and she says that she knows that it is not something fast, that it will go, like, “snap”, but maybe her daughter can benefit from it. But she thinks that generally the EU will be something good for her. (Joska Browska taler videre)

There is something about Polish people that she just recalled. Polish people are very… impatient. When something is to happen in a period of time…

*They can’t wait?*

Exactly.

*That’s a good point. Do you fear some consequences of joining the EU?*

That’s a difficult question because she doesn’t like politics very much… She prefers that it will be something good and as long as it is good it doesn’t really matter what happens. As long as it is good and it goes by her… it’s a little bit hard to explain. She says that she is not a very active person, it’s more like… what is it…

Lazy or she doesn’t really care so much?

I think this is not lazy and not uncaring.

*Just sort of awaiting?*

Yeah, I would say an awaiting person. She says that she knows that this is not a very good attitude, but this is how she actually is. She is not active, so she is waiting - what happens, what does the future bring? She would like the future to be good.

But she did go and vote. That is active…?

That was more for her daughter, for the children but not for her. But she thought this was important to change the future for the children.

Do you think the Polish national feeling will be the same in 30 years?

She says that the most difficult question come at the end (griner). No, she thinks.

Could she say a little bit more?

Could we meet in 30 years? (Griner)

Yeah, alright. Has the fact that Europe has become more borderless changed her way of living?

Generally she thinks it did change the life for people in Poland but not for her, because, well, because she has a job here. She doesn’t go to look for work abroad.

You don’t think about working in another country?

She doesn’t think about it because of the language barrier.
If there wasn’t a language problem would she like to go?
If there was a situation were the language barrier was not a problem, she would strongly consider this option, and mostly for financial, economical reasons, because she says that her situation is not easy, life is not easy here in Poland.

Is the way of living in Poland important to her, like the culture and...
She says that, yes, costums, tradition is all important to her. She feels that, going abroad, it would be difficult to break some habits, some conditions that she is used to. And she says that she has a friend who lived in Poland for 30 years and then moved to Germany, and this friend says that, apart from being bordering countries and being very close to each other, the differences in tradition are very big, so it was very hard for this friend to familiarize, let’s say, absorb the German way of living.

What was the difference?
Also it was hard because these conversation were very loose, let’s say, but she says that there are so many things, very simple, and she gives an example. A legal segregation or rubbish segregation, I think it has just started here, or it has recently started here, and in Germany it was a normal thing to segregate your garbage. And it was something she would have to learn.

Where do you mostly get information about The European Union from?
The biggest media would be television, as she doesn’t read newspapers very much. The other source would be her husband who is sitting at the internet also, but television would be the most.

What does her husband do?
Her husband works in logistics here at the factory.

What is his educational background?
He also finished technical secondary school but it was focused on mechanics, so he has a mechanical background.

So is that... At what age do you finish?
At about eighteen or nineteen. He did it in stages. After eight years of primary school her entered the first stage of secondary school, which gave him the education, so he could be employed and then he had his second stage. It is a little bit like English college. After college you can get a job and it is similar. She said that her husband was a little bit luckier, because at his school they were learning English, so he has some English practice, and also he works for “FIAT”, which is the Italian factory, so he also knows a little bit Italian.
I think there are some programs on TV about people from Europe living in Poland… Do you know what I mean?
Yeah.

Does she watch them, does she like them?
She says that she watches this particular program. Not all the time, because she works in two shifts, so she doesn’t always have the opportunity to watch this particular program. She says that this program is very nice, because you have citizens of different countries who also sometimes live in Poland and who speak Polish and talk about their feelings of Poland. It’s also very often confronted… Poles and other nationalities. And it’s mostly something funny, so it is a very happy program.

Do you consider yourself a central or eastern European?
She is talking about something different…

But does she feel closer to the eastern countries or to the western countries?
She still feels that we are closer to the eastern countries.

Why is that?
Her opinion is that we are still somehow behind other European countries, western European countries, but we are not so (much?) together with other eastern European countries, so she says her idea is that we are somehow in front of the eastern European countries, but we are still behind western Europe.

This is a difficult question, but maybe if she thinks about the television program it will help a little bit…It doesn’t matter that she didn’t travel; it’s her feelings that are important.
Do you think that there is something all Europeans have in common – some culture…? She can try to compare with other countries, Africa or Asia…
In comparison to other places like Africa or Asia or India it is different, because she thinks, if we take India, that people are very fanatical, very religious. If we compare ourselves with those regions she thinks that Europe is more civilized, very advanced…
There is something that could be interesting for you, because she says that comparing to Iraq, Iran and all that information about the war in TV and those sorts of things… Comparing Iran to Polish or European… is different, because the relationship between man and woman are different, because in Europe and Poland she says it starts, and maybe they are more like a partnership, and in those other countries Asia, Iran, Iraq they are more like the man is a lord and the woman is a servant. She doesn’t have the right to vote herself.
And it’s not like that in Poland?
No… (griner) Women wouldn’t allow it.

Could you think of something else that all Europeans have in common?
(Griner)

I could ask another question. Do you think that Turkey should be in the EU? And this is not about politics it’s more about culture.
A little, yeah. She Wouldn’t mind having another country in the EU. About Turkey, she says she doesn’t know Turkey very well, so she doesn’t have any objections.

What about... the geographical borders go through Turkey, and through Russia as well. How would she feel about bringing Russia into the European Union?
Without any politics involved she says, geographically she said, as long as it is beneficial for Europe and for the countries involved, she has nothing against those countries being accepted as members.

And the cultural identity... Being a lot of different cultures mixed...?
There are some things of negative quality... Because she said, you can’t get just the good things, because you will also have some of the bad things. She mentions that because of differences in culture and traditions there might be, let’s say, some difficulties, frictions between nations – those sorts of things. There will be some disagreements internally in Europe between different nations.

Now I would like to talk about religion. Is religion important in your life?
It is very important for her. She can’t say if it is so important for her right now, because she was brought up in a Roman catholic church or if it was her own choice. What she can say is probably in the past it was tradition, because old Polish people were Christianised after birth - baptised. And then they are brought up according to catholic traditions, everyone around them is catholic, and it is something that you do, and it is natural for you. Now young people have more options to choose, and she says that they are more cautious of what they are choosing. They have got many choices, and they are, maybe, a little bit independent. They can do what they actually want. And she says that she doesn’t take the Catholic Church as it is. She says that there are some things about the catholic, institutional church that she doesn’t like

What could those be?
One of those things is that she says that modern priests… The situation where they should gather young people to the church they are actually pushing them away. Like with sacraments. There are a few sacrament that are part of the catholic tradition, like baptism, and the thing were you eat bread, this is another sacrament, and then, when
you the holy spirit on you, the third sacrament… marriage is one of the sacraments. When a person is brought up, and becomes an adult it has a mind and consciousness of its own. It becomes an individual. It’s supposed to have the gift of sacred spirit. This is one of the sacraments, but she says that in modern days this is not something young people go and do out of their own will. It is something like additional subject in school. You have some books that you have to write in when you go to church every Sunday, there are some questions.

*Are they being registered?*
Something very similar, something very similar. And it is something… It becomes very formal… some books, some questions, tests about it… So it is something that young people have to do, so it is pushing them away. It is not of their own free will.

*Is that different from before?*
So there is a point of view of the matter. She thinks that priests see their religion as the most important, let’s call it, subject. When her daughter got lectures about this sacrament, she would get back at seven or eight o’clock PM, so it is late in the evening, when she is supposed to be home preparing for the next day of school. She thinks the priests are very selfish. They make of it because in the past it was something, almost, natural. You were just supposed to… Now it has become very formal.

*Why has it become formal?*
She says that she doesn’t sit everywhere… in aggregation, let’s say, we call it “awia”. Every church has an awia… so she doesn’t sit in every awia. It might also be something a bit personal, because it has also changed for her, awia, her church, when the main priest in her church changed.

*So it depends on what person is the priest?*
Exactly. On who is the head person. She says that it is maybe because of the situation now. Maybe the church wants to gather all the young people in the church to have the community, so the young people won’t wander around and do bad things, but she thinks that the effect is contrary.

*Does she think that young people are less religious than the older?*
In her opinion it is actually opposite. The young people are more religious than the older. The older people were religious, but it was all done… secretly maybe…

*Because of communism?*
Also. So it was a bit like hiding. And now, because you are free, you can speak your mind and there are many activities around each church. She also used the pope as an
example... he was very strong for the young people. He liked being with young people, and they would gather around the pope and liked him very much.

Is the church an actor on the political scene in Poland?
She feels that it has gone down. Because in the past it was a common practice for the priests to talk to the people in the church about politics, what they should do, what they should do. She still sees it, but it is much less often. It’s a little bit different than my opinion but...

How was life during communism?
She doesn’t consider this time in the past as a bad time. Of course, there was something that was, if not bad, then, unhandy – a little bit difficult. Small difficulties, like, to buy something in the shop you had to wait in lines for a long time, because there were shortages in the shop. You had – like I said before – plenty of money, but there was nothing to buy with it. She also says that this was in her childhood, so she didn’t see so much...

Can we ask how old she is?
She was born in ’64.

So she doesn’t remember the time as bad?
She doesn’t see it as something bad, because when she was a child there were situations, for her, the old people might see, like, to stand in queue to get into shop, for them it might be bad, but for her it was fun to stand in queue to get something, like, you know, meat. For her it was fun. There weren’t many situations where she was oppressed by society, because neither for the religion, neither for her mother bringing her up alone. But it wasn’t so hard for her because the government paid security. There were plenty of things you could get from the government. You could go on holiday and the company would pay, and there were plenty of things...

A good social net?
Yes. So even though she was brought up by her mother on her own, life wasn’t so hard on her. And she remembers that it was easier for her to get some pocket money as a child – of course there weren’t many things to buy with it - than it is now.

If she could choose, would she like to go back to that period?
Coming to choose, making a choice of which period, she wouldn’t go back, but she wouldn’t have anything against if the reality would change. She says that everything is about money. If the wages would level with the prices, life would be cheaper, and she says that... Life in the communism – I wouldn’t call it communism, I would say socialism – life in the past wasn’t poor, but it wasn’t, like a..., high life. People
weren’t rich but it was a stable living, and people were somehow jollier – they had time to have fun. She says that – I think this is important for you – nobody she sees… this urge to move, this rapidness in everything people are doing. Rush to work, rush from work. Rush of living.

So does that mean that she have to work more now, that she had more free time in the past?
She says that this point, that Polish people wouldn’t have to go to work on Sundays, she says that it is a little bit opposite. She doesn’t feel that she hasn’t got more free time now, because she is working some overtime. So sometimes, let’s say one Saturday a month, she is supposed to come to the factory to work. This means that she doesn’t have so much free time. Her family is pushed a bit aside, and she is more focused on work. This is opposite to what it was before.

Do you see any similarities between the Soviet Union and the European Union?
(No answer)

Is the transnational Union, is there any kind of similarities, or has the fact that Poland has been a part of the Soviet Union created some sort of negative thoughts about, once again, being part of such a big union?
Yes. Being a part of the Soviet Union, is something that she sees as a negative thing, because we were a small part of something very, very big, which didn’t care about the small parts. She also fears this, but only very slightly. And also because we will be on the border of these two, let’s say super-powers, might scare her a little bit. Or in between, in the middle [landet kommer til at ligge i midten].

She told us earlier, that she felt more connected to the eastern part of Europe, why is that?
She sees two things: The first is the standard of working, the industry. The standards that we have, the way of working, is more like Eastern countries. There is this difference between us and the Western Union.
Also in regards to the culture, we are more like the Eastern neighbours, than the Western neighbours. We are more… Slavic, than the rest of Europe. This is something that we have more in common, than with the rest of Europe.

Last question; What are your hopes for the future?
That wages will level with the wages in the rest of Europe. That, because of the increase of the payment, of the wages, that the standard of living will increase. That it will be easier for people to live in Poland. Also, because it will be easier to get a job, if not in Poland, then maybe people can get a job abroad, in all of Europe. And for her daughter, that if she cannot finish her education [fordi familien ikke kan betale],
or if she wishes to continue her education, that she can do it either in Poland or in Europe. And then later on find a good job, here or abroad. She is also concerned with Polish health-services, that they will be better. And the second thing is about retirement pensions, that they will be better. Because she fears, that when she retires the pension won’t be enough to have, not a high standard, but a standard life.

Mandlig fabriksarbejder - Valdik, 46 år
Trelleborg – Sealing Solutions.

[Interviewet indledes med en briefing, hvor interviewpersonen, Valdik, får at vide, hvad interviewet drejer sig om osv.]

What is your job here at the factory? What is your position here?
Valdik says that he is a [ground-] keeper here. He is responsible for the tool store-house, to keep the tools in the proper places, and keeping them in a good condition, this means that they are clean and dry. So this is his job here.

So how long have you been working here?
Valdik has been working here since the beginning of this factory. From the first day. He is one of the first six people to be employed here [tolken vender sig mod Valdik for bekræftelse]. Yes, he was one of the six workers to be employed here as the first group of workers.

And how many years is that?
Three years.

Ok. Do you live here in this area?
Yes, very close from this place, about four kilometres from the factory.

Ok. And were you born here? Have you lived here all your life?
Valdik was not born here, not in this region. He was born 300 kilometres from here…[tolken spørger Valdik]…in the centre of Poland.

So do you have any educational background?
Valdik’s background is….I don’t know how to compare it with your experience, but it’s kind of intermediate school. So intermediate school, but technical school… Specialist in mechanics.
What about his parents and their education? Were they academics? What did they do?
The parents are not academics, but they are in services as a baker and…. A person who makes the clothes [so in textiles?]. Yeah, not academics but in services.
Do you have any children?
Yes, three children. 20, 18 and 16 years old. Two daughters and a son.

Have you ever travelled outside of Poland?
Yes, he has been in Germany. Once he was in Germany with the previous job.

Have you ever been outside of Poland on vacation or has it always been with your job?
No, it was related with his job. His previous job was moving machines from Ger-
many, and he was sent to prepare something.

Can you tell me something about when you were travelling outside of Poland? Did you feel particularly Polish or something?
[Tolken spørger, hvad der menes]
I mean when he was in Germany, did he have a strong feeling about being Polish? Is there for example something that he was particularly proud of as a Pole? Has he ever been in a situation when he had that feeling…being proud of Polish values or some-
thing? [tolken siger, at han forstår spørgsmålet]
Valdik says that he has never been in a situation where he felt especially proud of being Polish, but generally he was proud of the Pope, because the Pope was from Poland. So he feels that he is very proud of him as being a Polish man, that somebody from Poland is so well-known, that he is a kind of father for all over the world. That is the only thing that makes him proud of being Polish, but generally he is not ashamed of being Polish in whatever situation or whatever is said about Poland. Generally he likes to be a Pole.

[Der kommer kaffe på bordet]

Speaking of religion: Is it something that you would say all Poles have in common? If you were to mention a thing, if you were to characterize something particularly Polish what would it be in your opinion?
Valdik says the religion is something that makes Polish people come together, and he adds something, which is for him, also is... perhaps very close to religion that is Polish tradition. This is two different things he thinks but tradition....[Tradition in what way?] Well tradition, which is related to religion, some kind of events in the year, some occasions.
Can you tell me whether or not you also feel European as well as being a Pole? I mean now that Poland is a member of the EU? Is that something you think about? Valdik tells that he feels like a Pole but also as a normal European. He feels like a European man, he has nothing against people of other countries or nationalities or skin colour, he treats all people the same way, whether he is somewhere or whether he is here and has contact with other people from other countries. Valdik gave an example; when some perhaps very old people in Poland might not like the Germans, because some remains of the war or some bad things in the history. He himself does not feel like this, he thinks that this is of another generation. He told that you can find in Poland some bad feelings about the war or the Germans, but for him nationality does not matter. Every man is equal, not special treatment for anyone.

As I mentioned before Poland is now a part of the EU. Has that changed something in your everyday life? Are there things that are different now than they were before Poland joined the EU?

First of all, after Poland joined the EU... in his family there are a lot of farmers. They know that now they can get some extra money from the EU, and that is a very good thing and very important, because it is smart and improving their lives and their production, so that is something very good. There are no big changes in normal life. The life looks similar. But another positive thing is the open borders, now there is no problem to travel anywhere, and it is really a shame when we look at the television and see that there are some information from the Eastern border of Poland with Ukraine, where you will spend 25-30 hours, because of the check on the border, because of the Ukrainian treatment of European people. This is an example of how it should not be and it is very bad. But generally for the Polish it is very good to know that you can travel everywhere. And one thing more about the situation with the jobs. In Valdik’s opinion after Poland joined the EU, you can find a job in Poland maybe a little bit easier than in the past, although the unemployment is still very high, but this is not jobs that let you keep the good standard of life, because all investors in Poland or company owners which have factories here know that in Poland there is a very big unemployment, and they employ you for very poor wages, so they use the situation for themselves, and they treat people like cheap labour, and Valdik’s impression of this is bad. He knows that “okay I have a job, but salary is not good” and it is fine that after the EU membership we have some big companies, but not for good money and not to let you live from the good standards. So generally it looks bad.

I would like to know if you – when you think about the EU – think of it in an economical way? Like you said with the farmers and lower salary. That was perhaps the economical consequences, but do you also think of the EU as a project for cooperation and peace?
The main things that Valdik has noticed is the environmental changes, because now there are some – even - low regulation which tell you…for example if you have a house, you have to sign an agreement with a company that takes all the rubbish from your house. This is something new, because in the past nobody cared about what you did with your rubbish. Valdik had a part of a forest as his own, and he did not want people leaving their things in the forest. Now everything is changing, because everyone is aware that if you throw out something you will get a punishment, there are some regulations, which can punish you for bad treatment of the environment. So this is good, and Valdik has noticed that this has changed after the EU, but he thinks that it is of course still not good enough, he hopes it will be changing more and more, to keep everything so clean like in the other countries, because there is still some place where the environment is bad. This is very important to him. The other thing he mentioned now is that in the past when he was in Germany, he noticed that people liked to live in nice places, they have gardens next to their house, the front of their house is very clean with flowers and the grass is cut short. And now he thinks that this culture is coming to Poland and more people in Poland look after the environment and the nearest environment, they look after garbage, they do not want have an untidy area around the house or the place where they live. It becomes important for people now to show everybody around that they keep everything tidy and they live in a nice place. This is a good thing and it is something that came from the West.

What is your opinion on this cultural influence from the West? Now that Poles care about gardens and such, will it change the way they are or their traditions? In terms of culture changes in Poland… in Valdik’s opinion the big change, which you can observe, is the drinking. For example the alcohol drinking in Poland has completely changed, comparing to the past because now you can see something strange, now you can say that people drink more, much more than in the past and you can see it all around, because in the past there were, say, two or three pubs in the city, now there is a lot more pubs, a lot of pubs in the past you could see sometimes people completely drunk on the way or sometimes very loud, and there was some even dangerous places where people were completely drunk, but now there is a lot of pubs and you can not see the people drunk on the way or the road. You cannot find them just walking, compared with in the past. People now drink more, but in a better way or let’s say in a different way. Now it is a shame to be seen as a drunken man in the street, and this is a big change, which Valdik relates to the joining of the EU.

Why do you think people drink more now than before? Because there are some more places where people can drink and more people like to spend their free time in the pub or drinking beer, because there are a lot of people in the city sitting at the tables with their beer, but you cannot see drunk people like in the past. There were not a lot of pubs, not a lot of places where you could spend your
free time, but you could meet sometimes very drunk people in the bus station or somewhere in the city. So now the things are changed, the people drink more but maybe in a different way and maybe different kinds of alcohol also. And Valdik relates this to Poland being in Europe, this is a kind of European culture’s impact on Poland’s culture.

Ok then. I was wondering if you would ever consider working abroad again? Or perhaps if your children were to move abroad for work, could you see that happening or would you prefer if they stayed home and worked in Poland? The first thing, to answer to this question... Valdik told that he has nothing against working abroad, he is ready to work abroad, if he has the possibilities he is ready to go somewhere from Poland to work. And the same for his children, if they have possibilities to work somewhere outside from Poland, he has nothing against it, he would support the decision if his children decide to go somewhere else. But he also told that for the money you earn here in Poland you cannot live in a good way, and he is aware that the Polish labour is cheap and he knows that for the same job you can get much more money in other countries. He also gave an example of someone from his family, his brother-in-law, now he is working in Ireland and the salary there is, say five times more than you would get here for the same job, and he was able to fly to Poland for Easter for example and then fly back. So he has contact with his family and he is working for the good money, not like in Poland. The thing that makes Valdik want to work outside of Poland is only the money, because in the past when he was in Germany it was 1989, it was the same year when the Berlin wall collapsed, so there was a big difference when he saw the German shops, the German places, they looked much better than in Poland, but now he could not see any differences. Everything is the same, but the only thing is the wages, the salary. He told that the main thing for him is to live with honours as we say in Poland, so you live in a good way to be able to buy whatever you want. So this is the only reason, which makes him ready to work outside of Poland.

In 2002 there was a referendum in Poland. It was about Poland becoming a part of the EU. I would like to ask, if I may, if you voted and what you voted? Generally Valdik thinks that Poland should be in Europe. And yes, he voted in 2002 in the referendum, and he said yes. This is no secret for him. But now he has some observations. In his opinion the way the information was given to the people was very bad. There was said nothing to people about many very important things, which appear now. For example he says there was nothing about some regulations and some expectations for some kinds of activities or some kind of businesses, for example slaughters. They had been taught about some regulations after voting, after making the decision and now there are a lot of slaughters that have to close their business, because they are not able to pass some European expectations. So they have not been
told before the voting, so it looks like the government didn’t tell everything or didn’t tell about many details for some maybe business groups, some people which are doing something what the risk or the danger in the European Union was, what they have to do to keep their business running, or what will be the new regulations, so this is bad for him, that way of informing the people. But generally, yes, he has nothing against it.

Where do you get this information about the EU? Is it the television or…?
Valdik is saying that it is mostly from television.

Do you feel like there is too little contact between the EU and Polish citizens? Should Poles know more about the EU?
There is still a lack of information, and Valdik observed an example of some quarrels in the government where somebody said something, or there are some deadlines for whatever… preparing some documentation and nobody needs this date, because they did not know. Generally there is very poor information flow between the EU and Poland, that is his impression from television and sometimes we lose some possibilities because we miss the date. That is the main problem. Another thing is that sometimes there is a problem with the information meaning something different in the northern part of Poland and the same information means something different in the south, because there are some faults and some errors in the interpretation of this information. So there is a lack of proper interpreters in Poland, sometimes something is not clear. Different groups of Poles understand the same information differently. [So they don’t explain it clearly enough?] No, no.

Now that Poland has become part of the EU, has that changed your view on Poland’s eastern neighbours? Earlier you said that you were not proud of the way that Ukrainians treated Poles or other people coming to the Ukrainian border. Do you feel that Poland and, say, Ukraine or Belarus have nothing in common now that Poland is a member of the EU and the others are not?
Valdik told that being in the EU for him is not a reason to be proud or to be over the people from the east, nothing like this. He said for him it looks like the government from Poland and some eastern governments sometimes quarrel with each other, but this is not related to the life of the common people. He thinks that the same people live in Poland as the people living in Ukraine and there is something opposite between them. The problems are sometimes between governments, and has nothing to do with the normal life. He is also aware that in Western Europe there is sometimes an opinion about Poles. He thinks that this example is not true. He believes that you have found examples of bad Poles to the fixed opinion, but you can also find a Pole who is a very good specialist, and you can trust him, because he will do a good job
for you. But this is general in every country, people are the same. It does not matter if they are from Poland or France or whatever...

So you hope that Ukraine will sometime join the EU as well?

Valdik does not know the accurate economical or political situation in Ukraine, but he thinks that, yes, Ukraine could be a member of the EU, but of course they have to pass all the expectations, like Poland has done. But he also mentioned that it is very important for the normal people to change their minds like in Poland. The people in this kind of country like Poland or Ukraine they used to be treated very social by the government, now they have to be out to work very hard and they have much more impact than they had in the past. They have to change their minds and work very hard. But also they should not be very hopeful in a short that they would have a beautiful country like Western countries. You cannot just change your politics and your political situation and in one moment have a great new country. Valdik’s experience shows him that it needs a lot of time and sometimes it means in a long time you live in a country with nothing bad, but there is also not much more good things. Valdik says that there are some similar situations with the Ukrainian people as it was with Poles: Sometimes it is better to go somewhere to earn some money. So some Ukrainian people would like to live in Poland and to work here and to move from the East to the West. He understands the people from the Ukraine.

Ok. Being in the European Union. One thing is that you have the economical expectations, but there is perhaps also a cultural thing that the countries have in common. What about Turkey as a Muslim country, do you think they should join? Does it play any role for you that we in Europe are Christians?

Valdik finds that very difficult to answer.

Ok, that’s all right. How about the consequences of being in the EU, do you fear anything bad coming from the membership? Do you fear a development that you do not agree with?

The main danger for Poland, which Valdik has noticed for the future, is pushing Poland in terms of amounts or quantities, let’s say how much you can produce... milk or other things. So he does not agree with some regulations from the EU, that you are supposed to produce this and this. We should be free to decide how much to produce or if we want to sell.

Do you think that this membership will have an impact on Polish identity? Say in 30 years, will some of the Polish nationality be lost being a part of the new Europe?

As Valdik understands it there are some changes, bad changes... or maybe difficult to assess if they are bad...but looks like bad changes in Polish... maybe not culture, but the way of living. These are not changes in culture or tradition, but changes in the
approach to other people. In the past the people were not very jealous, not very helpful. If you needed something or to go somewhere or to borrow something, a car or something from a neighbour, you just borrow it, and if you need something else you have it. But now people are jealous, they are not helpful, people treat neighbours like competitors. If there is somebody who is more rich than other people, then the people do not like him anymore, they wish as bad as possible, sometimes even they hate him. And this is a bad thing, but one good thing from this is that people start thinking about themselves, and think “Hey, we can actually do something.” There are possibilities to get things, but generally people are worse in their relationships with each other than in the past. And this is also a sign of European culture coming to Poland.

But the good thing is that you want to do something for yourself…
Yes, people are activated because of different situations. In the past there was not a big difference between people and they live more together instead of separated.

Ok. If you were to guess or say your opinion…would you say that Poland is a Central European or Eastern European country? Because for example in the West many see Poland as an Eastern European country, because of the Communist period. Do you feel like this? Is there a great division between for example Germany and Poland?

Yes. Although there are a couple of countries who are in the same flock, there are some spits between the eastern and the western. [And where is Poland? Central? Eastern?]. Eastern, Poland is part of the eastern block.

Do you think Polish culture fits easily into a common European culture?

Valdik says that he does not know about the other cultures of Europe, but he does think that there is not a big crush between Polish culture and the other cultures. And generally there is no big difference. He says that he should travel more, to meet more people, to find some differences. Looking right now there are none.

Ok. To skip to something different: Do you consider yourself a religious man?

Yes, a very religious man, yes.

And being religious or catholic, is that something you connect with being Polish or Polish identity?

In Valdik’s opinion culture in Poland is somehow related to Polish tradition and history, but maybe in a special way is connected with Polish identity, but there is also a place for other religions. And in this way there should be a freedom. It is everybody’s choice, it is not like if you are Polish you have to be catholic, or if you are catholic then you should be Polish. It’s not like that. [But in your opinion it is still a part of your identity…?] Not necessarily, no.
Is it more important to you as a Pole that you live as a citizen in a democracy or being a Catholic? I mean living under certain laws etc. or that you belong to the church…?

Valdik told that this is more related to the geographical situation, and he would not join the religious things, the religious aspect of life with national identity. It is two separate things.

Is there a difference between the generations when it comes to religion? Is the younger generation as religious as your own?

In Valdik’s opinion there is a huge difference between the approaches to religion of the older generation and the young. The young people do not care about religious things or religion in their life. Religion is not in the first place in their life. Ok they have got nothing against going to church for Easter or Christmas, but in everyday life religion almost does not exist or they do not care about religion. That is the younger people of course. The older people are religious.

That perhaps your children do not share the same traditions?]

Yes. It looks like this: The parents who are religious, they are afraid that their children are not so religious, because for the parents, for example, religion means some rules, some way of living, some kind of being good in a positive way. And they are afraid that their children do not look after their issues and they do something wrong, they could do something very bad. And Valdik is afraid to hear something bad like “Your son is a murderer or something like this. And he thinks that religion is a kind of warranty of being a good man. And if young people do not care about these rules, of this religion, they lose some values in their lives. And they start to be bad people or they start to do bad things, because they do not respect any rules and religion has many rules. This is what he is afraid of, and he noticed that he now is afraid of being some place where he is not safe, because people are ready to kill...

So why is this? Why are young people less religious?

Valdik thinks that the main reason that young people do not care about religion is that they do not spend much time with their parents or the older people, because the grown-up people are very busy and spend a lot of time at work. They do not have good relations, there is not a lot of time together and sometimes young people feel lack of something in their life and then they buy entertainment, they like to go to the pubs or go to the parties and this is more fun for them than going to church. So the young people are looking to play, to have fun they are not thinking about serious things, because they have no contact with the parents. They have no possibilities to start thinking about serious things. There are not ready just for themselves to think about religious things. They do not find their own motivation to be religious. More important to them is to have fun.

[Der holdes en kort toiletpause.]
I was wondering if I could ask you how old you are, because I would like to hear something about how life was under communism? How was, for example, the everyday life back then compared to now?

Valdik is 46 years old.... The main difference for him is social security. In the past there was no expression like ‘unemployment’. Everyone had a job, moreover everyone should have a job, you have no job now, the government does not ask you or gives you a job. You have to do something, but back then there was no situation where somebody was out of home or somebody moved from his home, because he did not pay for it. So from this point of view there was... this was more safe more secure. People were not depressed, because they could lose their jobs, they could lose their homes. It was not like this, but it is now sometimes. Or sometimes you can see it on television. But generally his opinion about communism is bad. He does not like communism, because he sees now freedom and many more possibilities to live in a normal way, but also in the past under communism the people were safe, personally safe. The police had bigger respect than they have now. If you were staying somewhere with a group of people, the police came and asked and it was not allowed. But now people are afraid to go some where, because there are younger people who are dressed strange, and you are aware that you should be afraid of this. There is no police, and even if they are there, sometimes they are more frightened than you are. The police now are not respected and there are many hooligan groups. In the past that was not possible for any hooligan group...

Do you miss something from back in the days of communism?
For Valdik the most important thing that he would say he misses is special treatment. People they had more children, but it was impossible for children to be hungry, because you could get more money from your job if you had more children. So generally there was no big differences and the children were not left alone like now sometimes. Or like these days some people cannot afford to get breakfast for their children, because they have no money. In the past that was impossible. The government looked after especially children or people with problems. So economical treatment of children... Now nobody is interested in how many children you have or if you are able to give them something to eat or not.

What about the values, for example the feeling of being from Poland, have they changed? Did you have more confidence in the government back then or was there a greater distance between the people and the government?
First of all Valdik told that today’s politicians are on the complete bottom. Now the situation looks like this: They cannot solve today’s problems, they are not clever enough, and they have no ideas what to do with our problems today in Poland. And generally people do not trust today’s politicians, because they are very poor in their
way of doing everything. The results of their activities are hopeless. Now everything looks very bad. We have to remember the big corruption affairs, one after one, which is now very loud in Poland. The people from the top they are related with some suspect businesses and so people are very disappointed about them. So talking about politicians from the past: They are...well not all... but there are a few politicians from the communist time, which are responsible for some big investments in industry... they have built a lot of steel mills, coalmines and they gave a lot of jobs to the people. They built a lot of flats. It was much easier to have a job and to have a flat to live in. It was the ideas of some politicians. There was also a lot of bad things, because the communist government did not provide access to goods. If you wanted to buy something you had to spend a lot of time in the queue. On the market there was almost nothing. Valdik said that he had experiences, because he had built a house in this time. And so he had a horrible experience of getting some goods necessary to raise a house. So he knows those problems very well. There were a lot of disadvantages in the past. Now some things are solved, you can buy whatever you want, but often you cannot afford some things, maybe many things you cannot afford, because you have no job or your job is not good enough to give you enough money. In Valdik’s opinion the communist government collapsed because they went to the world and they found problems that were bigger than they had possibility to solve and now the situation looks very similarly. The current government is also finding problems, which they are not able to fix and it looks also very bad for the normal people.

Does the memory of communism mean something today? Is it something you discuss or talk about with your friends or your family or is it something people do not talk about?

Valdik’s observation is that the time of communism is for people very often a subject of discussion, when you meet with friends, you talk about it very often. And this is not a form of taboo. The people very often go back to this time and they remind something between them. They talk a lot about it. Valdik know of an example where some people said that in the communist time the government had a very accurate control with your rights, the government knows about everything, everything about you. And it was bad in the opinion of some people, but Valdik sees some advantages of this because for example it was impossible in the past that some kids would not go to the school in like one year or two years. That was impossible. At school there at least all children that were in the city that were born in the city. If they were at school “check”, if they were not at school “what is going on with this child?”. Now nobody cares about it. There is some information in television or in the papers that the people have children, and they keep them at home while they should be in school for two years for example. But nobody is interested in this. The other people had children which are sick and do not want to show other people these children so they keep them at home. That impossible in the past, because the special officer from the local gov-
ernment office has to go and check what is going on with the child, if he needs special treatment or not, for example what the parents are doing. This is in these days very bad, and something should be done to provide the same care for the weakest persons, like children like sick or something.

You told us now how it was to live under communist rule, and how it was to feel that decisions were taken without you. Has this experience had any influence on the way you look at the EU now? For example now that decisions which might involve you are being made in other countries, in Brussels. Do you see a similarity?

Yes, sometimes with some decisions form the European union it looks like in the communist time that some decisions are made without us. But Valdik understands that it only looks like this, that in fact we have impact on many of the decisions of the EU. We vote, we have the possibility to check something, if it does not fit us or we do not like it. So maybe on the first impression yes, but on the second it is different.

We have talked a lot about differences. Differences in religion, when it comes to the young and the old and from under communism to now. Do you think that there is a generation gap in Poland? Is it possible for two generations to communicate, I mean some do not share the same traditions, some lived under communism others did not…?

Generally Valdik thinks that there is a gap, a huge gap. And the root of this is, he thinks, two problems: First of all there is education. Education under communism was not so important, not so emphasized like today. There was no pressure on the young people that they had to learn. Now everyone understands that knowledge is the price of everything. You have possibilities to gain access to some things in your life, if you spend a lot of time learning. Even if you finish school you should still learn, but under communism they did not understand this. Work is not learning. The young people understand this, and they are used to using different sources like the Internet or the mobile phone for everything. And they also use different languages; they have different minds, because more they have access to more knowledge than their parents or grand parents. This is one reason why the two worlds do not understand each other. So a lot of information a lot of knowledge and then very poor education and lack of knowledge. The second reason for the gap is in Valdik’s opinion this very sudden, rapid Western culture. Because when Western culture appeared in Poland it was very rapid and fast. It was like this: We were allowed nothing, after this we were allowed everything. It was...especially young people were not prepared for this shock. One day they got access to everything, and one example was films. In the past they were allowed to see almost nothing, there were pornographic films it was not like this. But after one day, if you want it you can see it. And it changed people. They saw on television that people are murdering each other fighting or doing some stupid things, but they treat it very seriously. It has changed them so much that now the
older people that remember the old values they could not understand the people that are thinking in a more simple way... on money and drugs and the goods. Bruce Lee was an example. When young people saw Bruce Lee on the television, they went out on the streets and tried to do like Bruce Lee. Their identity was the same as Bruce Lee. So it works like this: Whatever young people see on the screen, they will try to copy in their own lives. They are changing to fit the identity shown on the screen. But the older people they have the experience, they know that this is fiction and not reality that it is the idea of a director or a writer, and they are only entertained by what they see, but young people believe that this could be their way of life. That is the difference...

So we have reached the end, and we have just one last question: What are your hopes for the future? Are you optimistic? Valdik said that he is definitely optimistic: He believes that everything should be better that it is like a scale. After some time everything goes into balance. It is like marriage, between man and woman. They need some time to find the way that they want to live together.

All right then. That’s it. I think we covered it all. Thank you very much. We would like you to know that we appreciated it and that we found this very useful. Thank you.

Studerende – Aleksa.
Universitetet i Krakow.

Since you’re both working at the Erasmus could you tell me a little bit why you’re doing this?
Okay, so you know it’s quite funny because I started to work here because I was quite bored with my studies. The first year it was okay because I’m not from Cracow so everything was new and on the second year I’m bored. You know I don’t have anything of interest on my classes. You know I study about law, about economics but it’s not my interest. So how much time I can spend in cinema, not so much, (ler) so I started to do something here. That is the main reason of doing it.

And do you get a lot of Erasmus students here?
It depends on the part of the year, because (?)it’s just like more than hundred on one part, on summer start, but sometimes they stay for longer, they stay here for one year, and in the next summer start they can, you know, we have new Erasmus students. So...
But the Erasmus is quite new here? It’s a part of the EU project and then...?
Yes but it was before we became a part of EU the program was, you know, already working before last year.

Okay. But has there been like a boom of...?
No, not really. No because Erasmus students who come to Cracow must have some mediparent (?) from Poland. No it’s not just like administration but there is not so many people who are interested in Polish culture. I have a friend from Italy and he came here because he heard from friends it’s quite easy.

Easy to attend university...?
Yes, easy to establish.

I’ve heard the opposite?
Yeah but, you know he’s Erasmus student. He don’t have to do the things we do.

Arh okay. We’ve heard that as well, that the Erasmus is quite easy here, but I think the normal university is quite tough isn’t it?
Yes. We have a lot of classes and they’re quite hard. You have to read a lot and have orientation in everything. You’re a student, so you have to.

Okay. Can you tell me a little bit about your background? Like you didn’t grow up in Cracow?
No I’m from Crosnaw, I can even show you on the map.

Yaeh, I’d like it.
It’s a quite small city.

So close to the border.
It’s not so far from Cracow, like four hours by bus, but it’s like you know, most of people from my secondary school from Crosnaw goes to Cracow, because Warsaw is more expensive for us and it’s far like five hours by bus. You know it’s the way we think. It’s far away from home.

Do you think there’s a big mentality difference between Warsaw and Crosnaw?
There’s a difference between people from Cracow and from Warsaw because they don’t like each other. It’s always like oh you’re from Cracow, and you from Warsaw, and we don’t like each other like that. It’s like identity with football groups; it’s something of the same.

Really?
Not stuff like aggression, but people from Warsaw have different mentality. They’re more self confident. It’s like:”I’m from Warsaw” – Orh, just like capital.

*I think it’s like that in most countries actually, that the capital is quite popular. I mean in France for instance I think it’s like that. People don’t really like people from Paris. In Denmark I think people have a lot of predegis against people from Copenhagen, but here it seems to be quite...?*

It’s just like that Cracow was the capital before, and it’s just quite funny because in Warsaw it’s just the city of yuppies, young people who want to have earned a lot of money and something like that and Cracow is just like a city of culture and there’s a lot of students. It’s a quite different atmosphere.

*What about you’re parents? Are they academics?*

No not really. (ler) My father was a policeman in… just before ninety. In the time of socialism he was a policeman, so he is not so (?) It’s quite strange but people get to know about this, because he was a policeman, and right now police is not so popular. You know all these football fans, hooligans. These people don’t have good opinion about the police.

*Is he still a policeman?*

No not really, right now he’s just painting. Pictures.

*Like an artist?*

Yes. (ler) And make lamps from glass. Stained glass. And my mom have different jobs. Right now she’s a sociologist.

*So she’s an academic?*

Yes, but she finished this course quite late. I don’t know, 26 years when she finished her studies. She was just like learning after 40, so it’s like a new job for her. And she has courses for people without jobs, or how to handle this.

*Can I ask you if you have any brothers and sisters?*

Yes I have a brother. He’s older than me. Three years ago he finished his studies, and he’s looking for a job. (ler)

*It’s hard to get a job?*

Yes, very hard. Especially in Croswaw because it’s a small city and in this part of Poland, it’s very hard to get a job because he don’t know any important people and he just finished his studies, so he don’t have any experience.

*So it’s important to know people?*
Not always, but it helps sometimes. It’s good to have experience, but it’s hard to study and work and try to handle both things.

Yes of course, like work when you study?
Yeah, like finding work when you study. It’s quite funny.

What about you? Are you gonna go back to Crosnaw?
No, I don’t think so. Because there are no places to work. I still don’t know what I want to do after bachelor because I want to take masters but I think about some bigger cities, just like Cracow maybe. I would like to stay here but it is not so sure.

Why not?
Because it’s always just like… I’ll be living in the place where I find a job. You’ll never know.

So you’ll just move where ever the jobs are?
Yes.

Do you consider working somewhere else, like another country in Europe?
Yeah, in Spain. I started to learn Spanish (ler mens hun taler) like a month ago/Malaga. It’s warmer than Poland so it’s a good idea to go there.

So that’s serious? Could you imagine living in Spain? With family and…?
Yeah. I would like to travel. I don’t know if I would be able to live somewhere else, because I think that the differences, maybe not culture, but the mentality of people is quite specific. When I go out with Erasmus students who come here, there are differences.

What is it about Poland that you don’t wanna leave?
It’s hard to say. It’s just a feeling that this is the place.

Where you belong?
Yes. It’s a feeling like: “Oh I like this juice” I know it’s quite stupid, but it’s just a sentimental view of sometimes something reminds me of my childhood. In the smells on the streets sometimes. Just like in Cracow there is this street that I remember. I was on the first year and I was going in the evening and the halls through it was smelling like chocolate because there is a factory of chocolate. Oh it was wonderful. Something like that. Just feel that it is a nice place, maybe you don’t get much money here, but it’s okay.

Have you ever travelled outside Poland?
I was in Italy for a month when I was younger. Last year I was in Dresden for three
days, to do some workshops. Dresden in Germany. I don’t travel so much like my
friends.

But you would like to?
Yeah. Go somewhere further. Like, I don’t know, Japan.

To see something completely different?
Yes. To feel the differences.

Between maybe European culture and…?
Yes also. Because when you go somewhere else, to a totally different culture, then
you start to appreciate your own. Yeah like: “I want to go home” (griner)

When you where travelling, did you ever have a feeling of being very Polish?
Maybe not by travelling but speaking about some culture things, like my friend right
now she’s studying in Belgium and when we meet we speak about the differences we
see and even about the behaviour of young people. I feel just like a stupid Polish girl
sometimes. Some embarrassing things maybe.

What could that be?
Just thinking about relationship between people. We sometimes take things too seri-
ously. Nothing important, but I just feel like a stupid Polish girl.

What could be taken too seriously?
I don’t know, maybe just the way about young people think about for instance sex.
There’s a big difference between Polish girls and others, just like Spanish.

Yeah? Okay. In what way?
Polish girls are more seriously. When they sleep with somebody, it means something.
(Ler)

I’m thinking maybe sometimes, when you introduce people from Erasmus, what could
you tell them about Polish culture? What is typically Polish?
There are no such things as typical Polish things, because it depends on the regions.
And the way you’re interests are. Because if you’re interested in art you’ll talk
about… I always talk about (Beckanski(?)) because I like him very much, but it al-
ways depends on interest. I tried to encourage my friend from Italy to learn some-
thing about Poland because he came here for six months and he drinks all the time
but the easiest thing is to show people our typical Polish food maybe. It’s the easiest
way to show people our culture, maybe not culture, but the way people cook, behave, the traditional way of thinking about family for example.

What could that be?
You know, family sticks together, you’ll always have to take care of your grandma and grandpa, just typical feelings like: “maybe he’s stupid but he’s my brother and don’t you dare say something bad about him.”

So Polish family has a very tight connection?
Maybe tight but not concerned.

Could you say more about what Polish culture is to you?
It’s a lot of history, because we have a long history. And when you look on the pictures from the last hundred years, it’s always about have meaning for our identity. We didn’t have our country before and there’s a lot of painters who operate with symbols and tried to say to other people: “Oh come on. It will be better, we will have our own country” And culture like art and a lot of symbolic and religion.

Yes?
I think that a lot of young people don’t feel like they’re a part of church right now. But in our culture there is a big role of the church and the religion.

Yes that’s what we’ve heard, that actually at the moment more and more people are being religious in the young generation.
It has not increased I think. I think it’s typical that young people don’t feel like a part of church. Like the church of institution. We just get pissed off that the priest tell you something to do. I think it’s quite different because, maybe we are religious but for our own. We don’t go after the priest and do everything he says. You don’t go to church every Sunday.

So if I understand you right, you’re religious, but for your own sake. And you don’t go to church for a specific priest. It’s more the religion and you rather than...
It’s more believing, not belonging – something like that.

Do you think there’s a big difference between the older and the younger generation concerning this?
I think yes. When I see my grandma she always ask me: ”Ola, is your brother going to church?” And I say :“Grandma, I don’t know. I’m not interested in that”. I think everywhere it’s like that, when you’re old you think, “Oh my God, I’m going to die, I have to go to church”. No it’s different.
So do you think the older your grandparents are, the more they go to church? Or have they always...?
I think my grandparents are brought up in different circumstances. My mother is not as religious as my grandparents. So I think it depends on your parents. My parents are quite liberal and I don’t have to do anything in this subject. They don’t tell me to go to church. It’s up to me, and it was always like that. But I have friends that... their parents still try to interview and they ask them: “have you been in church on Sunday?” So it always depends on the parents and the way they have brought up their children.

Do you consider yourself as Polish or European? Or both maybe?
Both right now. I have classes about European, about the construction of the identity, so it’s quite funny. I can be Pole, I can be European. It’s quite funny, when we started being in EU and some people said that we are coming to Europe because we’ll always be in Europe because of historic circumstances. It’s so strange. Yeah, I feel European.

But do you feel first Pole and then European or more like you’re a Pole and a European?
Right now more Pole than European because when you see, I don’t know, the constitution of EU or all discussions about the (?) No, just like more Pole. The history of Poland is closer to me than the history of whole Europe when some nations were fighting against each other. So I don’t have so many things in Europe to identify myself with them.

Okay. Do you connect any specific values to being a Polish person /a Polish citizen?
No I think it’s just universal values. I wouldn’t say I’m more catholic than anybody else, maybe I’m more conservative, it’s just like my problem not Pole’s maybe. Not especially. I think that Poles are more aware of their history. It’s something that we always remember. Some episodes in our history, because we have a lot of history in school, it’s just like that. Maybe we are more aware of this, of history. That’s all.

Is that also like history a long time ago, or is it more recent history, like the past hundred years?
I think yes, the past hundred years. Maybe not farther because it was so ages ago, who cares about it?

But I mean for us, maybe the Vikings are still quite important, and that’s a very long time ago.

Do you think Poles stick together as a nation a lot?
No, not really. Because Poles are very divided. They always... It’s just like stereotypes in Poles about Poles that we envy each other a lot of things. So we are not so solidarity so like people thinks abroad. I think that Poles (?) Sometimes (?) I can say that I was in Churcheln last year on film festival and I was surprised that...

*Where is that? Oh so it’s in Poland?*
Yes it’s in Poland. Half city is in Poland half in Czech Republic. And I was surprised, that people can be so nice to each other, because in Cracow there are a lot of rude people and I think that Poles are rude.

*Yeah?*
Yeah, and we even think about ourselves that we have to try harder.

*Try harder to...?*
To communicate with people on some normal levels. Not be rude and not to say… You know it is surprising for people, for example in shops, when you go, for older people who work there when you’re going out, you say “have a nice day”. It’s just like, “oh my God, where am I living.

*So that’s a new thing?*
I think it’s just a question of the last fifteen years that changed, because before ninety, people you know (?) Right now the capitalism, the free market all these things changed the behaviour of people. Now clients don’t have to beg somebody to sell you something, but the salesman have to say: oh please buy stuff in my place.

*So it’s more a competition now?*
Yeah, people have to try harder.

*I was in Moscow, I don’t know if it’s a right comparison, but I found that the service mentality is really strange. You almost have to tell her to give you some coffee or something if there’s no please and (?) you know.*
It’s something of the old platonity of people that you have to ask them to buy something. Right now it’s opposite so it is differences between generations, because our parents have different mentalities than we, and young people in Poland, they just feel… I have a right to study, to go somewhere to double up myself and our parents had to try harder to have a possibility to study. So it’s just like differences.

*What do you mean “try harder”?*
Like my mother had to go to work to study. She had to work and study, because she wasn’t able to pay for living in a different city, so she quit the studies because she had to go to work. So sometimes our parents said that they don’t want us to make some commitment, like they did.
Sacrifice?
Yeah, sacrifice.

But before I thought that the government paid for the education.
Yeah, but right now we don’t have to pay for education also, but the cost of living right now is higher, so our parents are working for us, for our studies, just so that we will be able to live here. For example like me. But fifty years ago their parents, my grandparents, wasn’t able to pay for theirs.

Do you think there’s a big difference between the two generations?
I think yes.

In what way?
The way the mentality of our parents is quite different. For example when my aunt always ask my cousins, “Oh you go to study, why are you still not married?” The relationship, even between boys and girls, is the easiest way of showing the differences.

So they are more conservative? And old fashioned in a way?
Yes.

What about values? Is that because they are more religious or?
I don’t think so. I think it’s just the way of being brought up. I think that they just think in the old fashioned way, maybe more practical. I wouldn’t connect this with religion.

Would you connect it with communism?
Maybe, a little bit. I think this communism was a quite different environment for people to live and to survive. Because they were just double minded, on the street or in official places, they had to behave appropriate to the moment and only when they came back home they could be themselves. Just like, I don’t know if you know this book “Europeans”? There is this chapter about Italians. That Italians were behaving quite different at home and quite different on the street. I think the same was in Poland because people at home were feeling more comfortable and they were able to speak everything they want. So maybe that’s why the family is so close to us, because if you don’t feel comfortable in your work you will feel comfortable in family. I can say every stupid thing I want to my parents or to my brother and he’ll say: “oh yeah you’re my sister, ok, come on”

Oh yeah, maybe that’s the reason why. But why then, is your generation different?
Because we are brought up in different times. Like the free market for example. The competition. I think the competition has a big influence for us. We have to learn more than our parents, we have more possibilities, but we have to be able to do much more things than they. You know like competition on to work market. If you want work, you’ll have to be better than a lot of people, so it’s just quite different because for our parents it was just like, you finish secondary school, and you’ll have a place at some factory where you go to work. It wasn’t a problem to find a job. Right now it is a big problem for us. That’s why the mentality among young people is different because we have to be better than others. Our parents didn’t have to prove to anybody that they are better than their friends for instance, but we have to do this.

*Do you think that some sort of a value from before, that this competition can be both bad and good? That it is maybe more difficult now to get a job, and before it was easier. Do you think your parent’s generation misses anything from back then?*

I think it’s popular in Poland, maybe not as much as in Russia with parades with pictures of Lenin, but I think a lot of people in Poland miss old times. They always say: “When I was younger, it wasn’t so difficult”. It’s quite strange for me for example because I don’t remember old times. “Okay” – So what, it was easier, but it don’t change the situation right now. But our parents miss old times.

*Also your parents?*

My father I’m sure. He miss it, because he was working then and (?) Yes he misses it. Now he’s at home all the time.

*Do you talk about it a lot?*

Not really. Not with my father.

*Do you think your mom and your dad talk about it?*

I don’t think so. Sometimes they quarrel about some stupid things about me and my brother and then I can catch these differences. But not really.

*But do you ever discuss Communism? Did they tell you a lot about Communism?*

You know, they just talk about some episodes from their history, from their lives, for example my mom talks a lot about going to school, about my grandpa and the way he… About some little things from daily life. Not in whole, they don’t discuss the entire situation, the political situation and economic as special.

*So it’s more like personal stuff?*

Yes.

*Are there any groups in Poland that are less accepted than others?*
Yeah I think there is a big problem with homosexuality in Poland. I even wanted to write a work about it. In Cracow, like a year ago, it was like a parade for people, for gays and there were a lot of people who were against this parade and there is a lot of people, even young people who wanted to fight with gays and lesbians. It’s terrible because I always thought that Cracow… There are a lot of students, so it should be tolerant, and it shows that people are very difficult here. And it’s very difficult for young people to think about their own sexuality and identity because there is no tolerance.

What about people from other countries surrounding Poland?
Oh, I think it depends from which countries people are. From Germany there’s a lot of strange sort of Germans, like: “Oh you started second World War” and so on. But I think that it’s also changing all the time. It depends on frequencies of meeting people from other cultures or other countries. Because it always depends on the person you talk to. I think I’ve changed a lot of my points of view from when I started to work here, because the more frequently I meet other people from other countries the more it shows, maybe there are little differences, but they are not so important. For example old people they don’t have any kind of connection with people from abroad. They still live in like “Oh the Germans started second World War” They are very close minded, but it depends on the meetings of the people, and the possibilities of getting to know other cultures.

What about Russia? What is your relationship to Russians?
I don’t care really. Maybe my father will say something about it, but I don’t care about this. I’m just opposite Polish(?) Russia, but that is different.

What do you think your dad would say?
He would say something about old times, I’m sure. But I think Poles will always be afraid of Russia, because it’s a quite big country and quite influence. But also Poles don’t agree with Putin Policies right now and it’s just Russia. I wouldn’t like to go there.

You wouldn’t?
No, I wouldn’t.

So Poland is a new member of the European Union. Has this had any affect on your life? How can you feel it in your everyday life?
I study European studies, so we go with our professors on party the first of May. I don’t feel changed, like if I go to shop, and something’s changed, no. Not really. I wasn’t surprised because for two years I was learning about European Union and so on, so it’s nothing new for me. It was quite funny when there was the referendum;
you know voting, and the arguments from the people who are against just shows that we are not so tolerant as we thought before. Because a lot of people said that our agro-culture will collapse, for example, or there will be a lot of gays in Poland. Everybody start to be a gay because they will be able to...No, the European Union was shown less like the regions, where people don’t have any values. It was amazing, and it was just funny for a student and they’re just making fun about it in classes. It was just something like that.

*Is that the church playing a big role when you say values?*
I think yes, because there are situations when a priest, go on Sunday on the Mess said that the in EU there will be abortion in Poland and there will be gays, you know, gays will be getting married. All these controversial things. I’m not surprised that old people have doubts about EU, because they don’t go for classes and they don’t read about old people. You have 75-year-olds, not so interested in, I don’t know, literature or news, they just go to church and listen to the priest. It’s like that.

*So that’s actually their source of information? It is mainly the church?*
For old people, yes. There is a lot of actions trying to show Poles that EU is worth Poland. Something like that. And it will be better. You know, trying to show Poles that it’s worth to be interested in EU in all the policies and it was funny because after six months I think it was surprising that Polish agri-culture got so much money from EU, and that people was able to, you know, get something from EU. It’s surprising that we are able to do anything, that we are not so stupid and that we will handle this.

*So this may be obvious but how do you feel about being part of this new community?*
Great! (griner)

*So did you go and vote?*
Yes. I’m not from Cracow, so I had to go to my home, take a piece of document that I’m not going to vote in Chraznow but in Cracow, so but yes I was voting.

*And you voted yes?*
Yes. I even had a sticker saying: Vote yes!

*Do you fear any consequences of the membership?*
Any consequences? Not really. It was quite famous to repeat that our national identity would be endangered, but I think it’s quite stupid because it’s just obvious to me that when part of EU we will be more Poles than before because we’ll be stretching our national identity, like when we are part of EU. It’s just like it’s paying for all its regions, just like Scotland. When you’re part of a bigger thing, you get institutionalized, you always stress that your background…
That’s a theory but can you see it already in Poland?
It’s just like “preambua”? No? Like the beginning of the constitution, that Poles were
definite that should be mentioned about God and it was just amazing, because then
we were stamped like, you know, Poles became like one. We are diverged and we
always quarrel with each other, but in such things (?) even politicians who are on the
left side, not so religious and who don’t say anything about religion: “Yes there
should be something about God in the beginning of the constitution”.

Preamble is that the one?
It’s Just like the beginning of the Constitution, in Polish it’s “preambua”.

I think it’s the preamble.
Okay. So that is one thing that could unite all the Polish...?
But I think it’s like always when we feel not so safe. It’s just like in ninety-six there
was a big float in Poland, and it was also amazing for me, because I was in primary
school then and a lot of people who normally was angry with each other, but in a
situation of danger, they were united. We really need to be in danger or just don’t feel
so safe.

Safe as a nation?
Yes. Just like not feeling so comfortable in a situation, any kind of situation. Then we
feel that maybe we should make some compromise and start to cooperate with each
other.

So some things you will have in common with each other, like safety and maybe relig-
ion?
Maybe all these things with the Pope just right now. There is a lot of people who
don’t feel like a part of the church but they appreciate the Pope and his work and
right now I think if you go, you know, close to Labkastreet, you’ll see a lot of groups
of people, they are praying for the Pope. It’s the same situation that people in difficult
situations in Poland try to be united and to work with each other.

When I say: “If you fear any consequences?” we’ve heard some people talk about
that some Poles would be afraid of being invaded by workers from Eastern Europe
or being afraid of being more like a second range member of the European Union?
I think we are too big to be second range. We are as big as Spain so, oh come on. (ler)
We have too many votes. It’s depressing that our politicians are not so well qualified.
They are not so educated I think. Because there are a lot of politicians who are from
such strange parties like “SamaBrama” (?) or (?) and they are against the EU. So
when they are in European Parliament I Think most Poles are afraid of their behav-
You know, we feel responsible for our politicians but we don’t accept them. This is the biggest fear for us.

**So you don’t really think that they represent you?**
Yes, because I didn’t vote for them. They are like stupid people. I don’t like them. Never mind. (vi griner)

**Do you think the Polish national feeling will be the same in say thirty years?**
No, I think that it will change for good. I think that Poles will be more self confident, because right know I think that the Poles have a lot of complex, just like you know confronting the people from the EU. I think that the Poles always think that we are worse from different nations a little bit because of Communism and because of the standards of life maybe. And we have some problems in television that people from abroad who lives here, who speak about Poles and their behaviour and some strange situation.

**In a nice way, or in a bad way? The programs in TV, is it nice or funny or...?**
Yes yes, it’s just like one of these nice education programs about how to show Poles in funny ways of people from other countries in the EU. (Ler) And they just talk about differences and last week it was about Polish identity a little bit because they were talking that they think that the Poles, even for the last ten years, started to be more self confident. They are not so depressive like they were. But it’s true, when you go on the streets in Cracow there is a lot of sad people.

**But you don’t think it’s true?**
No, I think but it’s changing. It’s not within one year. It’s a long process. And I think that Poles will become more self aware about their culture and how they can use it for selling, I don’t know. Like the Scottish with all the symbols of the culture. To promote our country.

**So what would be a symbol of Polish culture?**
Oh my God, I don’t know. I think it will have to do with something to eat. I’m sure. (Ler)

**So has the fact that Europe has become a more borderless society changed your way of living?**
No, not really. Nothing changed.

**But maybe you’ll live abroad in the future?**
Maybe, but the future is so far away. I think it’s typical that we don’t have plans for a few years further; it’s just like, living right now. You know, three months is maximum.

_We’ve been thinking about getting information about the European Union. And I suppose you get yours mostly from university?_
Yes, I study about the EU all the time.

**But what about Poles in general?**
There are some centres of information where you can go and get any source of information. I think the most important, like breaking the stereotypes are just like this program into the… because it’s… No it’s a good way of showing in a not so detective way that the people are quite normal, they just differ from each other, but it’s like all the same.

**But isn’t it a little bit manipulating?**
A little bit, but you can feel this if you study, but my parents are: “Oh it’s such a lovely program”. We’ve just studied some psychology where they make some kind of resources. You can feel this manipulation, but our parents or people who just work, I don’t think they feel this.

**But is it okay then, to make programs like that?**
“You can like Europe”, or something like that.

**That’s what they’re called?**
Yeah, you know, they just show people the differences and, you know, a whole program, one program on Christmas eve. The traditional way of preparing Christmas in Poland, in France, in Spain, in England. It’s not about institutions, but about culture and showing people it’s not so strange. It’s not another planet. And about institutions, I think it’s more classes in school. Lessons in maybe secondary school. But I think, there are not so many informations about this. There are a lot of books, but not everybody will go to the bookshop and buy a book. It depends on people because some people don’t even look for this information.

_No, that’s what I mean. But in Denmark we have a lot of people who know almost nothing about the European Union. But I guess it’s the same in Poland?_
Yes, I think so.

**Who do you think knows the least?**
I think people who don’t have any benefits from this. Agri-culture, I would say they don’t know anything, but they know more than me about some kind of documents to send to some offices to get money from the EU. I think the people who know the
least are people who don’t have work for example, and the basic things are the most fulfilling for them, just how to survive a few days. So they are not interested in the EU at all.

_Do you consider yourself as an Eastern- or Central European citizen?_
Central. Yes. I wouldn’t say that Poland is in the centre of Europe, but Central. East is something close to Ural.

_To Russia?_
Yes.

_Where do you think the line goes?_
I’m sure it’s impossible to put a line because it depends always on your feelings about other nations. For me it is not so important. I wouldn’t say that Russia is a part of Europe at all.

_No?_
No. It’s so different, the mentality. No way (laver pruste/sukkelyd)

_Okay. What do you think is a part of Europe? On that side?_
On that side. I would say that Ukraine is a part of Europe. Especially, you know, the closest are our part because it’s just like two parts of Ukraine. I don’t know about the rest countries, I haven’t been there, so… It’s difficult to say about something I don’t know.

_What about Belarus for example?_
No, not now. No. I think they need a lot of time to be just like European country. They are too close to Russia. I’m just like: no no no Russia. (ier) No friends of the Russians.

_What about Turkey?_
No. I’m writing about this. Turkey made great progress in all this stuff, like law, economics but I think it’s to difficult to create European identity if we take Turkey inside. Because it’s a different civilization. I don’t have anything against Turkey but I don’t think they should be in the EU.

_So what are these things that we have in common? In Europe?_
Our background, maybe not the things we all know, because it’s impossible to choose the things everybody knows and every Europeans should know, because I’m sure that not everybody reach down to earth. Maybe just the values, the value of life. The protection of human rights are just quite different, just look on The United States. They
just don’t have any (regalement) system of human right protection. And we have. There’s just a strange difference between Europe and The United States. Yes because, I think maybe Europe is slower in action but we have bigger history than the United States. It’s easier to say something about identity in opposition to somebody. It’s easier for me to speak about US than Europe, but I think that Europeans are wiser a little bit. Because of the history. And we have too many wars inside Europe and I personally think that Europe has experienced more suffering of the people than United States. I think they are still too self confident, just like going to Iraq, beginning a new war. I think that Europe was diversified because people in Europe know what war really mean. It’s quite strange that the Poles said “Yes” to this. But it was our policy.

*Denmark did it as well...*
And what do you feel about it?

*I feel very embarrassed about it personally.*
*But you had public support. Denmark didn’t. Right? (Gry)*
The situation is that about twenty Polish soldiers were killed in Iraq and they all the time show crying children and wives. So because a few politicians pulled our soldiers to this war...
*So you didn’t vote?*
No.

*Cause we did neither.*
Because if there would have been a voting we wouldn’t have sent them. And it was like: “Oh Poland will be an actor in the international relationship”.

*I would like to get a little bit back to the common culture of Europe. Do you think that Polish culture will easily fit into this common European culture?*

Maybe not so easily, because we are still not as tolerant as I would like to see Poland in about 10 or 20 years. It’s like we don’t have one common back with our values and (cannels(?)) of literature and art, or something like that. But I think the typical things for Europe is the diversity and the way that we respect all the cultures. This is the bigger value for Europe, to respect others. It will be quite difficult for Polish culture to get to know others. Just to be one of... Because of our history. All old books, our literature or art, it’s all connected to history, and you have to know quite well the history of Poland, to get something valuable from these books. Most of the works from a hundred years ago are about the Polish situation and symbolic way of showing our Polish identity. I’m sure that nobody for example in England who don’t read about
Poland so much will be able to understand these things. Not because I’m sure it’s so great, but it’s just differences of history and it’s just symbolic things.

*And also that history played a very big part of your identity. And it still does.*

Yes, also. And we also have some subjects in my classes about the (Tannen of literature?) And we would even find some good Polish writers, but the (?) of the language is so big, that it also will be difficult to translate and understand all these little things in the language, which makes this writer so good. Just like Bruno Czhunzh or Combrowitzh. It’s all these strange things and I can’t even say them in English.

*The language maybe, is also a big part of the identity?*

Poland have a few regions, and their languages are quite different. It’s not so different that we don’t understand each other, but it’s just a few words that when I go outside the building I go “na pola” and some say “na bur”. It’s just like for example if two students meet in Cracow and we are from different parts of Poland, and we make fun of each other that he goes: “na pola” and I “na bur” and the easiest thing is, and we don’t meet each other. It’s just like little things, but in the mountains they speak quite different. I know that in (polsk navn) speak quite different language, we even have classes in (samme navn igen).

So it’s not just like one language, but I think it’s difficult for the rest. It’s not so bad like in Spain or in Italy. The language.

*The geographical borders of Europe they would go down the Ural mountains and a part of Turkey and... But there’s a lot of quarrel about, what is Europe actually and which countries should be a part of say European Union or also just Europe. One of the common things you think is that we are tolerant to differences, but why is it then that for instance Russia is too different to be a part of..., or even Turkey maybe... Do you see what I mean?*

The problem is... We should be tolerant, but we still have to think about... The European Union, at the beginning, it’s just a regional institution, let’s say that. And it have to have some borders. So okay. But if you speak about Europe at all and about the differences, I think we should be tolerant, and try to work about policy for immigrants for example. But I think that if you want to create a strong Europe and to be able to speak one voice of Europe, we should think more about identity and about who to identify with Turkey for example. People from Europe have problems when we speak about religion because of the stronger position from France for example. There are more religious countries or less... It’s not so important maybe. But when we think about Islam also, for me, we should be tolerant, but we should think more egoistic about our own identity. We should try to create something strong, and not try to put everything in one place.
And this actually leads us to the next subject, which is religion. Do you consider religion as important in your life?
In my? Sometimes. It’s difficult because I’m not so confident in my religion right now. So it’s always just like looking for something.

Do you often go to church?
Not really. But I was today.

Does it affect you about the Pope?
Today I was.

Because of the Pope?
Yes. I heard about it yesterday, when I came back at twelve after partying. So I was a little bit embarrassed.

But is he dead?
No, not really. He’s just suffering all the time.

We actually went through a lot of these questions already. Take Denmark as an example, people are not very religious, but here in Poland young people seems to be quite religious, or even as religious?
I think it depends on the group. I think that one of the stereotypes that everybody thinks that we are religious. I think it also depends… One example: My brother, he’s not religious at all, but he’s got a girlfriend and she is very religious, and there’s two years of difference. So it always depends on the people you ask. The more depth you have, the less religious you are because you try to look for the answers in different religions. Not only in Catholicism but start to think about maybe Buddhism or Islam. There are a lot of young Polish rappers who became Muslims. Not 1000 of them, but there are situations where they became Muslims.

How could that be?
They just changed their minds.

Where do they get that input from?
Oh, I don’t know.

Some of the black rappers are from Islam. (Rasmus)

So is the church an actor on the political scene in Poland?
Sometimes. Maybe not as church, but some political parties who want to win the votes of some very religious people. We have a saying that some tries to be more
saints than real saints are. They try to prove that they are so religious and so Catholic, but they are not, so they are just trying to win some people who will vote.

Now I would like to get in to the Communism period. We could start about... If you learned about it in school?
Not really, it was just like lack of time. Because we always miss some classes and I think I learned more from literature than from history, because we always learned a lot to the end of the second WW. The period between second war and these days is like a black hole for some people. Because we don’t have time for this.

Oh, you never get to this part?
I had something, but I’m not sure. It’s not so interesting right now. Maybe somebody who’s interested in history but for me… I’m just trying to think about my future because old times are just boring, stupid and I don’t want to hear about it any more.

We heard that history is actually very important to Polish people and that it is a big part of their identity. What about communism?
It’s also a big part of the identity and we will always think about some events from these days.

But for you it’s not important?
The biggest part of identity right now is Second World War for people. Sometimes it’s Communism of course because we always feel worse than other nations. People feel that history is important, but they don’t know history as deeply as they should know. “I feel Polish because of history, but I don’t know history.” – Something like that.

But to you, what is important?
In history?
I think the most important is maybe Second World War. I know it’s quite strange, but this time shows real behaviour of people. We have a lot of literature showing that not every German is bad, not every Pole is good. I feel that this is the most important part. It’s more universal values from this. Second World War is like whole Europe and Communism are just parts of Europe, and it changes our mentality and behaviour, but it’s not so universal maybe.

Yes maybe. That could be a good explanation.
Do you think there are any leftovers from Communism time? Can you feel it in your everyday life?
I think that a lot of old people miss old times. You can see this when you meet them, because they are always sad about that it was better than right now. A lot of people...
have problems with changing their mentality. In old times they had a job, they didn’t have to try so hard and right now the consequences, political changes and economical changes are difficult for them to understand and to survive in this world.

But do you think they would actually like to go back, and live like that again?
I would say that some people would like to go back. Yes. They weren’t able to change their lives with the change of policy and with the change of history. They can’t handle the normal life right now because they lost a lot of things.

Has there been a change in classes. Like the rich have become more rich and the poor has gotten poorer?
If you had a little bit of money in the beginning of the nineties and you had a good idea, you could have a lot of money after and become rich. In our sociology classes even our professors say that there are “people who win, and people who lose” from this year of 89. It will always be like… People from the country side… There were big agriculture places, just like “piagiare” and when Communism collapsed they closed down these places, and a lot of people in the country side lost their jobs and they are right now just sitting and drinking. So it is a big difference of the standards of life.

Can you mention anything that has improved since Communism? What about in your life?
(Ler) Oh, it is a big improve since then. Even when you go to shop you can buy everything you want if you have money. My father always say, that right now you can buy everything but you don’t have so much money like in the old times where you had a lot of money, but you couldn’t choose anything in the store because there was nothing. So this is a big difference.
And people have to try harder. They have many possibilities but they have to put a lot of effort to this.

Do you remember the change?
Not really, I just remember the year of…

How old are you?
It was before my primary school. I was like six. I just remember that my mum bought me a ball in a store.

No big parades or anything?
No no. Our city is too small for this. So it’s not like Warsaw.

And I guess it was a slow change?
Yes, I go to primary school. I was stressed because of going to school. 

_Do you remember what school was like before?_

I remember the changes of the clothes of the children. Some basic things. Before we had to wear some navy blue uniforms and after one year we didn’t have to wear these. So, just small changes.

And the way that my parents had a bar in this time. And in the beginning it was quite hard to get some products, like chocolate. He went to Germany to buy a car and then he bought a lot of things to sell in the bar. I just remember some small stupid things.

_There is actually something I’ve been thinking about. I think a lot of buildings must have been built during Communism. They are very grey and brown. Not a lot of colours._

Yeah, like simple shapes and something like that. Yes because the policy was to build a lot of buildings for a lot of families. They don’t have to be nice, but they have to be practical.

_And why no colours?_

I don’t know.

_Do you see any similarities between the Soviet Union and the European Union?_

I think yes, just like the buildings homo(?) subjecticles(?) and homo Europeans tries to build identity. I think sometimes in the EU, they try to manipulate the fact and to build common identity, create it, yes. I think sometimes it can be the same. Of course it's not the same about the rights, the law, the economic but about identity I think that the commission and the EU in whole should be more careful because I think that people in central Europe, it's almost the same for us. The identity is build from the government from something upstairs, like higher.

_So it's being forced? Is that what you mean?_

Maybe not forced, but created from somebody who's higher than us. I think identity should be build from the basic level, from the people. I think it's connected with the way the Polish nation was build. Because it wasn't like on the west side that it was a country before and the nation-state create identity. Because we didn't have a country for a long time so our identity was the basic for us. Not the country.

_Not the state?_

The differences of building the identity. (taler i munden på hinanden)

_So that's the essentialism thought maybe?_

Yes.
So does this create some sort of scepticism towards the European Union?
Maybe not scepticism, but long distance. Poles need time to get to know EU better and to be sure that we are safe, and that EU don't want to take any part of our suverenity. That was a great argument before voting that we are a young country, because we didn't have country before and we have that now, so we should think twice before we resign for our suverenity even a small part.

Do you think there's a generation gap in Poland?
Yes I think so.

Bigger than in other countries?
I think it's quite common for the central part of Europe because of the communism. I think it's bigger this gap between generations because our parents (?) in communism. So they have quite different values and that kind of situation that they could be against something and my generation have nothing to be against. We are not so rebel like our parents for example. Different situations.

Do you think they were more aware?
I think they had something to fight for. I think it's the best way of saying this, because our parents sometimes say that we have everything. We can do anything we want and it's up to us all the time.

And that's a little hard maybe sometimes?
Yes, because it's more difficult for us to find our identity because we don't have anything that differs so much. Like United States and Europe, like Europe and Turkey for example. Our parents and country and communism. We don't have anything to say no. Build our own identity. It's a problem.
So why did your mom have an education later on?
Before she finished secondary school, she was able to get a job. She tried to study law but she had to quit it for going to work. And when the communism collapsed she changed her job a few times, she was working in different places and when she was without a job after some time she got an opportunity to change the work – the education path and she started to make some courses and when she had some papers she became to have courses for people without jobs.

So that’s a part of also changing from communism to...?
Yes, that she had to change the qualification.

So she was good at changing her mentality?
I think so, yes. I think my mom is better than my father. It’s like, Oh woman! (ler)
**A little feminine power!**

*Okay* Is there a big difference between being a male and a female in Poland?

Yes. Differences in the way people think about you. My father could say that I should cook something because I’m a girl. Then I say that my brother should cook something because he’s a boy. This is the generation gap also because the way we think about women in society is different than twenty years ago. It’s interesting, that we have something like “Poles matter”, that women should work, should take care of the house and children, and the husband when he came back from work. So the women in Poland are more self confident and they have to work harder to prove that they are, maybe not better, but as good as men. The truth is that they are better, but they have to work harder to prove that they are equal.

*Is that a problem in the young generation as well?*

No, I don’t think so. If a guy say something stupid, he will be laughed at.

*I think that was my last question…*

*What are your hopes for your future?*

I want to work my work. I want to finish my studies. I would like to take master in Amsterdam. I don’t know if I will work in my summertime because I have to find a job to pay for the studies.

*Can’t the Erasmus pay? [for the studies in Amsterdam]*

No, because it’s one year I want to make master. We don’t have any formal connection between my university and this one in Amsterdam I found.

*Why Amsterdam?*

They have a great course about temporary culture. It’s difficult to find something in Poland about temporary culture because we have something like ages ago, old materials, papers, books. I would like to write my work about masses and mass society. You know, consumption and buy more and something (hun kan ikke fine ordene)

*Could the European Union be an example of that?*

No, not really. I would like to write about American society, about consumption and taking more to have, than to be. Yes, I have to think about this one.

*But do you think you will stay in Poland?*

I don’t know. No, I don’t know. It just don’t think about that right now. But I know that I would like to be old here. After 50 years of working, travelling and so on I would like to come back here.

*What is it that you want to come back to?*
I would like to live in Croznaw for example and like that it’s a big contrast between Croznaw and Cracow Because it’s like the country side, free, fresh, just like, animals, trees. Oh yes, all these nice times, so you feel like on vacations. On holidays. 

*Back to your roots?*

Yes.

*Okay, thank you very much... Vi stopper båndet, men tænder det lidt efter igen, da hun fortsætter.*

I think that my teacher said that, you know another big influence of my teacher, in university that Polish mentality is really connected with the way the nation identity was built, because we were always against our government in history. Right now we feel against our policies, our politics. Because it was our history and it’s very difficult for us to identify ourselves with our government, just like Iraq for example. I think the differences in the west identity, about the building of nations also, because the countries was before. Your nation state was before the nation identity. It’s just like in Austria, I think there are a few examples of that kind of... There was a king for example, he started to reform something. He changed the education system and then he built the identity of people, that they tried to be the same as a nation state. And in Poland it’s opposite. We need to be against something, like our government right now.

Vi løber interviewet igennem for at se om vi har forstået det hele rigtigt. Hun stopper ind imellem og tilføjer noget mere, og det er transkribert nedenfor.

*We talked about your studies, that they can be hard and you have to do a lot of reading.*
But it depends on the studies you have. There are some classes, where you don’t have to do anything, but you’re not learning anything. You just go there, and they mark that you are there.

*And you told us that you went to Germany with your mum.*
I was in Italy with my mum. In Germany I was a year ago.

*Then you told us that you sometimes feel like a stupid Polish girl. That Polish people are maybe a bit more serious about stuff.*
Could that be compared to say, Danish people?
I don’t know, I don’t know any Danish people.

*You told us that your parents were liberal and you were able to decide yourself what you want to do. It’s not that strict.*
Maybe that’s why I’m so serious, because my parents are liberal, being self-consciousness and responsible for myself.

You told us that Poles can be a bit rude, and they are trying now to be nice due to capitalism and the free market. I think they are just learning how to communicate with each other. It’s very sad to say, you know: Poles are rude! (ler) But I think it is a little bit true.

Then we talked about Poland coming in to the EU and that before some people were afraid that the agriculture would collapse and that Poland would have a mass invasion of homosexuals. Yes and that people from Germany would come to Poland and buy our land. It’s always like, you know, have your own land, be an owner. It’s also a value for people.

We heard that homosexuality is considered as some sort of disease. Is that true? I was once with my friend in church, and the priest said something like that. Like: “You can cure this” It’s a so stupid thing. From ninetysix or ninety maybe it was out of the law (?) It was removed from the list of sickness in the world organisation, but still in Poland priests are saying something like that. That it is a disease, and some people believe this. This is the worst.

Is there nothing you fear from the EU? Me personally? Not really. No because I don’t think that Poland is such a great country for people to come here to work really. We don’t even have places for our own so it’s not so nice place. I think that probably when our Polish enterprises won’t invest here but abroad and we’ll have a lack of investments in Poland. Because Poles will get to go abroad. It will be cheaper for them. I think that Poles will have to think about their identity and just feeling maybe to do something to other Poles, to invest for example in small cities, to develop them. To create some chances for young people and not go abroad. This is one of the serious fears. Myself. Worried about my country.

That investors and educated people will go somewhere else too? Yes. It’s just like with nurses in Poland, because we have a lot of nurses, well qualified. Right now they are going abroad because the work abroad is well paid and here they don’t get too much. So Polish nurses are going abroad, and we don’t have any staff in our hospitals.

Then you said that your politicians don’t really represent you. In the EU. That you don’t really like them.
Yes, because most educated Poles feel embarrassed because of the politicians. Sometimes, just like Ruquita who said: Nice or dead(?) It was so stupid. About the agreement from Nice. Everybody knows it can exist, normally further than (?) and Maine/May is the further date. He said something stupid, and our whole government had to explain to the nation and to the EU this situation because some stupid guy said something like that. It was embarrassing. Come on.

*Then you said that United States are more self-confident, just going in to Iraq and...* I think they make wrong (points(?)) from the west civilization. Every president, just like Bush, say: “Oh we have a mission, we are going there to give them democracy”. It’s so stupid. He don’t have a paper that he is the only nation state that knows what democracy is, or human rights. He’s just too self confident that he is the one who knows everything. To decide over other people.

*Can I ask you something about the church? During communism it was...* Yes it was in opposition to the church…
*Yes, it was... The church was the main...*

**Studerende – Agnieszka**
**Universitetet i Krakow**

(efter en kort introduktion)

*How old are you?*
I am almost 22

*Are you the head of this Erasmus thing?*
Yes, I am responsible of this section of Erasmus students who work in an organization.

*Do you live here in Cracow?*
I live in Cracow now because I study here. I study sociology by the way, but I come from Katowice which is the capital of one of the regions in Poland where my parents live. So I have only been living here for 3 years now, but actually I feel that it is my home city.

*But you came here to study at first?*
Yes, I came here to study, but I feel that I am going to stay here rather than come back home.
So how long have you been studying sociology?
3 years. This is my third year of studying.

Ok, so since you are in the Erasmus, does it mean that you have travelled yet? And have you been on any exchange program yet?
No, I haven’t been on any program yet, because I have been working on the Erasmus student network all the time and I simply couldn’t find time to go abroad for such a long time. I am actually finishing this job for the section by now. And next year I am going to do something else. But I have been travelling a lot. First of all because of the student network and second of all because I like it. So actually I have visited lots of places in Europe.

Ok, so is that primarily where you have travelled?
I think that the main countries are France and Great Britain, because I speak these languages. In these countries I have spent more than just a holiday on 2 weeks, because I wanted to learn the languages. So maybe I spent 2 or 3 months. But about the other countries I have travelled in, I can say that I have travelled in many different kinds of places and visited many airports and railway stations. Sometimes it is like this more than just visiting a city being a tourist.

Ok, but what about your parents? Are they academics as well?
Yes, they are academics. They are engineers. I don’t know exactly how to translate it. It is kind of like building engineers, but they don’t work in their professions. My father is account manager and my mother doesn’t work now. She stays at home.

Ok, but maybe you can tell us of a situation where you have been travelling around and where you had a strong sense of being Polish? Have you ever felt this? Maybe you were proud or ashamed of something?
I was proud to be Polish 3 weeks ago when I went to Gdansk. It wasn’t abroad but I felt like I was abroad, because I was invited for a meeting. It was a meeting of my organisation. And there were 400 people from all countries in Europe and also from some different other countries like in Africa. It was organized by my organisation in Gdansk, by Polish people. It was very very great. And all other international people were very surprised I would say, and satisfied. This was the time I was very proud of Polish people. When I was abroad I didn’t feel very proud of being Polish. Sometimes I felt a little bit upset. Specially when I was in England.. Or the UK last summer.. I was there to improve my english. And I was working, because living there was very expensive compared to living in Poland. So there are many Polish people who also wanted to find a job, but they were doing it in a very wrong way and I felt that Polish people sometimes were so stupid. But it was probably some bad impression I had because I wasn’t proud of them. The part of the people in Poland who are
rather not educated and they were just there because they couldn’t find a job. So I wasn’t proud of them.

*So you didn’t think that they were ambitious enough?*
They wanted to be ambitious, but they couldn’t be because in general they didn’t know how to be ambitious. And they tried to make their life after it, but they didn’t know how to do it. And they failed. That is why I was a little bit upset and sad about them, because I saw them and then I saw me. And some English people were treating me like they were treating in general all Polish people, but I felt that I wasn’t the same as most Polish people being in UK. So I felt a little bit uncomfortable about it.

*But how were they treating you?*
The problem is that each time you meet somebody, first of all you will try to put them into some kind of category. So to English people I was Polish. I was a Polish girl coming to England and before they didn’t meet me personally. They didn’t get to know me. I was working in a pub over there and when I did something wrong, like all the people used to do, because simply people are not perfect, then they would usually say: look what the stupid Polish girl did. You know, when people don’t treat you in a proper way, then you might not feel that you are Agnieszka, but just Polish. It is obvious and I don’t like it. I don’t bother if people are Polish or from Russia, UK or whatever. They are just who they are, because they are human beings.

*So in general you wouldn’t say that there is something special that characterizes Poles?*
In general I feel that British people thought that Poles in UK were everywhere. But there weren’t really bad opinions. Some people used to say that Poles are very good workers and they are not at all afraid of hard work. But in general I felt upset when people were generalizing and putting stereotypes to us. But some things are true, like that we steal in Poland. Here it is very likely that you can have something stolen, but again it can also happen in other countries. I don’t steal myself and I don’t like generalizing, but when I hear something like this I first of all feel a little bit angry, because it is stereotype. And a bit sad because the stereotype has a little bit true inside.

*Ok, so I was wondering if you besides considering yourself as Polish also feel like European? I mean is there a conflict about being national and just being European?*
No, first of all I consider myself as a human being and not Polish. And then I consider myself as European and then as Polish. Because actually when you speak to people like I speak with everybody, and you don’t have a contact with foreigners, then you probably consider yourself as Polish. So if you only meet some other people by accident then you are Polish first of all. But since I meet a lot of people I don’t consider myself as Polish. And I don’t think that a lot of young people have a prob-
lem with nationalism now. So it is rather a conflict that Poland and the EU may have, because of some topics like the European future and religion etc. So I think it doesn’t exist among young people rather among older people here in Poland. But sometimes I feel more Polish when I go abroad. If I spend too long time abroad, then sometimes I start to miss things and it is not about Poland as the country, but rather something with our culture. Or that I sometimes miss my friends or some of the other usual things you do each day, like the food you eat or the pubs you go to which are not the same abroad. That is the reasons that I might miss Poland, but not as the country and not for the politics or history.

It is more a cultural thing?
Yes

So, can you see some Polish values that Poles would have in common? Like for instance you were travelling and met another person from Poland, then what would you have in common besides of your language? Is there anything? Like a specific humour or something like that? Is there such a thing?
Of course each person is different, but what I can recognize in Polish people is first of all very obvious. It is visually. You know how you can recognize some people by their faces, like for example the French people. The other thing again is that I think that Polish people are good workers. And it is maybe because of the history. And on the other hand they are very very stressed about their nationality. It is typical. Maybe because we lost our country for a long time. And if you try to tell people some things about Poland they will be more stressed than the others. But on the other hand I don’t know your country very well, but I know very well France and UK and they are also very stressed. So you can’t say that it just has something to do with the people. The thing that I have recognized and that many others have recognized is that Polish girls are very pretty. Of course this is another stereotype. But we are also supposed to be very nice to other people. New people, you know what I mean?

Yes.
It is different from the people in the south of Europe. People in the south of Europe are nice to you, but I would say that they are nice to everybody and to nobody. They are nice because they are nice. It is their culture and they will tell you that you are their friend, but they won’t remember you the next day. In Poland it is very different. People are nice to you and they can help you a lot, even if they don’t know you. Because they have such a culture and really feel that you are their guest. They will do a lot of things for you. Even if they don’t have time for it. They will even give you a lot of food if you visit them in their houses. It is typical Polish. And a little bit different, because you need to recognize how honest they are compared to the people in the
south of Europe. Like for example the Italians and the Spanish and those from the other countries.

*What do you mean when you say that Polish people are stressed by their identity?* I think it is more the old people. The old people here remembers much more. First of all the second world war which was very terrible in Poland. And then all the communist periods. Because they felt that they were treated bad compared to many other countries after the war. Poland existed after the war, but it wasn´t really Poland because the government was Russian. So they feel that they always have to fight and that they are now afraid to lose their country. It is connected to their opinion about the EU, because they are afraid that if they become a part of the EU, then they will give them a little bit of their autonomy. And the EU will then take more and more. So they will always be afraid that someone will take their country.

*So you think that the fact that you have been ruled by the Soviet Union, it does play some part in a cold relationship to...* Maybe I don´t feel it so much, but I still have an impression of this history I was born in (I was born during communism and 7 years when it stopped) so I remember quite well all the clothes I didn´t have and also the toilet paper that my mom had to get in a very difficult way. This is a really stupid thing and usually people at my age in Western Europe didn´t think that we could have such problems. But I see that younger people than me, like my little sister who is 12, have totally different lives and it is very similar to the young people in Western Europe. I feel that I can appreciate things more sometimes. Usually I forget that it is a very common thing to have everything around you, but there are sometimes when I stop and think: Oh God, this is amazing. Specially when I travel to eastern countries, because then you get reminded of how everything was and you see the world in a different way over there.

*Ok, but you mentioned that you are not a communist. Is that something that you talk about? I mean is that a topic that you discuss with your friends or whatever? Or is it something that you wouldn´t want to talk about for some reason?* I don´t think so, my friends and I don´t talk a lot about it because we simply don´t remember a lot. I just have several pictures of a childhood during communism.

*But it is more on a distant memory for your generation?* No, I don´t think that my generation really cares about communism. Or they feel that if they think that it was bad then they prefer to forget about it. My generation will rather laugh at communism and we have lots of nice movies making fun of communism and showing it from a humouristic perspective. And we have communistic pubs today. People come there to make fun of it, because communism was ridiculous in Europe. It was sad and very bad and people were upset about stupid things like rules, trams or really different things. And now we, as young people, just laugh at it rather
than try to remember it and analyze it. Younger people than me, they just don’t care at all. They can have good jobs now, but they cannot compare it to the jobs existing at the time of communism.

Do you think that your generations sort of humorous approach to communism and discussing history, is that very different from your parents? My parents also laugh at it, but they appreciate all the things they have now, more than I appreciate it and my generation. They remember the time when they had small pieces of paper and had to go to each shop and buy meat. You couldn’t get meat without it. And I had more meat because I had some sort of illness, where I couldn’t eat any type of flour. So thanks to me my family were able to get more meat. It was amazing, we had twice more than others. And everybody was happy because of me and the fact that they could have meat. It was very very strange, but we had such problems. And because my parents remember how everything was they now appreciate the things more. And they think twice about throwing away things, which is different from my generation. Sometimes I can even see that they have some old habits and prefer to continue doing things how they did it back then. Maybe because they miss some of the everyday life back then.

How about the political change? Is that something that would concern your parents? Yes, my dad told me that when he went to highschool he had to participate in meetings and parades concerning political events. It was communism of course and he didn’t want to but he had to. He had to work voluntary for the government or the country, so sometimes they had to cut trees or cut grass. Everybody had to work for the country and my father was very upset about it so he tried to escape somehow, but other times not. He remembers it in his mind and says yeah it happened. Sometimes joking about it. I think he is not angry about it anymore. In general people are not angry about it today. But they are happy that it is finished. Of course there are some who are sad that it is finished, because during communism there were jobs to everyone and we had the same money. Everybody didn’t have anything.

Is the feeling of belonging to a community different now? Yes, because at that time people found that there were one group of people and they used to fight against the government and the country. And now people fight against themselves because we have one group which is rich, rather than let’s say middle class. But middle class is not real middle class like in western countries. These classes fight against eachother. Basically people are not happy that other people have more. This is the feeling. Now we are not one group anymore. We are several groups and each one wants to be the best and have the largest amount of money. So we are not really like one country. You could feel this feeling, like people were all together. Like they had something together when they were very often protesting and had
many parades. You could find many thousand people gathered in one place back then, but now this doesn’t exist. Everybody takes care of themself and their problems and jobs. So it is very special what you see, now that the pope is dead, where so many people gather in one place.

He died?
Yes, yesterday he died.

Ok, we couldn’t understand the local radio. But let’s skip to something else. Has the fact that Poland has become a member of the EU changed the national feeling? Are you depressed that people are perhaps more individual now and more concerned of doing things better in addition to have more money? Or how about the feeling that you broke out of communism? Is there any kind of pride?
Are you asking about my oppinion? How I feel or how your people feel?

Just your idea..
When I grew up during communism I was very small. And I didn’t do anything particular when it finally fell. But I was happy to have t-shirts with Mickey Mouse that I couldn’t have had before. I think that people in general were very happy the first 5 years. We started to have everything on the shelves in the shops and some people got more money, but there were also some people who lost their jobs. So ofcourse not everybody were happy. Now it is different, because we have a whole new situation in the world with much worse situations. And people all over the world wants to have money and good life. So now people in Poland have started to forget that in the past they couldn’t say what they wanted, they didn´t have a normal TV, they didn´t have anything. They remember that they had good jobs and money. Now they don’t have money to pay these things and what I feel is that before we joined the EU I had this impression that I wasn’t European because I hadn’t any contact with other Europeans here. So actually students joined the EU before the country. Because of Socrates/Erasmus programmes and all other exchange programmes. So now they don’t feel what I felt. I thought I could travel without my stupid passport, that I didn’t need to wait in any stupid queues like Non-European or European countries, which is first of all not a good feeling when you are like in a second category and secondly you just save your time, cause it’s easier. And then the other thing is that we can work in other countries which is good, because Poland is not a very rich country. And if we travel abroad and want to stay there longer time we can only go to Ukraine. But if we want to learn English or any other language, we simply need money. So it was a very good thing for the first time when I could go to the UK and I could earn money to stay there longer than 2 weeks. So this was my impression: Something had changed. Really, for good. In Poland eggs had become cheaper, but sugar more expensive. It is always like this. And I don’t feel that something is really more expensive. Something
gets cheaper and other things expensive. But we definitely get more foreigners now. Still you don’t really feel it here in the city, because there were always many foreigners in Cracow. It is a little different when you think of Warsaw, Cracow and Wroclaw. 3 different countries in Poland. All the other parts of Poland are really thousands of years after.

*But would you say that Poland is a nation that belongs in Europe? I mean, do you feel like a central or eastern European country?*

I feel like a central country in Europe. The point is that it is not important for me. It is just a geographical thing.

*Do you think that the membership changes the way that you see Ukrainians or Belarusians for instance? I mean would the Poles consider them not to be a part of Europe?*

No no, for Polish people I think that all the countries are European countries. But they feel a little confused about Turkey, because this is religion. This is my top theory: Religion is everything. And Russia is Europe and also the Baltic countries and Ukraine. When you go to Western Europe you feel like all the people living there are a little bit better according to economy and so on. And of course we feel in Poland that we are better than Latvia, Russia or Ukraine. But actually it is true. It is a good impression because people there are more poor than we are and everything is going. It is really better in Warsaw.

*Do you think that the feeling of being Polish will be the same in the future? Let’s say in 30 years. Is there a progress going towards that people are getting less nationalistic? Or is it just something that is going on with the students?*

I don’t know. I think it is worth to say that when I compare it with Western European countries I think that they are still very nationalistic even though they have been members of the EU for a long time. So they appreciate the EU because it gives them a better economy and a kind of feeling that they are European and that they can be safe. They can fight altogether against, let’s say muslim countries and terrorism which is the main topic now. But they still feel happy to be French, Belgian, Italian & whatever. And when you ask them: who are you, they will answer: Are you French or Danish? No, I am European they will say. And I think that it will be the same here in Poland. When people answer such a question they will always think about it. Maybe they will give a different answer, but if you simply ask where are you from, they always say that they are from Europe or from Spain for example or Poland. Not just that they are from Cracow, because they want to feel as part of a country, not a region.

*Is there a strong sense of being part of the Cracow area?*
Yes, there is. People who were living here originally, not like me, I came here. They feel that they are very proud of what we call Krakowianzik – Cracowians. Because this was the capital some time ago and the old intellectual part of Poland comes from here. So they feel that they are unique, well educated and better than the others. It is a common feeling here. And you know fights between the cities have also been normal here. In the same way as in UK where Glasgow and Edinburg are always fighting, you see the citizens of Cracow and Warsaw fighting here. In Cracow we say that the people from the capital are not any good. And honestly the people in Warsaw are jeaulous that Cracow is obviously more beautiful than Warsaw. But you can feel it, really. Sometimes it is funny, sometimes maybe less.

Do you fear any consequences of being a member of the EU?
Yes, as I said I feel a bit more free.

But do you fear any consequences? Are there some bad things about it? Like, do you fear that some of the Polish identity will disappear?
I don’t know. I don’t feel it that much, because I am mostly happy about the union. But maybe I am a little bit afraid of the EU in general. That each country will not find the advantages of being with eachother. I as a person won’t lose anything by joining the union, but we as a people can lose lots of things by not joining it, because we try to be too tolerant some times to everything. The EU is more like economic stuff, but we still need to remember that we are Europeans and we have lots of differences between the countries, but we still have the same culture and religion: Christianism. Or the kind of greek philosophy of how everything was built. And our culture.. Humanism and everything. So when you compare ourselves and our tolerance that we have to everybody and all the different countries, we can lose them yet. Compared to muslim countries who are really against our culture and they are not tolerant. So they can not accept it. We are accepting them and then we are disappearing. I am not against these people, but I feel that when we accept them, they should accept us too. If we accept them in our country, we should accept them, but only if they accept some rules that we have. So you can’t simply do some things, because it is our culture. And we are not doing it. We get all the different cultures, and not only the muslims, I am also talking about the hinduists, jews and every other culture. This is my theory of life; that all the conflicts we have, have their origin in religion. Not only with countries, it really doesn’t matter. Second world war finished and now we only have conflicts with cultures and religion. So if we accept their culture and religion we lose ours. Because they come here and introduce their religion and then when we are too tolerant we simply don’t see or recognize that we will lose a little bit of our religion. The mixture will grow up, but I don’t want this mixture. I prefer my religion to leave it, because I really like it. I feel more comfortable, because I have grown up with this religion, this culture and this country. Actually I am not catholic. I am talking about
religion because it gives you something. You know, you are not catholic either. But we had this pope and he had good ideas and gave us something to the people during his life. Because of this christian religion we have beautiful churches and I prefer them than let’s say hinduism churches or whatever it is called. Because I like them and I grew up with them. This is kind of typical behaviour, right? I like things more when I know them and I am typical. So when I go somewhere abroad I can expect somebodys religion and culture. Because I know that it is really different than mine. And this is what I am really afraid of. That we are losing it now, because we are too tolerant.

*You don’t think that you can speak about a common European culture without speaking of christianity?*

We need to agree that each culture in the world was built on religion. So if we have this religion we need to keep it somehow. And it is not even christians with some kind of human theory of life that doesn’t even exist in any other culture. And democracy. These are the main things of how each of the cultures are built. We need to keep it and try to save it because some people don’t like them. They can simply stay in their part of the world. But not coming here and trying to take it or kill it. Because I think that I like my culture and religion and I really want to keep it. You know, I don’t agree with all the cultures. And I don’t agree with something in their mind. But I can accept different behaviour, let’s say that people in some countries treat their women different because they like it. They create their own culture. According to our it is wrong. But we can’t understand them because we didn’t grow up there. And I am also afraid of... This is one thing that we should keep our religion, but the other thing is that we shouldn’t try to introduce all our priorities to different cultures like try to say to other people how they should live. That is also not good. They started to do the things that some other countries wanted to do. So I want that everybody leave all the other cultures be themselves and live happily with their families. I mean we can travel abroad and mix eachother, but just be tolerant in a way I said. This is the main problem in our land, like what Homptington said: That we are gonna really survive only in the European religion. Eastern European it is called. Try to think and realize that we need to save it and not be too tolerant.

*So you mean that if this is a clash of a European community against some Islamic or some muslim one, do you think that Europe or Poland identifies themselves as not being islamic or whatever? I mean if religion is such a huge thing and such a tight thing related to being Polish, then being Pole/European means that we are not Muslim?*

I think that people don’t see it in that way. They feel like each day they are catholic or whatever. It is not even about being catholic, now it is more about living a humanistic way of life. And democracy. But you can feel it only when you meet these peo-
I am not talking about that it is wrong or anything. Really, I don’t see anything of this about the religion. The only thing I see about different religions that is wrong is that they usually, and I mean some of them. Not buddhism or hinduism, but some of them like really muslims or other religions that want to introduce their way of living in our countries. I am talking about such a simple thing that here when I personally met some muslim men, I am not saying all of them are like this, but some muslim men wanted to walk a little bit ahead of me. And I was like: why? It is the conversation that is stupid. Why are they doing it? There was no answer, because they simply couldn’t say. But maybe they don’t even realize it. It is something, but it is wrong of this people to try to introduce this kind of behaviour to me, because I don’t want it. I cannot accept it. So they should accept it. Like when I go to some muslim countries I can’t simply wear a t-shirt or a short skirt because it is not common there. It is forbidden. And I will accept it. I am gonna go there and I will wear their national clothes. And they should do the same here.

_So should they not be allowed to wear a scarf or anything when they come here to visit your country?_

I don’t think that all these things should be forbidden, but lets say that sometimes they want to come here and build their churches. Different religions, different churches. But why? If they come to our country then on the one hand we should let them do it. Personally I would like to be like yeah of course I don’t mind. It is not a problem for me. But when I think about the future, if you let them do it, the point is that this people like in some parts of the world, they are like more and more of them. So if I could live in their religion and if I wanted my child to live in their religion, I would say: Yeah of course. Be everywhere, all over the world. I like you. But I cannot accept your religion. Because I like mine and my culture, my freedom and my status as a woman. If I let them come to my area where I live and introduce all their culture in my area, then one day we will have more of their culture than of mine. There would be Chinese religion in Europe and everything else and I don’t like this. And then me and my children couldn’t be living in the culture that I liked. I am afraid only about this thing. If you think about this moment we are living in now, then there are no problems. We can simply let them build their churches, have their meetings, open their shops and everything. But then in some time we will start to lose our culture because of that. So we should basically do what they do. They don’t accept it. They can’t accept us wearing our clothes and behaving in our way. This is the only thing that I am afraid of. Really really afraid of.

_Do you know any muslims here in Poland?_

No, I mean I have one very good muslim friend. He is from Morocco, but he lives in France now. Actually he is not really muslim, he is maybe more European some
would say. I don’t ask my friends what culture or religion they have. I simply try to
get to know people and each of them are just simple human beings to me. This is just
one part of my self. I live in the moment and the near future and that’s it. If I meet
you, then you are just a person to me and I really don’t care. I wouldn’t need to ask
you where you are from. But if I start to analyze something then I need to divide peo-
ple into some categories. Because simply without it, there would be a totally mess in
the world. But I don’t know about my friends. I think that they are either atheists or
they believe in some god like a christian or catholic or a protestant one, I am not sure.
But if you are asking me if I believe in anything I really don’t know.

So the church doesn’t play a very big role in your life? And despite of that you still
feel connected to it in some way?

Yeah, connected to religion, not catholic.. Christian religion. In general christian re-
ligion because all of our civilization and culture was built on it. Catholic is part of the
christian religion. I have a connection because my parents believe that they are catho-
lics, so lets say when I come back home they want me to go to church, they can’t ac-
cept if I don’t. And as a child they made me go to church too. So each easter and
christmas we have kind of agreements that we need to go to church 2 times. Other-
wise they cannot accept it. I need to do some things to make them happy and there-
fore I am willing to take part in this agreement. Because I love my family and I don’t
want to make them feel sad, so I go. This is the only connection to the catholic church
in Poland that I have.

But do you think that it is a general thing that younger people are getting less reli-
gious?

In general yes, but I can’t say a lot about it because I still think like what is this? I
have some friends that go to church, but this is a topic that people don’t talk about at
all. In some countries you talk about religion and it takes the main place in their life.
Like when people do some things according to ceremonies or to local traditions. But
here in Poland all I know is that people go to church on Sundays, but they don’t talk
about religion. So I think it means that they do it more according to tradition. I have
this impression. I would say that 96% of Polish are catholic, but they are it because
their parents were catholic and their grandparents were catholic. Like in the US there
are more and more people believing in some god, but when they believe they really
believe and they even get crazy about their religion. In Poland it is not like this. It is
just something. We go to the church here on Sundays and nothing else. It is like no
topic which I think is really amazing.

So you wouldn’t say that the Polish catholic church has any influence on how you
vote or your political orientation?
No, I don’t care at all about it and my parents don’t care. But if you are talking in
general about the Polish people then I would say that it really is. But older people
they still care, because the thing is that during communism all the Polish people and
our government were fighting against each other. And then there was a church The
church was a kind of government for the Polish people because the government was
their enemy and it didn’t accept the catholic church. So people were really catholic
and they loved the church, because they felt that they were safe there. When you
think about people who can still remember it they still have this feeling. But for my
generation and the middle class people in their thirties, we don’t care about it any-
more. Because we have had much more busy lives and a lot of buisness and we
needed to work to get money and pay for their children and these things. For our gen-
eration we didn’t know about this feeling about the fight between the church and the
government. So yes, it takes an important part of all the peoples lives, but not in my
generation anymore. But you should really find some good researches about it, but
actually I don’t think that there will be any good researches because if you ask the
Polish people if they believe they will always answer that they do.

*But when there was the EU referendum, did you vote back then?*
Yes, of course. I came back to Catowice because I couldn’t vote here. No, actually I
went there to get the paper so I could vote here.

*Ok, so may I ask what you voted?*
Aah.. In favour.

*But not a lot of Poles voted, did they?*
No, and it was actually not because it was a question about the EU, but that a lot of
people here don’t vote at all because they have the impression that nothing will hap-
pen here anymore. They see evil everywhere. In each party and they feel so de-
pressed. It is really also depressing for me that people don’t believe in anything any-
more. That they don’t have the hope. It is because we don’t have good politics and a
good government. You know, during communism all these well-educated people, the
elite, they were all put into prison or killed or they had to immigrate to the other
countries. And this is a very big problem in Poland. That we don’t have this elite who
can govern our country and who have good ideas. People now governing are all for-
mer communists or some are just farmers or something. They just want to come there
and take as much as they can. And this is what makes us so depressed, because we
simply cannot see a better future in 10 years. Because there will still be all the same
people, so for who could we vote? For former communists or for poor people who
actually don’t know what they really want to do? They are often not very well edu-
cated so they cannot understand basic things in economy and so on.
But do you think that Polish people feel that there is a similarity between the Soviet Union and the European Union?

A similarity? I don’t think that it is similar at all, but some people may feel it. Like my grandfather, he would feel it. That we went from one roof to another, if you know what I mean?

Yes.

So I think that specially it is the older who feels this. And I don’t know if it is half of the people or most of them.

So where do you mostly get your information about the EU from?

I was at a quite good highschool and they had a special course concerning the EU and these topics. And when I joined the university I chose a similar course too about integrating into the EU and the relationship between Poland and the union. Then of course we have received papers and we have watched it at tv. And of course there has been meetings and debates. I used to have more time for it, but now I just don’t have time at all, so I can’t go for these debates anymore. Now the young people just learn about it in school and the older generation watch programs about it in tv, so it is always a kind of manipulation. But I think that most people haven’t read about it like I have, because I had these special courses about it. It is more some common information that we get about the union. What are the rules, what are the main governing parties? People don’t necessarily know these things. People just don’t think about EU as a great thing that can connect Europe and make it stronger in the world. They just think of the EU as a way for them to be able to go working abroad or they worry if some foreigners will come and take their land or that the eggs will be more expensive. And this is not their fault, but it is the fault of the government and the media who don’t talk about the most important things like the general idea of the union or the future. Not the near future, but what we are gonna have in let’s say 10 years. And that is why people have this stupid knowledge about the union. I don’t know how the EU is presented in other countries, but in Poland it is not good.

So you would prefer a discussion which was more of a cultural value?

Exactly, because this is the most important thing. But yes, of course we have money from the union and of course we need to pay some of it back because some things are expensive. And people are also angry because of some reasons like that the sugar is now more expensive. It is rediculous, because on the other hand they have new roads and the EU pays for it. So they don’t think in such ways, but they still think about real stupid things like if they have to pay 0,20 zloty more for the sugar. And some will even think that it is more important not to pay this price difference and to stay separately. I have no idea what these people are thinking. If they want to be a part of Russia or maybe of Asia? But it is not their fault. It is just this elite that is missing
and should be here to introduce the people to this topic, but we don’t have any who can do this.

*Do you think that there is one thing that every European has in common?*
Yes, I think it is democracy. This is just the first thing that comes to my mind. And it is so important. Usually it doesn’t exist in some countries. This humanism and democracy is really really what I am most happy that I was born into, because it gives you the freedom. Maybe it is a big word, but it is because I think of these poor people who actually have no freedom and no democracy. It is only because these words and ideas are used in a wrong way, but it is very important that we have it at least in our minds so we can do something with it. Some people simply don’t know what these words mean.

*Ok, so would you put democratic heritage before a religious heritage? Are we Europeans because we are democrats or because we are christians? Or can you put it that way?*
No, I think that the idea is that first of all we had christianism. And upon christianism democracy was built. Am I right? No, it was like Aristioteles before christianism or whatever. So yeah, you can say that. Because maybe he was before and his democracy wasn’t right. Then it was christianism that came, but this main democracy that exists now was rather built on christianism and all this respect to human beings. It exists in our religion actually. So I think that these two things have a little bit in common, but you can easily divide them and make a structure out of them because everything is really mixed.

*Is that the same in Poland or do you feel that there is another tendency among Poles? Do you think that you are Poles because you live under the Polish constitution or that you are Poles because you have this common catholic church?*
I think that it depends on what kind of Poles. Because still I am maybe giving you a bad impression of Poles, because I have a contact with one society and one part of Poles. And there are lots of others living in the country. So I have no idea of how their ideas are. I can guess how they feel. Maybe some of them feel the way that I feel, but I think that they rather don’t see themself as Poles because of religion. Because of course catholic religion also exists in other countries. They are Poles because they were born in Poland and they have common history and some of the same traditions.

*Do you think that Polish culture fits easily into European culture?*
Yes, I think it does. I think the difference between the European cultures are the traditions. It is not really a problem at all. I can go to some other countries and let other people introduce me to their cultures, but it is not very different because the base is
the same. So when I like something I can accept it and use it. And if I don’t I can simply leave it. The same is with Poland. Actually the Polish people like our traditions very much. Like the way we spend christmas or something like this. And when they like it they can introduce it to their houses. Or they can introduce something else.

*Earlier you talked about that you thought that there was a great difference between the young people and the older people in each region or how we remember communism. Do you think that there is a generation gap? Or is it just a tiny difference? Maybe.. No it is a big difference actually. I would say.*

*You mean those who were adults under communism or those who were children or born after communism? I don’t feel it very well, because I simply was a child under communism. And I am a little bit mixed up probably. But when I see people or children who were born after communism they are totally totally different. It is amazing and sometimes I can’t really understand them. They just don’t appreciate a lot of things as they should. They think that everything is very simple and that they can get it all and that they should get it all, which for me is not true some times. I have an impression that we have 2 groups of adults. Those who remembers communism and want to seperate from it and the past. And they are typical people living in consemionist worlds. And the other part of adults remembering communism are the ones who would want to stay in communism. They are just against everything in this mean world. It is really really difficult. And this is this new group, people like me. More or less my age. We remember this communism, but we know that the world is different now and some things are better while others are worse, but in general most are better. This we should accept and try to keep it so it remains the best. Live our good lives and this is one of the things that make me stressed when I go to the western countries. Because I can feel that the people living there simply work to get money so they can spend them. And it doesn’t make a point for me, because we are just human beings and not animals like mammals. So we should do something more because we can do it. We can think, we have brains that we can spend and create something with. It is good instead of just stupid things like going to work, get home and eat and then go to the pub and get drunk. In general spending money like this. I feel that it is becoming more and more common between many young Polish people.*

*Ok, but I don’t know if you are familiar with the German term “ostalgi”?*  
No.
It is a term that exists in the former East Germany and it is a sort of longing of getting back to communism. A nostalgic feeling of “back in the good old days.” Is that something that you find in Poland too?

Yes, in some areas. First of all the unemployed people. But also among old people like my grandfather who is retired. Actually his pension is quite good so he gets ok money. He is really afraid of some things such as the fact that young people do no longer believe in God, that 20 percent of the people are unemployed while they had jobs during communism and now it is worse. These things he doesn’t understand because he is old, so he feels that it was so good. He is sure that if he lived in communism he wouldn’t be afraid of dieing, because then I would still be able to find a job and not have to live under some bridge without money. It is such a simple stupid way of thinking that some Poles have.

What about the Eastern European countries that are not in the union today? Do you think that they should be accepted in the future?

Which ones?

Like Ukraine, Belarus and Albania plus the others who are still not a part of the union today.

I think that all of them should be accepted, because I believe that we should try to be together in order to save this culture that we have. Because I think that none of the Europeans would like to live in a culture like hinduism, buddhism or a muslim one. I don’t think so, really. Personally I would really never want to live in any of these cultures. I think that it might be stressing to go and visit these places. But, no no no no. That is why we should be together, even if they don’t have any money or economic safety. Maybe we should wait a little, but finally they should definitely be a part of the union.

The main idea is to keep in peoples mind all these ideas of democracy and freedom of the human beings. And this is the most important, because maybe we don’t need all these parliaments, all these people working in Brussels. And we don’t need to pay for them just to make something remarkable. Maybe it could be done in an easier way. But we need to have somebody who reminds us about these main ideas.

So, the last question is: what are your hopes for the future?

I am quite optimistic actually. I think that everything will be alright. Now I don’t feel like we should be afraid of something concerning the EU and Poland. I am more afraid of the result of our voting and all the bureaucracy. Now in Poland there is a party which is called “Young Center” I think. It is a young party who has its origin in a party which is called Unia Wolonotskij?? Which means union of freedom. This is a party who was governing in one of the very first governments in Poland. Now it is not very popular at all, but this party wants to create and rename themself as democ-
ratic party. Just probably to make people vote for them, as they won´t really vote for the old one. And the young people working for this party decided to promote the idea of Europe before this voting. And there is a kind of a project which is called ambassadors. So the 3200 people (I think) decided to subscribe in a website and all these people are supposed to create a project in three months that inform people in general about all the new things going on with the union. Because we simply have a problem that people don´t know enough of what is going on in this topic. They really know nothing about it, because the government does not inform about it and no one else does. Hopefully they will inform the people at least of what the new ideas of Europe are and what we need to vote for. The biggest part of the Poles say that they don´t have any opinion at all, which is terrible because they don´t know anything. Maybe it will be the better and I really hope this, because I don´t have time to participate in this project personally or to inform people. Because I have so much work here. But I know many people who want to do something, like informatic students or young people who would like to organize something to get a picture of Europe. And hopefully Poland will gonna be more interested in this topic even more. Now we have a really really bad situation with our Polish government, so people are rather interested in this topic. So people will rather think of Poland and Polish problems than the European ones. But we will be ok. We should be.

I think that this covered it all. So thanks a lot for now.

Dr. Maria Kantor
Universitetet i Krakow

I'm a specialist in Hebrew poetry, I teach out hebrew, but now it’s only part time, for seven years I was employed as assistance.

So, you speak Hebrew yourself?
Yes.

Are you from Cracow?
Originally no, I was born in the mountains in Novi Souct. 17.000 people are living there now, but for the last 27 years I've been living here.

May we ask you about your background? Are your parents academics as well?
No, my parents were regular workers. My mother was a hairdresser, my father was a baker.

Okay so you broke the pattern?
In that family yes, although my uncle, on my mother’s side, was a professor of Polish literature. But no I didn't grow up in an academic environment.

So, have you ever travelled outside of Poland?
Yes many times. I've never been to Denmark although I've been all over Europe; Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Germany, Belgium, France but never to Denmark.

*Did you travel a lot before the Polish membership of the European Union?*
Yes, my first travel was in ‘86 in England, and then I have been abroad regularly, almost every year.

*Wasn’t it complicated to get out of the country at that time?*
At that time, very much. I needed to apply for a passport, then I needed to apply for a visa and go to an interview at the British embassy. And then… well it was only a short visit, tourist visit, because I knew some friends in... I met some friends as a student. I did not graduate at that time, but afterwards I had to go back and return my passport. Then you had to stand in a long queue; there was a long queue for returning your passport and a long queue for getting your passport, so that were terrible days. And of course my passport was only temporary and I had to go to my hometown to get it so yes that was a difficult period. But it was possible, it was possible but a lot of trouble.

Have you ever, when being abroad, had a strong sense of being Polish, anything you were particularly proud of?
Well in those days, cause there is such a difference between those days and now a days, I think that in the old days I was certainly proud of Polish history and of the most famous people. So before the Pope there was of course Nicolas Copernicus, and then of course the Pope and later Lech Walesa. So the national heroes, but I think it is history cause I was not so proud of your industrialisation cause in those days it was not good. But history certainly, and kind of the spirit of independence, that Poland was not so suppressed under the communistic regime like other countries, like.... My first visit abroad was in Czechoslovakia that was even in 74. I remember that very well, and then I went there in February and when I went there you know I saw everything in red, and I was thinking what are they celebrating? You know cause there was no celebration in Poland in February and it was of course because they were celebrating their February revolution. We celebrate our October revolution. I was in Bratislava, which is now the capital of Slovakia; I was 17, and so surprised to see everything in red. In Poland it was not so, we had to celebrate things, of course not this, but the celebrations were not so evident.

*Did that make you feel proud that the Polish people weren't that suppressed?*
Well, maybe not proud. Maybe more a kind of feeling that our spiritual identity was strong enough and of course it was also because of the church. Cause the church in Czechoslovakia wasn't that strong, so here the fact that you could go to church and express yourself quite freely was something that mattered.

_Do you think that, that feeling is still within the Polish people? That they are able to stand against threats from the outside?_

The threats from the outside are different now. On the other hand, because there is no threat of being surmised to any regime or anything, it's a different feeling. The threat is more materialism. That you will spend more time after money, after pleasure but this is not the same feeling. There is no danger of war. We feel safe in NATO, so you can not compare. I feel that you can not compare.

A different situation?
Different situation. Of course there are threats but these are threats that you can expect, that are everywhere in the world, in democratic countries. But there is no threats of immediate regime, or immediate control from Moscow or even from Brussels. Although some people have that fear, but there is nothing like that, you know, that we are directed from elsewhere, you know, that we must do this and that.

So that was what it was like in Poland before?
Yes.

But other countries were more suppressed by the Soviet regime, and I was just wondering is that something that Polish people are proud of? That they weren't run over?
Yes, well I think so, I think that one of the characteristics, which some people think is negative some positive, is maybe stubbornness. You know on one hand being stubborn is all right, but you know it can have positive and negative sides. So when there was depression and anti regime people didn't want to have it, they rebelled against it. But of course they can resist against some good things, you know so it is a both way weapon. So Polish people are stubborn.

What does this stubbornness consist off? Has it got a lot to do with the church?
No no. In general I think it is because of the history (afbravgelse). Because Poland is a central European country and Russia is behind us, so all nations, armies who wanted to defy Russia, you know to go there, they had to march through Poland. And then we are in that unfortunate situation, so that the history taught us. I think that it is more historical.

Do you think of Poland as a Central European country, not that I disagree but..
We've always been a central European country
But some people, whom we have asked, think of it as an Eastern European country. What do you consider as eastern European countries? Ukraine, White Russia, part of Russia, all the Baltic countries and then I think Moldavia.

Is Bulgaria and Romania central?
No they are south, southern countries. Of course Austria is central and of course Hungary.

Do you believe that these countries should be a part of the EU? For example Ukraine?
Yes I have nothing against it.

What about Turkey?
Turkey, my personal opinion is that I'm for Turkey being in the EU. But this is my own personal opinion.

Most off the Poles, what do they think about Turkey being in the EU?
I can not give you the answer, I mean there is…we do not have negative feelings about Turkey because there was a (?) community in Turkey just back in the 19th century, when there was a Polish legion organised in Turkey. And it is more connected to us historically, I mean one of the national poets fought in Turkey, Adam ..? He even died in Turkey. So there is…

During the partition Polish legions, units, armies were organised in France, Italy and Turkey hoping that they would liberate Poland. So you know these countries are connected in a theory of freedom on that time, even in our national anthem we sing: If Italy last Poland last, because the legions were organised in Italy as well, but that’s history, a historical perspective.

Do you think that all Europeans have something in common?
Yes, definitely.

What could that be?
Culture, Latin culture. Even in Ukraine there is Latin culture, Latin values, Roman culture. Okay let’s say Greek-Roman culture to have it properly. Cause the east, like Israel they have a language and culture which is very different, the interesting thing is that we do have some things in common but there are many differences.
What about Poles, I mean, if you were to characterise Poles, how could you characterise them and what would they have in common?

Well history, a deep sense of history. (telefon ringer, afbrydelse)
And a feeling of independence or maybe a desire, a longing for independence. We don’t like to be under another regime, so a strong feeling of independence. Sometimes too strong, especially when you...

..does it get nationalistic, or.. sometimes maybe?
Yes, yes..

In what way?
Well sometimes we react too violently, in the sense that we don’t reflect and don’t... well of course in clear cases it is good to show your feelings of independence, but on the other hand in the recent months for example when we supported America in Iraq and then France says that we shouldn’t do that, that we are silly, a kind of a new member of the EU, how can you expect your own...you know so of course our pride was touched. Because France is a big country, an important country. But in the EU no country is more important and no is less important. How can you measure that, I mean each country is independent and has its own policy, so...we want to have our own opinion.

But don’t you fear sometimes that your own opinion won’t get through in a big membership like the EU?
Naturally, naturally.

Aren’t you afraid that polish identity will disappear..?
No, no.. Polish identity will not disappear cause it has not disappeared for thousands of years, for over a thousand years if I may say. EU is not gonna be a new regime, we survived harder times so..

So you don’t see many similarities between the Soviet union and the EU?
No there is nothing to compare, nothing to compare. First of all we voted to join the European Union out of free will. It was an independent decision, a free decision, there is nothing to compare. There was no voting to join Moscow.. So you can not compare it.

But do you feel especially Polish or do you consider yourself as European as well?
Well, I think that people in Europe feel as natives in their own country and as Europeans as well. I wouldn’t say that an African would feel European or a European would feel African. I think that every person living in Europe feels English, German whatever and European.
Yeah, but maybe people in Moldavia feel less European than people in Western Europe, maybe they felt a bit left behind.
It depends on what basis you define your feeling of being European, you know. For me.. I’m historical, geographically in Europe, and Poland has always been in Europe so for me there is no scale for being more or less European. You are either European or not.

But I think that what she meant was if you consider yourself as a Polish or European citizen. I know that you are both, but what is most important for you?
Okay okay I don’t agree with you, there is.... I’m a Polish citizen, I’m not a European citizen ‘cause there is no such thing as a European citizenship. So I’m a part of Europe, I’m a part of EU but there is no European citizenship.

There will properly be shortly.
No I don’t believe so.

You don’t believe so..?
No, cause citizenship is connected with... What about Switzerland? ...No...That would be a…. I’ll say a disaster, you can’t do that, cause there is no such thing as European citizenship as there is no such thing as an American citizenship, because it is Canada, USA and and....For example I never think Switzerland will join the European Union because of their desire and then what....They will be in Europe without a European citizenship, that’s stupid....

But do you then feel that a specific country’s culture and identity goes before Europe..? Do you understand what I mean?..Like that is the main part of belonging to Europe? Do you have to have a specific culture before you can be European?
No I., No I think that everyone living in Europe....that every country belonging to Europe is a European country and the culture is different, you know, naturally. You know, you properly travel a lot and Polish culture is different, English culture, Spanish culture, Italian culture, Moldavian culture and they will always be different cause you can not unify culture, you can not. You can only find elements, common elements but there will be no unification of cultures, because otherwise every nation will have to forget its history, literature, politics you know things that matters to you and I wouldn’t like to live in such a... I wouldn’t like to meet a person from England who speaks like me, that would be a disaster, cause I’m not looking for similarities.. I mean I’m looking for things I can share with, that I can discuss, but not things that are the same. Cause people are different and are looking for differences and then when... You know, when you love someone you don’t look for that person to have the same things that you have.
So where should the borders be in Europe, that separates Europe from let’s say Asia? The river Bouk of course. Ukraine belongs to Europe, although it is divided in three, you know eastern-western part and.. But I think that they belong to Europe, and White-Russia.

But not Russia? Russia is difficult, because it is such a large continent, it is a continent. So definitely one part belongs to Europe, but you know other parts are not European. Asia it’s a different culture. So that’s very difficult, this country is very complicated in many ways.

I would like to ask you something because, before we talked about that Turkey was also a part of Europe..
Well, I mean Turkey, I didn’t say that, the question was if I would like to have Turkey in the European union.

Okay sorry. There is a difference, you know whether Turkey is in Europe is a different question, because of course Istanbul, you know is kind of Europe but Turkey is in the Mid-east, they are closer to Europe but it’s clearly a different country.

But don’t you see any culture clashes in Turkey? Yes, there are always culture clashes, Culture clashes I can find everywhere.

Yeah but should that be European? Turkey is very different in many ways, why should Turkey be in Europe and not.. Well for example Iraq, Iran, Israel or...no no..... You know historically speaking Turkey and Israel have more connection than other countries in The Middle East, with Europe based in history and culture because you know Turkey was also under Roman influence and Greek influence so that culture has got..?

Let’s go back and talk a little bit about what Europeans have in common, you talked about Latin values, could you talk a little bit more about that? Latin law, latin.. Well you know it was Pax Romano, which was good cause there was peace in all these countries, so the culture was.... When you look historically at Rome it was excellent, there was excellent communication, high culture, you know when you think about the kitchen, or hygiene and all of this. So when you look at us now you think that we live in a... You know when you look at our clothes and Roman clothes they were so (?) And we are a part of that, because earlier we were living in
another world. You know because Slavic culture was a bit wild, you know in Den-
mark there was the Vikings and so on.....

Has it affected your life in any way that Poland is now a member of the EU?
In a way it is good to have that feeling that I’m now a part of a large community and I
can easily go anywhere without being questioned. It’s a comfort that I can take a car
and go anywhere or that I can leave my passport at home.

What else has changed since you joined the European Union, in your everyday life?
In my everyday life? nothing really. Maybe that there are more foreigners, tourists
here, which I’m glad to have, but in everyday life nothing. Only the feeling that I can
go out you know..

So it’s not like food has gotten more expensive or...?
Well a little bit for a short period and then you know (?) The prices are hopefully
regulated by economic rules. So if there is a pound of apples, I would buy them for
less than two zlotys, but apples in Denmark cost more than two euros, but we have a
lot of them so, but of course I wouldn’t like to have the same price everywhere, but
then we will not have them.

Do you think that Poland should join the euro?
Well, I would have nothing against it, because it would be for economic reasons. But
when it will be we don’t know because our economic is not...there should be some
regulations and we don’t know yet. Although I kind of like Polish zlotys, before there
was Roman coins here, German coins.

But do you fear any consequences of being a part of the EU?
In what sense?

Well I don’t know.. Do you fear that the Polish identity will somehow change, or do
you fear any political, cultural consequences of the membership?
If there will be any changes, the changes will be natural because of the development
civilisation and such you know culture, industrialisation, computerisation and so on.
But the fact that we are a member of the EU... Because there is no EU-identity, cause
it’s not a artificial....like you know the language Esperanto, it is an artificial language,
they create literature, poetry, but they have not changed their identity of anything. It’s
like the European union, it’s a creation that’s good or bad in some aspects, but it’s
nothing that actually effects the roots you know the natives... I think every country in
the membership should feel the same, cause I don’t think that any country would like
to lose their roots, and culture and identity, I would be surprised if someone would
like to.
How would you define Polish culture?
Well maybe, Latin, Christian .culture. Or literature…. This is different, you can not
define culture, maybe certain aspects or the influence of the culture…

But what makes you different from the countries surrounding you?
With culture you mean...?

No I don’t think of a certain kind of culture, but just... Just what makes Poles Polish?
You mean like identity?

Yes..
Because culture is, culture is....

I don’t think that she meant...well the roots of your identity, of your culture...like how
do people in Poland think different than people in neighbour countries?
Think different?

Yes, like a very Polish way to think that is special..
Ha ha...no no.

What makes you different from let’s say Germany?
Less order.

You mean that you die younger?
No no, order! For example there are certain stereo types, and not every stereo type is
that bad, because there is some truth in it. So there is more order in Germany, more
spontanity in the south of Europe, and I don’t know about Denmark. I believe that
there is also more order in Denmark, because the Scandinavian countries are more
orderly. Here we like order but not like the Germans, but we are not chaotic. We are
not, you know, like they say in the south: mañana mañana. But we are not like the
Americans who plan everything you know like A, B, C, D. So we are kind of a mix-
ture I would say. Kind of like the situation here, with the Pope dying, you can see that
people are (?)like last night when 25,000 football fans got together, that was not
planed, in America you must plan for 25,000 people to get together, here it took a day
to get them together right? It was by sms or email, or the students, so we have...that is
a characteristic of the Polish people, in terms of some historical event, we could mo-
bilise ourselves very quickly. So quick mobilisation.

So Polish people stick together in difficult situations?
Maybe not in significant situations, because we are not in a difficult situation right now.

*So people stick less together?*
Yes, in some moments. But in such historical moments there is a feeling that Polish people can mobilise themselves very quickly. There is also a part in history where there was a threat of Turkish invasion and immediately the king went to Vienna and there was a general mobilisation, because there was danger of war. But there was also a danger 27 years ago when the Pope was elected it was the same, the people went to the churches and.....but there was a quick mobilisation, now it’s easier; you can send sms or mobile phone. But I was surprised yesterday, to tell you the truth that gathering of these football fans! Because they are so hostile, I think that about a month ago a young man was killed because he belonged to another club. There was a big hostility, so you know, I could never imagine, a hundred percent of the people would say, if you asked them: would you say that these two clubs would be together, they would say never.

*So let me get this right, a person was killed because he belonged to another football club?*
Yes, and he wasn’t the only one, there are more than 20 killed.

*So you where very surprised when the two teams got together?*
Yes.

*I wanted to hear your opinion on, if we talk about Polish history and the fact that Poland has been independent...you know Poland has actually been independent very few years of its history.*
No no, Poland was a very large country until 1771.

*Yes yes, but in the last two hundred years or so.*
Yes for 120 years or so, Poland did not exist on the map. Actually it was one of the few countries that did not exist.

*So what do you think it means for Polish identity? I mean you talked about stubbornness before, but do you think that it has other consequences on how Polish people identify themselves, the fact that they had very little independence in the last 120 years or so?*
Well, I wouldn’t.. I don’t think that Polish people think in the sense that selectively they only take that part, you know the 120 years of lack of independence... No...We look at the history...no I would say our thinking of history (?) so I would say that the
centuries of independence was much more important than those years without independence.

_So do you think that there is some kind of longing for the great period of Poland? I mean back in the 16th 17th hundred?_  
Well, of course sentimentally, but we know realistically that history will not come back because otherwise half of Europe would be Polish, but that is a dangerous question to ask ..ha ha...because do you realise that the Polish borders were from the Baltic sea to the black sea (?) White Russia, part of Russia, you know, all Ukraine and all these... Poland was a big country, a big kingdom and a great kingdom with a great king.

_But my impression is that in the last 100 years Poles have always believed that they would gain their independence again some day._  
Yes of course.

_So... okay._  
But that feeling and longing for independence was because Poland was a large country...

_Yes exactly, that was my point._  
..For so many years. You know, Christianity was brought here in 966 then the first king was communised here in Cracow in 1025. So you know for 17 centuries, so let’s say 700 years of independence.. So it is a lot, it is.

_Yes it is._  
We remember those years of suppression. We do remember.

_Today, are there any groups that are less accepted than others in Poland, like are there some people for whom it is very difficult to get a job, or?_  
Now the situation has changed but for many years the gypsy’s were, but now it is...even the name gypsy is not allowed, they are called Roma’s, so there is a different attitude. The place where I grew up the gypsy’s where certainly outside although there where no violent conflicts.

_But gypsy’s have been there for a long time. What about refugees from let say the Middle-East or.. What about these people are they welcomed here?_  
Well, there is a kind of opinion among Poles that we are not against them. In the cities it is different because there are no jobs. There is a different opinion in those places because there are no jobs, but again the refugees do not settle in the villages, unless they have a Polish background, you know from Siberia and so on. Because not many
of them would like to live in the country, you know, on a farm, but this is a total feeling. But of course all these Vietnamese settle in Warsaw, and in Warsaw there is zero unemployment. The only fear is the fear of jobs.

*Where do you mostly get your information about the European Union from?*
Well from radio, television, internet, but again I know the language so I watch BBC and I know German as well so.. (afbrydelse, telefon ringer)

*Back to the question about EU-information, do you feel that the Polish people know enough about the membership?*
No, certainly not.

*How can this problem be solved and why is it so?*
I think that there should be school programs, television, national television and national newspaper informing about it. But in a simple language, not in a.. the articles are too complicated (afbrydelse, døren åbnes). And also direct contact. The best entertaining program on Polish television is a program called *Europa da se ljubic*, which shows that Europe can be liked. There are foreigners living in Poland invited, that is excellent, they have...most people watch it and it is the best education they can get, because it is real. It’s a little bit funny and educative at the same time and it breaks up any stereotypes many feelings, and that was an excellent idea. Young people watch it, because they get to know it, you know, what it’s like and also...That is excellent.. So such information and also information by specialists explained in a simple language. Good communication is needed. Unfortunately most of our politics can not communicate, so that’s the problem. You know, when you have Tony Blair or President Bush, you know, when they communicate it’s simple, you know, short sentences. Our politicians, you know, I can not listen to them, they speak long sentences, you know, that’s not what people want. There are very few people who can express themselves clearly.

*So there is a big lack of communication between the politicians and the public?*
Yes the public, there is a lack of good communication, because the politicians are talking, they appear everywhere, but the way they speak, the people do not understand them. One day they speak something, one day they speak something else, so most of them are… I would say 90 percent of them are hypocrites.

*Is it true that a lot get information about the EU from the church?*
No no, I am a believer, I go to church regularly, I never had a priest speaking about the EU. They can speak about some dangers, but that’s obvious like materialism, or you know...
Some of the people that we were talking to yesterday from the factory, they told us that they got EU-information from the church.

Yeah, that’s not true. I mean some people.. The thing is that very often people go to church, but they do not listen actually to what is being said. They do not read good articles about it, so it’s... What do you mean from the church, the official teaching of the church doesn’t say you know....so there is server cents in the church that say nothing about the EU, unless you know general, general.. But you know there are dangers. I think that everyone agrees that there are dangers in the EU, you know materialism. Even that one country wants to dominate. I can see that Germany and especially France wants to dominate in the EU (afbrydelse telefon ringer) but you can have institutions connected with the church that give information. I think that when you ask such questions, I mean my self, I’m a educated person, you need to define what do you mean by that, because these are general things, because when you ask me if I get information from the church, I would say no you get them from the newspapers. The church does not have their own newspaper, but they have the weekly paper, but this is not an official newspaper of the church. The Pope was for the European Union, the politicians where against...(båndet stopper)

So do you think that the church is an actor on the political scene?

(afbrydelse telefon ringer, mens vi snakker videre)

Well, it may appear that it is.. It has a lot of influence, but the church also has the right to express its own opinion every one else is expressing it so why not? I believe that every person is independent and I do not take decisions under influence of...I mean I listen, but it’s a kind of mobile lesson, politics is different.

Do you personally fear any consequences for the EU, Do you have any sceptics?
Myself?

Yes.
No, I was totally for.

So you voted?
Yes, of course I voted.

In favour?
In favour, I had no doubt.

What do you think, in the Polish society, the Polish people fear for EU? You talked about capitalism..
Well not capitalism, but you know a kind of.. I would say...you know.. Well it’s not about the EU as such, but western culture.. Or it’s not the culture...well there are certain things you do not like about your country like drug addiction.. So it’s bigger in the west than in Poland. I don’t know about Denmark I think that suicide is a problem in Denmark, right? So each country has some problems, and I kind of feel that that will also be my problem, for example in this case if suicide is a problem in your country... But people do think that that’s not a problem in Poland. For example drug addiction or open homosexual parades, you know love parades. You know many people and I wouldn’t like to have it happen here..

You wouldn’t like it to happen here?
No no.

How come?
Because, what for? (afbrydelse telefon ringer mens vi snakker videre) Because what’s the point of showing tolerance, does it have to mean that you have to love everyone you tolerate(?) But what is Loveparade, I mean there is no point, cause what do you manifest?

You mean the gay parade?
The gay, of course mostly gay parades. They have never been persecuted here, that’s kind of more personal. They have been persecuted in jobs, but what’s AIDS that’s a different thing, people are looking different on that problem. There is a kind of phobia against AIDS & people who are HIV positive, this is dangerous, this is an illness.

Is there a fear that more homosexual people will come to Poland?
I don’t know I have not heard such a thing here but.. I think that there is enough homosexual people living in Poland.

Is AIDS a growing problem or?
AIDS is growing but it’s not a big problem, but by the way the church will take care of these people, the most of AIDS people.

So we want to talk a little about religion. Is religion an important part of your life? Definitely.

What kind of role does the church play in your everyday life? In your decisions? Your...?
Well it’s a little bit difficult to say. The church as such…it’s more the teaching of church the Christianity, the Christian values, cause definitely whether you go to this church or this church or if you don’t go to church at all is not so important in some
ways. I go to church but my brother doesn’t go to church, And I love him and I say you know, he has a very positive attitude towards...I mean we have a very good relationship and we say in average we are very good, you go to church you don’t so on average.. But the fact is that he doesn’t love me less cause I go to church and I do not love him less cause he doesn’t go to church.

*And what about your children...? Do you have children?*
I don’t have children but my brothers two children go to church. But if I had children it wouldn’t be a problem cause the religion is (not(?)) a matter of the own personal… You know you can go, you can not go, but do not go by force. I wouldn’t take anyone by force to any religion, or I wouldn’t press any religion on anybody (afbrydelse telefon ringer, hun tager den)

*So could you just talk shortly about the Catholic Church and its influence on Polish identity?*
Well, again it’s a very general question and there is not one simple answer, you know. Certainly it has an influence on Polish people, because the church has always taught and educated people patriotic feelings. Certainly, the church has always been proper when…and it has always restrain Polish spirit in Polish people, so naturally the churches historical point of view is positive and big, patriotic.

*Do you think that there is a generation gap in Poland? I mean you can talk about two aspects; The first aspect is that the younger generation is less religious, or not, and the other is that the younger generation has been brought up after communism..* No, no I think that there is no generation gap. There are certainly less people who go to church now but it’s their own decision. Earlier more people went to church, but they went there cause of political reasons. Now the fact that they don’t go to church it’s okay cause, you know, if they went to church because of politics that’s hypocrisy, cause you need to accept…. You need to be free in accepting your own religious feelings. So if you feel that you need to go to church this is your decision, if you do not.. I wouldn’t like to have people in church if they are not convinced that they should be there, that’s hypocritical.

*But do you think that the older generation is more religious..?*
Well, look at the situation now I’m surprised that right now…. Because the day when the Pope was elected I was 19 so he is the Pope of my student life and.... there are people who are now 20 they were little, I mean they were children. It’s amazing to see how their reaction is, I’m amazed, cause this is not the.. I’m in that generation, I mean I’m 45, of people who where affected because I was 19, and they were children or were not born, so it ‘s difficult, but ....
So we want to talk a little about communism what do you feel has been the big changes after communism in Poland and what do you think it means for Poland that communism fell?
Well, Poland is an independent country. Poland is a democratic country, freedom of press freedom of speech, you know, I mean everything is different. The feeling towards politics, earlier I hated it, or hated it, I mean the militia they where terrible men, they beat people. There where terrible things, now Poland.. you can deal with the policemen and I know that they would protect me. So you have been lucky living in a democratic country and not under such impression. You were lucky for that but you will never understand what it meant. This is not wrong you will simply just have to experience it. But I’m totally convinced that you are luckier than I am. You always need one more generation to get rid of this kind of thinking. Even though I grew up in a good family, a patriotic family and I, you know, I knew the history the true history of Poland, I was lucky in that perspective, but even in that indoctrination that I had in primary, in high school and in university had a profound impact on my thinking. Even if I resisted I had to hear these things. The influence, I mean I would say there is a terrible threat of indoctrination in any regime. I mean you lean things which are not even true. I’ll give you an example, earlier we where told that 4 million people died in Auschwitz, now it’s a million and a half and you know how can you miscalculate? I mean how can you give the wrong number to give the impression of more victims, that’s terrible and I’m not talking about (?) you know fortunately I did not live in those days.

But was something better under communism?
Nothing was better, I have no longing what so ever. I can not say any positive things, even though I would say I have a kind of sorrow in my hart. As a child I had to go in queue for sugar, these are the memories of my childhood, and this is not because there was no sugar in Poland but because it was rationed. But you know these are the memories of my childhood you know lack of sugar when there was plenty of sugar, or lack chocolate, food, oranges, you had oranges for Christmas. Terrible.

Does it still effect your life today?
Well not that my childhood wasn’t happy, but it wasn’t the childhood that I could have. When I went to the west I had a terrible reaction in the sense that I was in Italy on a conference and there was plenty of food, oranges and so on and you could take them. They were for you, but I was afraid to take because if something was not given to me you know, I had such a feeling that I couldn’t take, you know. If they were not given to me I could not take. They were on the table and I could take as many as I wanted and no one would say a word.

When was that?
In the 80’s when.. It was a kind of feeling, a kind of reaction.

So it was just so deeply within you that you couldn’t just get everything?
I needed to ask that it was not you know.. Because now you can get plenty of oranges but, you know, there are little things that, you know, when you ask what it was like earlier, you know, when you went to the west you could not believe that you could get these things.

What do you think that education means in Poland? What does it mean to be an educated person? And has it got something to do with the environment that you come from?
I don’t understand..

We are moving on now... Yeah it’s a bit different subject now sorry. I just want to ask you shortly what do you think that education means in Poland?
Ah education! Well it’s a very important aspect right now. You can see a great development in education, when I was in high school only 30 percent wanted to go to university, even apply to university. Right now it’s about 80 or more so certainly the education is a value that people want to have. It’s something strong, something people desire.

But isn’t.. I mean yesterday we talked to some people who said that during communism it wasn’t that necessary to be that well educated, and now you need to be educated to get a job and..
Yes that’s right, but that’s because of the historical development. The (impacted(?) wasn’t that well developed and there was no need for specialists, I mean, there was a need but again it was easier to manipulate and control people who are not educated. But of course I had my education in those difficult days, but it was not a problem. If you wanted to go to university it was not a problem. It was only(the only problem was ) if you had enough skills to go. But there was not a problem that you could not. Because even I was not brought up in a educated...I mean my parents, grandparents where workers and I liked reading and.. But there was not a barrier that I could not go to university. Although many people did not want to go. Now it’s different.

Why do you think that that has changed?
Why?

Yes.
Well people can see that they can have a life, that there are jobs

And isn’t it also because under communism everybody had a job?
..Theoretically had a job..

..yeah theoretically, but now there are less jobs, and people see that you maybe need an education to get a job
Yeah that’s one aspect. There is also a positive influence that EU has, because people see that people are well educated in the west, certainly ....So that’s also a positive influence from the EU.

So could we as the last question ask you what you hopes are for the future?
Positive, positive. I’m an optimistic person generally speaking. I hope Poland will be a good country. I don’t want Poland to dominate, I don’t want any EU country to dominate. I think that every country has it’s right to express it’s opinion, an independent opinion. And if we do not want to... I have nothing against that....if the British people do not want to accept the constitution, that’s fine. If we do not want to accept the constitution it’s fine, if someone wants to accept the constitution it’s fine. But generally speaking I don’t think that we need a constitution, European constitution, but that’s a different problem. But I want people here to be a little bit richer, you know higher living standards, but on the other hand the most important thing is that people are satisfied with what they do, with what they have, you know be happy, good family, more children for Poland. The children rate is bad so I suppose.. I do not have any children but I wish for them to get more children. I think that children are important. To be satisfied with what they have, be proud of the country and of Europe too. If Europe is successful in many ways it’s good. And to tell you one more thing the old Christian values, good Christian values in Europe. I’m sad that in the European Union there was no mentioning about the Christian values.

They had a big discussion about that.
Yes they had a big discussion, and nothing would have happened if....this is a historical fact. If it was Jewish, I mean if it had Jewish roots I would be...nothing.. I mean I openly admit about Roman and Greek roots and does that make me worse or less qualified or (?) These are historical truths. If it was Danish...

...like Vikings ha ha.

No, I’m sure (?) or Hamlet or if we had that way of thinking to be or not to be would be.....I would say it’s very important to tell the truth although sometimes it can be painful. Sometimes it can be liberating, you know, you can’t deny a fact, that’s hypocritical... That’s, you know, I can accept atheists, you know, whatever but it has to be true, honesty.