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Abstract

This paper adds a comparative perspective to the study of taste, cosmopolitanism and social organisation. Drawing on material provided by two similar projects in the UK and Finland it explores the relationships between national and cosmopolitan taste cultures. Whilst there have been some recent attempts to study taste in a comparative perspective, the weight of sociological inquiry into taste is focussed on specific national spaces, including the France of Bourdieu’s (1984) seminal contribution. This tendency persists even as the production and circulation of culture is increasingly accepted as global. Global culture is assumed to be the driver of cosmopolitan ways of being, but is also interpreted as a threat to distinct national cultures. Studies of taste provide an empirical setting where the lived experience of global culture and the ambiguities
of cosmopolitanism can be observed. Based on interviews and focus group discussions from the UK and Finland, the paper broadly concurs with those critics who see cosmopolitanism in the context of the maintenance of privileged political or symbolic positions of classes/status groups.
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Introduction

Studies of taste are almost always national in character – certainly the most influential study in the field so far, Pierre Bourdieu’s Distinction was (1984). This may be a consequence of the organisation of research within national silos but it belies the extent to which taste-cultures are not elided with national boundaries. This is evident in the presence of global items from outside of the nations under study on the research instruments within national studies of taste – but rarely have these international elements been central to analysis of the data produced.¹ The appearance of tastes as “national” by virtue of

¹Even in Distinction, cultural products with origins beyond the boundaries of the French nation state are present on the central survey. Of the singers
data being collected and analysed nationally – contrasts with the acceptance that contemporary cultural production and consumption are global in character.

This tendency, then, might stem from a more general trend in sociology to equate societies and nation states, an idea critically referred to as the “container model of society” that implies a “methodological nationalism” (Beck 2000; Chernilo 2006). Alongside the recognition of the limits of the nation as container of the social, sociologists have presented strong claims for post-national, cosmopolitan subjectivities as the coming norm in the global world (Beck 2000; Szerszynski and Urry 2002). These pronouncements on the nature, extent and forms of contemporary cosmopolitanism are rarely based upon empirical evidence. Where the contemporary experience of global cultures has been explored empirically it is through scholarship into local audiences for global forms on the one hand (Miller 1992; Morley and Robins 1995) and the role of global cultural products facilitating various forms of migrant or diasporic identities asked about, for example, Luis Morano was born in Spain, George Guetary was born in Egypt, Aznavour born of Armenian migrants, Brel was born in Belgium. Of the 19 films asked about, eight are French, five are Italian, one is Mexican in origin but made by the, at that time, exiled, Spanish avant-garde director Luis Buñuel, and 5 originate from the US (see Bourdieu 1984).
(Gillespie 1995; Gilroy 1993; Ong 1999) on the other. Such studies – which tend to be small scale and ethnographic in nature – are concerned with the symbolic uses of the products of global cultural industries in identity work. They reveal the tensions at play between the local and global and trouble assumptions that global culture is simply a homogenizing force. Such studies aside, empirical evidence for the lived experience of cosmopolitanism is relatively scarce.

The value of identifying or observing ethics or practices which are definitively cosmopolitan is itself contested (Pollock et al. 2000), and the best techniques for doing so are yet to be determined. Beck attempts to identify some indicators of cosmopolitanism which might be used by researchers to explore the concept empirically (2000). These include the relative presence of ‘local’ and ‘foreign’ cultural commodities (cinema, TV, books) in a setting, the range and volume of languages spoken, the mobility of inhabitants in global labour markets, the routes, technologies and intensity of communication with regions beyond the setting, the prevalence of international travel and the stability and coherence of notions of national identity. In relation to these indicators, Kendall et al. outline the inherent tension between a complex, contested multi-faceted concept like cosmopolitanism and the kinds of practical
categorisation required for empirical and especially quantitative work (2009). Given the many claims made for cosmopolitanism in ethical, political and cultural terms, different dimensions of the concept might require different techniques. Kendall et al. identify cultural openness, i.e. an openness to people and experiences as one key attribute of a cosmopolitan subjectivity and suggest some clear affinities between a cosmopolitan disposition and that identified through the emerging literature on cultural omnivores (Peterson, 2005), arguing that a cosmopolitan taste disposition is one attribute of the concept which is identifiable and observable. If, following Bourdieu, we recognise that taste is as much to do with practices as preferences, then the observation of tastes and their significance is well placed to shed empirical light on the ambiguities of cosmopolitanism. Recent studies by Savage et al. (2005, 2010) on global cultural flows and the imaginary of national identity in the UK indicate that notions of local, global and national are negotiated in relation to taste. The examination of taste is a possible route to understanding the lived experience of global culture.

A focus on taste or disposition offers a way to explore two dimensions of cosmopolitanism. As Beck (2004) has identified, there is a distinction between a normative cosmopolitanism,
associated with the accretion and spread of values of tolerance and openness to difference and a “banal” cosmopolitanism based around the everyday interaction with culture which, even in the relatively recent past, would have been considered distant or exotic at least within Western European contexts. This latter form, for Beck, is precisely premised upon those most mobile cultural forms, be it the forms of global cuisine which have accompanied migrant populations or the forms of mass media which emerge from “core” global symbolic producers. The former version resonates more readily with the distinguishing values and world view of what Calhoun describes as the “frequent-flyer”, mobile, global, professional and business class (2003). The latter version, also conceptualised as “ordinary” (Lamont and Askartova, 2002) or even “accidental” (Kendall et al., 2009) is perhaps more widespread as global cultural flows deposit items and practices to be integrated and absorbed into the everyday lives of broader populations.

Preferences and dispositions for cultural forms “are embedded in particular socio-cultural circumstances, though they also stream across national and other social boundaries.”(Katz-Gerro 2011:354) The cosmopolitanization of national taste cultures, such as that wrought by the spread of global forms of culture, is always in the context of the maintenance of privileged
political or symbolic positions of ethnicities and of classes/status groups within nations. Cosmopolitanism in its expression as a disposition can be understood not simply as a new form of global, post-national way of being but as part of the re-working and renewal of the relations of cultural capital, on an supra-national scale.

Classifications of cultural goods – and their assumed geographic, national origins – have, within Europe, played a central role in the identification of the legitimate hierarchies of culture within nations, with “European”, crudely, being shorthand for consecrated forms of high culture and “American” remaining a shorthand for commercial and therefore diminished forms of mass culture – albeit that these labels are less solid in contemporary context. What is at stake within them can be revealed though the experience of the incorporation of migrant and indigenous communities and in examples of nations “in transition.” In the former case, Hage’s notion of “national cultural capital”, applied primarily to Australia, reveals how “elements such as language, looks, cultural practices, a class derived capacity to intermix with others from different cultures (cosmopolitanism) ... give the person either some already contextually validated national symbolic capital or the advantages of proximity with the dominant national culture.”
In the latter case, as revealed in the case of Serbia (Cvetičanin 2007; Cvetičanin and Popescu 2011), where national taste cultures are in flux alongside the flux of national, political identities, there is strong evidence for “local” and “global” forms of cultural capital being differently spread along class lines. Politically, in this context, the anxieties and tensions connected with tastes for the global are not simply about homogenising influence of “foreign” – i.e. American or Western – influences but about a polluting influence on a coherent national identity. The local is ascribed a moral force in this context – strongly associated with patriotic sentiment. Cosmopolitanism is, by contrast, evoked as a kind of treachery. Global forms of culture emerge here as the means of entry into contemporary cosmopolitan culture – but also as a means of dividing between and within classes in relation to an orientation to an apparently stable but probably declining national/local past and an emerging, but more uncertain, global future. Taste matters in this context – and orientation to the global is a telling indicator of a range of forms of capital.

One way to explore this aspect of cosmopolitanism further is provided by our studies carried out in the UK and Finland, which, due to early collaboration between teams on the design and shaping of projects, offer both empirical material about
tastes for global culture and an opportunity for comparison of how tastes for the items from beyond the nation are articulated. The specific methodological difficulties of this process are dealt with elsewhere (Purhonen and Wright 2013). In this paper we consider the presence of global culture in the respective national samples and what this might tell us about the place of taste and disposition in debates about the nature of cosmopolitanism. We examine British and Finnish interviews about tastes for commercial culture (music, television and film), about food and about the experience of foreign travel and its influence on national identities as, following Beck (2000) empirical indicators of a cosmopolitan disposition. We begin with a brief overview of what the specific comparison between the UK and Finland might contribute to broader debates about cosmopolitanism and taste cultures.

The UK, Finland and the Contribution of Comparison

In his appeal for the universality of his approach to cultural taste, Bourdieu (1998) distinguishes between a naive reading of national differences – based for example on the identification of differing levels of preference (between, for example, Japanese intellectuals liking French Food and French intellectuals liking Japanese food) and a reading which takes
account of the particularities of different collective histories, rather than inherent national characteristics, in theorising the meanings of differences. In this spirit, the UK and Finland have some key differences in their socio-structural arrangements and collective histories and in their relation to global flows of people and culture. These differences, whilst they can only be crudely summarised here, are important in explaining what comparatively identifying different expressions of cosmopolitan disposition can contribute to understanding cosmopolitanism. We ask, to what extent do the expressions of taste in these settings reflect the influence of globalized cultural circulation in various fields? To address this question it is useful to have a comparative setting between two countries because the significance and meaning of “global culture” more generally is inevitably dependent on the characteristics and meanings of “local” and national cultures. Thus, even if the actual items and practices indicative of cosmopolitan/global culture are identical their meaning and status may actually be considerably different due to variation in the meanings given to the local/national contexts against which cosmopolitan/global culture is interpreted.

In sketching similarities and differences between our settings, we might identify the UK’s historical status both as the
“cradle” of the industrial revolution and as an imperial and colonial power, creating a contemporary national identity in continuing negotiation with the decline in both these statuses. An additional key twentieth century development was the emergence of a diverse multicultural population, made-up of migrants from former colonies and the post-War Commonwealth. More recently the UK has, following the global economic crises of the 1970s, followed a starkly neo-liberal political and economic path characterised by the liberalisation of labour markets and the dismantling of its post-WWII Welfare state. Such developments allow an “Anglo-Saxon” model to exemplify contemporary economic orthodoxy on capitalism’s organisation.

Finland’s collective history has its own points of reference. In sociological discussions, it is commonplace to consider Finland not only as a small country and a small linguistic area but also relatively homogenous culturally and in terms of class (Kahma and Toikka 2012; Mäkelä 1985). This is variously attributed to the late modernization of agriculture and industry in the period following World War 2 and to the historical alliance between intellectuals and the working class in the struggles for nationhood and independence in the early part of the twentieth century (Alapuro, 1988). Purhonen et al. point out the historical lack of feudal nobility in Finland as preventing the
historical oscillation of distinguishing taste cultures amongst dominant classes (2010). They also describe the foundation of the kind of strong social democracy which has come to exemplify the Nordic states, in which notions of equality and a narrowing of income differentials remains a motivation for political decision-making.

Culturally and especially in terms of globalisation of cultural goods, products and influences, the place of the two countries is rather different. Finland is more of a cultural periphery with external influences being extremely important, whereas Britain represents a kind of super power of popular culture (at least from 1960s onwards) through the commercial circulation of music and TV in particular, around the world. Much of this important difference is, of course, due to languages – and the respective relationships of the UK and Finland with the US as dominant source of commercial cultural products is also worth reflecting on in identifying the differing positions of the UK and Finland in global cultural flows. Alasuutari (2000, 2001) outlines the continued effect of these forms of globalization on Finnish society culminating, in the late twentieth century, in the decay of cultural homogeneity, the de-regulation of Finnish state broadcasting system, the end of “mass audience” and the
strengthening identities of minority ethnic groups within the population.

Whilst the scale and extent of each of these changes might be different, the general story is familiar within the UK. There are, of course, other significant similarities between the two countries. Both Finland and Britain have only quite recently been transformed into post-industrial societies, both are members in the European Union, and both have experienced in the last decades the rise of information technology, the knowledge-based economy and globalization. On the basis of these characteristics, one might expect considerable overlap both in the content of cosmopolitan, global culture and the extent to which it is consumed. However, the differences between the UK and Finland also give grounds to expect that the meaning attached to cosmopolitanism and global culture might be different. Because of the cultural centre/periphery difference between the countries and the linguistic differences, it may be expected that cosmopolitanism and global cultural influences are experienced differently in the UK and Finland. Taste for global culture, as an indicator of cosmopolitanism might also, then be articulated and used differently as a marker of status, distinction and national identity. We explore these differences in our data below.
Our Evidence

Our evidence is drawn from two projects which shared substantive elements of their data collection strategies. Both combined a central quantitative component with extensive qualitative data gathering and analysis. The British survey, “Cultural Capital and Social Exclusion,” was administered between 2003 and 2004 (see Bennett et al. 2009; Thomson 2004). The final achieved sample size on the main component of the sample was 1,564 with a response rate of 52%. The Finnish survey, “Cultural Capital and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland” was collected by Statistics Finland in 2007-2008 (see Melkas 2008; Purhonen et al. 2009). The random sample included 3,000 persons from the Finnish population ages 18 to 74. The response rate was 46% (N=1,388). The Finnish questionnaire was constructed following the example of the British survey, but with a number of national or cultural modifications that endeavoured to preserve comparability as far as possible.

In both countries, the survey work was augmented by extensive qualitative phases. The survey questionnaires included a question on whether the respondents were willing to participate in a follow-up in-depth interview. In Britain, this resulted in
44 follow-up interviews in 28 households selected among survey respondents and conducted in 2004-2005. In Finland, a total of 28 follow-up interviews were collected in 2008-2009. With a few exceptions, all follow-up interviews were held at participants’ homes. In both countries, the selection of these interviewees was based on the level of respondents’ education, age, gender and socio-economic status, household type and geographic location. Prior to the survey phase, in the UK 25 focus groups were conducted with people from a range of social, economic, ethnic and age groups within the UK population amounting to additional responses from some 143 people. In addition eleven interviews were held, based around the same interview schedule, with people identified as elites in prominent positions in business, political or cultural life. In Finland, the qualitative phase included 55 focus group discussions, collected in 2007-2008. The interviewed groups were chosen in order to represent a wide range of different social, economic, geographic, professional and age groups, from high-status elites to unemployed workers and students. The analysis of the qualitative material for the purposes of this paper included a number of phases. Recordings of the discussions, held in English and

29 of the Finnish focus group discussions were held with Finnish-speaking groups and 26 with Swedish-speaking groups, Finland’s most important minority.
Finnish, were transcribed, and later, key parts of the Finnish material were translated into English for better comparability. The national research teams also circulated brief resumés and analysis of each interview, written by the moderator of each interview. Thus the analysis was carried out by cross-reading all the material, classifying it by country, topic and type of openness for cosmopolitan culture.

It is this latter, qualitative part of the project evidence that forms the basis for much of our discussion in this paper, but to indicate the terms of our discussion, we preface this analysis with some descriptive statistics based about items and genres of film, TV and cuisine which were asked about in each country. Our comparative analysis of individual follow-up interviews was informed by earlier studies utilizing Multiple Correspondence Analysis (MCA), by which we could locate and identify each interviewee from both countries from a space of lifestyles created by MCA, allowing us to concentrate on comparing British and Finnish individuals occupying social positions as similar as possible (see Kahma and Toikka 2012; Purhonen and Wright 2013).

Clearly, in light of our critique of methodological nationalism, the presence or absence of specific national or international items in the surveys themselves represent a kind of cultural
imaginary – a tacit methodological knowledge about the kinds of things which would be recognised or known in a specific national context, resulting from a priori knowledge deriving from the lived experiences of the designers of the research instruments. It would have been little use asking about Finnish TV programs in the UK, where the limited channels of distribution and circulation for such items would make them too specialised an interest to resonate on a national survey. Instead, the arbitrariness of these selections can be countered with respect to the different trajectories they were attempting to connect with, notably a range from legitimate to popular forms and a variety of national origins. In the cases related below, where the items were shared in both countries, we get some indication of their relative popularity which is a useful starting point for the kinds of comparison we develop later.

Table 1. Liking for Selected Film Directors, Television Programmes and Types of Restaurants Representing Different National Origins in the UK and Finland, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Film Directors’</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>Finland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steven Spielberg</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Hitchcock</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Almodóvar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingmar Bergman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Campion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Television Programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Simpsons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Wants to be a Millionaire</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Brother</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All domestic-produced fictional television series</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Steakhouse</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents over 75 years of age are excluded from the British data in order to make the age ranges of both samples equal. For the British data, N = 1,432; for the Finnish data, N = 1,388. Both data are weighted.

\(^a\)The percentages represent those respondents in both countries who agreed that it “would make a point of watching” films by these directors.

\(^b\)The percentages represent those respondents in both countries who selected the programme as their most, second most or third most favourite from a list of 23 programmes and a response alternative, “none of these.”

\(^c\)The maximum count of this percentage is 300 because figures of liking for TV programmes represented the most, the second most and the third most favourites.
The percentages represent those respondents in both countries who selected the type of restaurant as their most favourite from a list of 11 restaurant types and a response alternative, “none of these.”

Table 1 reveals first the relative popularity of five film directors who were asked about on both surveys. Clearly there are significant reasons other than country of origin why a film director may be known or not in a particular nation, but patterns of preference here reveal that Spielberg (US) and Hitchcock (UK/US) are more popular in the UK and that those directors more immediately associated with “legitimate” forms of cinema – and also directors from the European mainland – Almodóvar (Spain) and Bergman (Sweden) are more popular and better known in Finland. Similarly, Jane Campion (from New Zealand, and a director with a more legitimate association) is marginally more popular and more recognised in Finland than in the UK.

A similar process can be performed in relation to the relative popularity of TV programs which were asked about on both surveys in relation to preferences for “global” television programs. These are represented both through comedy and drama shows originating in the US and the more recent phenomenon of global format TV, which generate local variants according to an
established template (Chalaby 2012; Moran and Malbon 2006). Again recognising the arbitrariness of the selections and the possibility of other influences in shaping engagement with these specific texts in the respective nations, we can see that the US programs are slightly more popular in the UK than in Finland. Of the global formats, *Who Wants to be a Millionaire*, a format originating in the UK, is significantly more popular there than in Finland. *Big Brother* is marginally more popular in Finland. The final row, regarding TV is interesting, reflecting the continuing importance of domestic, national TV industries. It indicates that domestically produced TV (drama and comedy) is significantly more popular in the UK than in Finland. In Britain, the survey covered nine domestic-produced fictional TV series whilst in Finland the list covered only three national fictional TV series. This reflects, of course, also the difference between these countries regarding TV production as a whole: Britain is one of the larger TV producer and exporter countries. Finland is a periphery in this respect, with a decent national broadcasting/production tradition of course, but the target of those domestic-produced programmes is almost entirely the Finnish-speaking or those living inside Finland. An audience can only consume what is available to it - and in Finland this entails a greater exposure to TV texts produced from outside the country itself.
Finally we can see from Table 1 the relative popularity of a range of cuisines with national/ethnic origins. Both nations show evidence of openness to “foreign” cuisines – and along the lines one might expect from their different positions in global flows of people. The British post-imperial, post-colonial experience is reflected in the greater popularity of Indian food, for example, even than that of its near neighbour France. In both countries French cuisine, with its exclusive associations, is a preference of a small and possibly select minority. Chinese is the most liked “foreign cuisine” in the UK and the joint most-liked, with Italian, in Finland. In Finland, “traditional steakhouse” is the most popular cuisine by some distance whereas in the UK, “the pub” is the most popular place to eat out. In both cases it seems likely these categories were residual categories reflecting national cuisines. In Finland, this residual category was by far the most popular, indicating a significance for national cuisine within Finnish taste culture which we explore in more depth below. In these fields – of film, television and cuisine – we see some muted relationships of national preference which might be indicative of different positions of the UK and Finland in global cultural flows, especially evident in relation to the role of language and the dominant global flows of culture and people. We build on these
in the following discussion, where we explore how national and cosmopolitan identities are intertwined in discussions about conceptions of the local and the global, in discussions about tastes for food and, firstly, in discussion about tastes for global commercial culture. We conceptualise the discussions that emerge around these three fields as articulations of the experience of what Beck identifies as “banal” cosmopolitanism in the UK and Finland (2004).

**Banal Cosmopolitanism in the UK and Finland**

**Global Commercial Culture**

The most common form of international cultural contact remains that provided by the circulation of the products of cultural industries - predominantly film and TV but also commercial music. This places discussion of global commercial culture within the context of the perception and experience of US culture in particular. Whilst clearly there are global producers from other regions these were not significantly present in responses found in either of our studies. Discussion about global commercial culture, then, is overwhelmingly discussion of US culture and, whilst there are residues of the post-war
suspicion of the US, as outlined by Hebdige (1998), it is not especially powerful in either country. American cultural forms provide a somewhat unexamined background to cultural life in the UK and Finland, without the urgency that might have surrounded such a presence in the recent past. Where suspicion of US culture is evident, in the UK, this is especially pronounced amongst older groups who, in the case of our focus group with middle-class pensioners, had lived through “the American century” and were still able to identify America with a vague sense of threat or decline – here expressed in relation to a perceived transformation in language wrought by the influence of US popular culture over the post-war period.

**Rita:** But what about then, we’ve got the rap culture haven’t we. We’ve got the street culture. This is mostly emanating from the States, so are we accepting their culture as ours? (...)

**Wynne:** Well we’ve began to use American expressions haven’t we like “free up.”

**Rita:** Yes, Hi, cool

**Rita:** My son was saying “mother, cool it, stay cool.”

**Wynne:** Chill out.

**Jim:** That’s fifty years old that!
Amongst younger interviewees, a different inflection to discussions of US culture emerges from disquiet over the US’s global geo-political role. Maria, a language teacher in her mid-thirties from the North of England, combines disquiet with this element of American culture in her rejection of the “typically” American Country and Western music.

Maria: Oh yeah, it would also have to be a lot of the pop that you get at the moment but yes just – ooh, it just annoys me. I find the, if you listen to the music it’s so American, I’m pretty much anti-USA infiltrating every other country so I do find it too American, it’s a symbolism of America for me.

This rejection of the genre, not because of any aesthetic or stylistic characteristics but because of its symbolic geography and its association with “infiltration”, is also evident in Seren, a social worker in her mid 50s, also from the North of England, whose dislike of Country and Western is in stark contrast to her openness for a range of musical genres, and a broader conception of herself as tolerant and open.

Seren: I think because it’s Americanism. It’s just American.

Interviewer: And you don’t like Americans because...
Seren: No, I don’t dislike the Americans but I think Country and Western music for me, just, it’s just American. It’s just very American. All the worst things I think about America.

The attempt to differentiate between Americans, America and “all the worst things about America” here is emblematic of the complexity of the cosmopolitan disposition as a sensibility with limitations and boundaries. We also discover, amongst older members of the elite sample, echoes of the notion that US popular culture – notably films – was aesthetically and intellectually inferior to European (especially French) films. This account from Colin, a retired senior civil servant who refers to musicals and epics, suggests this is a longstanding dislike, rather than one based on specific knowledge of contemporary popular culture. The cultural imaginary of the US as source of a somewhat diminished, de-valued popular culture, and of continental Europe, represented through France, as a source of fascination and quality remains for Colin.

Colin: There would be a bias of towards the French films because it’s always good to hear the language and they are rather good French films. I don’t like you know Hollywood big epics, I don’t like musicals. There is the, yeah there is the sort of frivolous side but most of the people I used to laugh
at don’t make films any more. I still think that you know Jacques Tati was one of the great comic geniuses.

This established use of the US as a shorthand has a more nuanced presence amongst younger cohorts, albeit those who are similarly rich in cultural capital. Terry, a curator of a local art gallery in a midlands city and a member of a focus group held with cultural professionals, who might therefore be expected to exemplify a cosmopolitan subjectivity, distinguishes American films from “foreign” films - reflecting in part a perception of “Atlantic” solidarity which is not extended to the more exotic Commonwealth ally of Australia. Such distinctions also reveal that there are differences in the meaning of “foreign” - here meaning non-American for this British viewer - and the programming of foreign films provide insight into different cultures which satisfies a cosmopolitan curiosity - rather than the “churned out” production from the US.

**Terry:** I like the seasons that Broadway [local art house cinema] do of foreign films, you know, I suppose I see that as an opportunity to get some kind of insight into different cultures, I mean I’m not saying it has to be foreign language, it could be Australian or whatever you know, but usually something that’s gonna be ... just kind of stuff that’s churned
out by Hollywood but you know you can get good American movies as well but – yeah, that’s usually the criteria plots.

In the Finnish context, in which products of US culture come from beyond both national and linguistic boundaries, there are notably fewer accounts of American TV and films in general and, whilst there is a general tendency to consider American cultural products a bit less valuable, explicit criticism towards American popular culture is rather rare. Instead, in the accounts of some of the younger Finnish interviewees, we find that American TV has a touch of legitimacy, which is connected to a cosmopolitan desire to travel, to know the world, and the benefits of consuming culture in the original language and beyond the usual, nationally proscribed, distribution channels. Nico is a well-paid consultant in his late thirties, who watches American TV series through the cable channels and internet well before they are broadcasted on the Finnish channels and travels extensively accompanying his adventurous travels with matching TV programmes:

Nico: Something that has changed quite a lot is that I watch all the TV series on the internet. At some point of my life I spent my Wednesdays waiting to see some specific season of *Lost*. Now you watch them the next day after they have been
shown in the USA. In fact my TV program these days is that laptop there. That has changed quite a lot lately.

Interviewer: Are there any series you follow through internet or otherwise?

Nico: Well I do watch some American series, like the new season of *Prison Break* or *Amazing Race*. So I don’t usually watch reality TV but because it has to do with travelling it is interesting.

Interviewer: Is there any TV program that you hate?

Nico: Well I can’t admit hating anything specific. But I’m not interested in this family-oriented wedding programs or *Huuma* which they broadcast on Saturdays. I can’t really stand those.

There is value, for Nico, in being connected to global popular culture through digital technologies. Here connection with US culture has an added layer of exoticism that contrasts with the more apparently mundane local landscapes on offer through Finnish TV. A very similar profile to Nico is evident in Sonja, a well-paid young educated professional also in her late thirties, who mentions American and Asian horror as particular

---

3 *Huuma* is actually another international format show – a Finnish variant of *Ant and Dec’s Saturday Night Take-away*, licensed by Granada productions from the UK.
favourites – the latter as emblematic of what she identifies as a current trend.

**Interviewer:** You have any special favourites in that area, some specific movies or directors?

**Sonja:** Well when it comes to writers, I’ve liked Stephen King and Dean Koontz. And then this Night Shyamalan is quite good, he’s directed for instance *Sixth Sense* and *Signs*. Then …

Japanese horror in general and Asian horror, that’s in and pop.

By contrast, Sonja is also one of those many young Finnish interviewees that barely mention any *Finnish* TV programmes or movies. In some young Finnish participants, the presence of global television and cinema goes hand in hand with dislike for similar kinds of Finnish cultural products. Markus, a twenty-something student, for instance, expresses curiosity towards old black-and-white Finnish cinema. He says, “I tried to watch them for cultural reasons” but admits that this project was too ambitious, because “I don’t find them the least bit entertaining.”

Sonja and Markus could be perfect examples of banal cosmopolitanism at least when it comes to TV and cinema: a liking of a number of different international TV series and
movies, without much evidence of any overt hostility towards dominant global forms from outside both national and linguistic territories, such as those evident in older, British interviews. For these younger Finns, though, there is a big gap when it comes to domestic cultural production. The specific generational tension that might be revealed by the conception of the local/national will be explored more fully in the final section. Next we turn to another site of banal cosmopolitanism in the UK and Finland, food.

Food

Both countries exhibit evidence that several decades of relatively cheap international travel and of the experience of migration, have generated a kind of familiarity with, openness to and knowledge of the cuisines of distant nations which are very much present in daily life or habit. The big difference, though, is that compared to the case of Britain, the culinary culture in Finland has “opened up” and become truly globalized only rather recently (in a higher degree from the 1980s onwards) and the traditional, rather heavy elements utilizing local ingredients are still the cornerstones of the Finnish cuisine (see Mäkelä 2005; Purhonen and Gronow 2013). Consequently, there was evidence of some differences in the place of tastes for food
in negotiating between national and cosmopolitan identities in the two settings.

In the UK’s focus groups, interviews and elite interviews, it was common for Indian and Chinese restaurants, for example, to be selected as preferable venues for eating out without much sense of their exotic-ness. This was especially the case amongst groups located within urban centres, where encounters with various forms of “foreign cuisine” are mundane and unremarkable, but even for groups and interviews undertaken in rural areas of the UK, there is a familiarity with Indian and Chinese food in particular and the incorporation a hybrid version of these foods into British taste cultures. Dislike of them was rare and fairly muted. Arthur, a middle-aged member of a group conducted with gay men in a Midlands city (all of whom were educated or professional men), for example, remarks, “But for myself I like to cook. I like different sauces and stews and casseroles. Forget any of the foreign muck, good old English food.”

Elsewhere Arthur reveals an ironic patriotism that emerges from his work as part of a multi-national company, involving the teasing of colleagues from other countries. Arthur draws on the signs of “foreign-ness” in British cuisine (such as the continental European “garlic” or “spices”). His pronouncement
here is recognised as playful by his fellow focus group members and is in stark contrast to the kinds of openness to European (French and Italian) and Asian (Chinese and Thai) cuisines they otherwise demonstrate – cuisines which are readily legible and available to them. It is not, in other words, a position held with any urgency or with any sense of threat.

This kind of experience of the ubiquity of international cuisines through their presence in towns and cities across the country is one route to banal cosmopolitanism in the UK. Another is through experience of travel – and especially in the British elite interviews the experience of living and working abroad. Consider for example this tour of culinary taste from Keith, a CEO of a global company with significant working experience in Asia and the US.

Keith: My particular interest obviously, Asian cuisine, and there’s so many different types but, from mainland China you’ve got Szechuan food, you’ve got Cantonese food, there’s lots of different types of Chinese food. Thai food, I like very much Vietnamese food I like so – I mean I’m pretty familiar with all the different types of Asian cuisine. I like Indian food and curries, something that, I mean not necessarily happy eating very spicy food but I just enjoy rice-based products because I
ate rice-based products for ten years and didn’t eat any potatoes or what have you, so I enjoy that sort of cuisine. Coming back into the western world, sorry Japanese food also I find that very cleansing, really nice, sushi and sashimi. The United States I mean you know have terrific meats and steaks and what have you which I also like, I’m not vegetarian, I enjoy good red blooded meats. Back into Europe, we’ve always as a family had an interest in France, I was fortunate to be taken there quite a bit in the summer holidays by my grandparents, so I was introduced to French food, even though very rich... Italian food I enjoy less actually the sort of pastas and that sort of food but I enjoy going to Italy and enjoy their restaurants.

These forms of personal contact with abundant difference, facilitated through international travel and engagement with professional networks also seems to lead to a re-appraisal of taste cultures and the emergence of a cosmopolitan disposition, specifically amongst more educated and professional participants. Terri, a researcher from South London, for example, chooses “traditional steakhouse” as her least favoured form of restaurant to eat out in – but mitigates her dislike with reference to her experience of a more apparently “authentic” form of cuisine provided through her international
travel, than that provided through an established British pub/restaurant chain.

**Terri:** I suppose they’ve got quite a bad press really, I didn’t eat steak for about twenty years but I went to a conference in Brazil in the summer and ate steak there and realised that actually it can be extremely nice...The term “traditional steak house” sort of sums up these images of the sort of *Berni Inn*⁴ which I just think would be extremely unpleasant really.

The difference between these two dispositions appears, predictably to be marked by differing levels of education and social class position – crudely a distance measurable in cultural capital.

Similarly in Finland it seems like in contemporary urban culture, eating ethnic food is no longer especially rare or distinctive. Markus, a student, has a habit of visiting a different foreign restaurant from time to time with his friends, apparently in order to get to know different food cultures. He has recent positive experiences from Italian and Russian restaurants, and he is a fan of Asian food, but “hates” Indian food and makes it clear that he is able to make distinctions

⁴*Berni Inn* was a British high-street restaurant chain.
inside different ethnic cuisines. He also clearly tries to emphasise this openness to other cultures by rejecting totally fast food:

**Interviewer:** Can you mention some places that you would not like to eat in? What would you consider is a repulsive place to eat out?

**Markus:** I think *McDonald’s* is a repulsive place, but I eat sometimes there when I’m in a rush as it’s so quick. If I’m somewhere downtown and I don’t have time to sit down and go somewhere to eat. But I still think it’s repulsive to eat there.

**Interviewer:** What’s repulsive about it?

**Markus:** The food is bad, unhealthy and considering the mush they make, it’s expensive.

A striking example of a learning mode to international cuisine when it comes to food emerges from Nico, the well-earning consultant. He admits having disliked sushi at the time of filling the survey, but during the time between he had been to Japan and noticed that what he perceived as a European connection between sushi and snobbery was completely inexistent which made him like it:
**Nico:** I went to Japan this summer and I visited a local, non-trendy sushi place. I hated sushi mostly because in Finland and in Europe it is always connected to a completely pointless snobbery. But there it was served in ordinary people’s places where these grandpas come and have a big chunk of tuna... plus that the fish was always fresh, it was really good in the end. So I could correct that one. Even if I haven’t had sushi in Finland even once.

**Interviewer:** Why did you hate it before?

**Nico:** Maybe it was the image of sushi and the idea of raw fish... it didn’t sound too good. But in the end people eat raw pickled salmon, and that isn’t any different from that. Maybe it was my own ignorance.

The “authentic” experience of Japanese cuisine makes Nico reflect both on the Finnish version of Japanese cuisine and the similarities between Japanese and Finnish cuisines, as well as his negative perception of the pointless snobbery of sushi as emblematic of a trendy urban food culture. Experience of the “real” sushi of ordinary people seems to give him license to see past that. Across the different Finnish social groups, eating seems to have a lot of potential of cultural goodwill in Bourdieu’s (1984) sense: several interviewees said that they had grown to appreciate something or, more interestingly from a
cultural point of view, learned to like something through experiencing it. For instance Jukka, a thirty-something metal worker with a strong US-influenced taste in popular music and cinema but a strong preference for national working class masculine culture in other fields, described the food he ate in his childhood and youth as very traditional (“potatoes, sauce with minced meat, macaroni casserole”) but said that his current girlfriend (a student at the university) has taught him to be much more open-minded about food: “Previously I didn’t like rice, but now I notice that it’s actually really good.”

In Finland, far more than in the UK, food becomes a site for negotiation around national identities. Even if Jukka has in a sense widened his cultural palette in terms of eating he is a perfect example of a more explicitly prejudicial rejection for ethnic foods, which was recurrent with several working class men living outside of the more metropolitan region of the capital city.

**Interviewer:** You usually like these kinds of ethnic restaurants?

**Jukka:** Well not really. Well I’ve been to the Chinese maybe once. But I didn’t really like that food.
Interviewer: Did you already mention what your least favourite food was?

Jukka: Well I mentioned the mushrooms but on the other hand maybe it’s not that. I couldn’t eat dogs or cats. Maybe in China they could eat dogs, even rats are eaten somewhere.

Interviewer: So those are your least favourite things?

Jukka: Possibly. I would taste everything else.

Jukka is not alone with these prejudices. Many male interviewees similar to him in educational and socio-economic terms share strong suspicions for ethnic of “exotic” foods. Even if they often expressed openness to culture from beyond the nation in other cultural areas, their discourses on food were linked to a strong national orientation, informed by strong perceptions of the tastes and practices associated with minority ethnic groups. For instance Risto, a middle-aged truck driver living near a small city in Eastern Finland, has baked an oven tray full of karjalanpiirakkas (a typical regional pastry) for the interview and is clearly interested in cooking and baking and calls himself a “gastronomist.” At the same time he describes pizza and kebab places run by migrants as “repulsive” and accuses them of bad hygiene. Veijo, a forestry engineer in his forties goes further in considering it “snobbery” to go for the exotic and recognizes the national Finnish cuisine as “normality.”
**Interviewer:** You like any exotic foods?

**Veijo:** No, not really. I haven’t really tasted the very exotic ones. But let’s say I regard them with suspicion.

**Interviewer:** What’s the problem?

**Veijo:** Well I feel like these exotic foods are a bit forced. It’s considered so fancy to eat something exotic and then burn your tongue with some weird spices that are normal food somewhere else. We should appreciate more these traditional foods that we have ourselves.

This latter sentiment places food within a narrative of tradition and change, as well as an expression of a national cultural capital – or a kind of everyday version of “gastro-nationalism,” that is, emphasising the significance and being proud of “authentic” national characteristics of food (see DeSoucey 2010). Such tendencies are less evident in Britain, where the longer term experience of post-colonial migration has led to the fuller hybridisation of British food cultures.

A secondly distinctively Finnish orientation, this time amongst older and more educated respondents hints at the presence of a distinctive culinary nationalism in Finland. This is revealed in the example of Ben, a former well-paid head of a bank office,
who has chosen to purchase famous Finnish paintings from his ex-workplace to decorate his home, and who is also a member of a selective nationalist gentlemen’s club. This patriotic element to his cultural life is also present in his descriptions of the diet of his family – a diet which seems self-consciously Finnish.

**Interviewer:** What have you eaten today, for instance?

**Ben:** Well today we ate... as all of our sons were here and one of them is married, his wife and son, who will soon turn one, were visiting us... we had mashed potatoes, raw pickled salmon and fried salmon and then we had... well, at least two different kinds of salad, at least mozzarella salad and green salad... And then self-picked lingonberries and pumpkins, what else? Then we had cucumber and stuff like that, I think we even had broccoli. There was food left over, so we ate mashed potatoes and salmon today. Oh yes, and yesterday I fried pancakes for the children for dessert. And we put self-made apple marmalade on them.

Such traditional, Finnish foods, with an accompanying rhetoric of self-made and self-picked satisfaction are distinctly un-cosmopolitan, with a kind of virtue attached to their simplicity. A similar attitude towards food is shared by Esko, a former politician and a farmer in his sixties, who lives in the
countryside (and receives the interviewer wearing a T-shirt with “Finland” written on it). Even if he obviously has lots of experience of international cultures through his work, he glorifies locality in nearly every imaginable occasion. The most telling quotes are clearly related to food and eating:

**Interviewer:** What kind of food do you usually eat?

**Esko:** Countryside food. Our speciality and privilege here ... is a smokery; they produce excellent smoked and cured things. And it is probably telling that when we celebrated my wife’s 60-years birthday a bit more than a week ago, we fetched a pork leg from him on both Saturday and Sunday. That was our main dish which was accompanied by salads and stuff like that. My wife is a good cook... My wife makes the bread in that oven, and the rieska is home-made from the beginning to the end. I have the pride and joy to eat the best rye bread of the whole of Finland; its sourdough dates from the first decade of the 20th century.

Esko’s account praises local culture and his own immediate surroundings so much that it is difficult to place it in the discourse of pure nationalism. Here we are tempted to see “Jantelagen” at work: the idea, originally formulated by the Danish novelist Sandemose, that in the Nordic countries, even
the elites are supposed to be modest (see Daloz 2007: 54). Both men, Ben and Esko, emphasize the economic aspect of eating certain foods – even if neither of them would need to save by eating more cheaply. At the same time, neither of these two high-status interviewees mentions, for instance, going to any ethnic restaurants, which seems to be emblematic of the cosmopolitan practices of younger cohorts in the UK and Finland, and especially elites in the UK. We explore this tension between the local, national and the global, and the social patterning of orientations in relation to these categories, in our final section.

Local/National/Global

Explicit descriptions of or claims for national superiority in both settings are rather muted – but a distinction between the relative value of contact with the world beyond the nation does appear to be marked by education, class and locality in ways which suggest that cosmopolitan dispositions are unevenly spread. In the UK, Alice – a participant in a focus group with service workers from a village in the border’s region of Scotland – makes a claim for an emotional connection to home, though one expressed with a recognition of the “value” of encountering difference.
**Alice:** Because if you go away, no matter where you go, you’ll meet different people, different cultures, and it’s just nice doing that. But it is always nice to come back again.

This tension between a satisfaction with what one has, locally and nationally, and a curiosity or eagerness to encounter what one hasn’t can be seen to be a marker of difference within the UK focus group sample at least. The only use of the term “cosmopolitan” within the whole of this sample is this paean to the particular joys of “local” life expressed by Stuart, a member of a focus group held with landowners in the same Borders.

**Stuart:** I think that, we live in the Borders, we live in a super part of the world, it’s tranquil, peaceful, there’s not a large population. A lot of the entertainment and social entertainment we make for ourselves. If we want to do anything we have to travel. And I think that’s - yeah, - there’s a more cosmopolitan society, there’s incomers and, a lot of us have been educated outwith the area, met a lot of different people from different walks of life and yeah, I’d like to think that in the community, the majority of us have pretty broad horizons. But it’s, again in this locality because it’s - it’s
a close knit community as well, we’re very lucky, very fortunate. There’s a lot of things we don’t have, but there’s a lot of things that we do have.

Here we see a conception of the immediate local environment – the national, but more especially the local as a particular kind of imagined space (tranquil, peaceful, close-knit). Whilst Stuart is not here expressing suspicion or fear of “incomers” – and is recognising the value of “broad horizons”, the emphasis in this account is to value the “social entertainment” that emerges from within the an imagined local community, rather than necessarily to search for enriching experiences beyond these environs. Elsewhere, amongst respondents from urban, professional and highly educated groups, this tension is expressed differently. In a group held with cultural professionals (workers and managers in art galleries, cinemas and theatres) we see a rather different imaginary evoked by “the local.”

**Linda:** I know it sounds terrible but sometimes if things are really pushed as like local it can put you off because the very word “local” it has all these like connotations and not many of them are very good and it can kind of, I think it can prejudice
people against something if they see that it’s kind of home
made or home grown if you like

Interviewer: When you say local does have connotations, do you
mean in terms of - small town or provincial?

Linda: It does, especially these days it does conjure up images
of like really backward in-bred little towns.

These kinds of suspicion of the “local” as backward, contrasts
with the openness to the exotic or international as representing
the sophisticated or complex. A focus group held with young
professionals and students, for example reveals a similar
division as expressed through taste for art within the home and
traditional English landscapes - exemplified by Constable’s The
Hay Wain. Joanna, a manager in a global logistics firm, describes
her preferred form of home decoration in terms which draws
approval from her fellow focus group member, Sean.

Joanna: I’ve just remembered I’ve got a massive Marilyn Monroe
Andy Warhol print in the kitchen, I would always go with
abstract and modern, and things like - when I think of what my
granny had in her house say but my granny had The Haywain and
things like that and I would never ever in a million years have
that in my house.
Interviewer: Why wouldn’t you have *The Haywain* in your home today?

Joanna: I just – it’s a bit cheesy now isn’t it I think, I’d probably have it as a kitsch lamp that moved or something, I wouldn’t have that kind of … would just look wrong, looked right in my granny’s house but it would look wrong in my house.

Sean: I think I agree with Joanna though I think there’s, I wouldn’t, even when I’m trying to look for things it would tend to be things which are abstract or semi abstract or at least unusual like Asian or Indian, something like that and definitely not *The Haywain* type thing.

Here, for younger more educated groups, the local and the national are associated with the past and with the tacky or “cheesy.” A “kitsch” ironised or parodied from of these national cultural forms might be acceptable – as Savage et al. (2010) describe – but it is the international, and in this case the beyond-European, where fascination lies.

A similar tendency to appropriate the international and the “faraway” emerges from the Finnish data. Nico, the Helsinki-based consultant that we know from earlier quotes, is a good example of this. He has a very anti-national cultural profile in general, mocking “national romantic” and “rustic romantic style”
as examples of bad taste, but his global orientation is best shown when the discussion turns into travelling. Nico has visited 39 countries – and gives immediately the exact number when asked about it, implying that this is a crucial element of his identity. Moreover his travelling is of a particular, type, focussed on the experiential, in contrast to the travels cruises and all-inclusive trips of “ordinary people”. Sonja’s account is very similar – an experience of travel which becomes an expanding list of places and experiences from around the globe:

**Sonja:** I travel quite a lot. Nowadays that I have money as I work, I travel many times a year. I love to do weekend trips to cities or then some longer trips to Asia. But when I was younger, I’ve been to Spain and all that. Do I have to make a list of all the places I’ve been to? England, Romania, Greece, Athens, in Thailand in a couple of different places, Phuket on the beach, Grab, Bangkok and then in Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur and (unclear), I’ve been to Ibiza and the USA. Oh yes, I’ve driven the car through the West Coast and been to the Midwest and New York and in the Nordic Countries. Where have I been to lately? Germany and I can’t even remember where.
Whilst these young well-earning professionals in the Finnish data, who express their international tastes through almost all their cultural consumption, are very similar to their British equivalents, it is also easy to identify some contrasts. Older Finnish profiles tend, instead, to value traditional, local, and Finnish culture over the more exotic items and practices that we have seen in relation to either the younger cohorts in Finland and the UK and the elites in the UK. We have already seen that Esko, the former politician, is a socially and culturally very conservative person, who is familiar with and consumes European culture, but otherwise his life is focussed around national and local phenomena:

**Esko:** Wherever I am, this nature and landscape means a lot to me. When I said that this is the most beautiful place on earth, you have to take it in a specific way and put my words in quotes. But I’m not a person who longs for faraway places; I don’t long to see something marvellous which is somewhere far away when we have lots of things here close to (this village), places I haven’t visited or seen.

This valorisation of the local is also true at the other end of the social scale, as represented by Pertti, a janitor in his late fifties living in the Helsinki region. Pertti privileges
Finnish culture and expresses a strong national, even regional or local emphasis in almost all the culture consumed, whether visual artists, cinema, books or food. Travelling to Northern Lapland appears to be the limit of his geographical horizon, and he gets tears in his eyes while thinking about that possibility – an emotional and cultural connection to the imaginary of the nation is evident here.

**Interviewer:** Are you interested in travelling?

**Pertti:** Well sometimes I’ve thought about it, but maybe I’ll just forget about it – because I’ve had this dream that once in my life I would like to visit Lapland, as I’ve never been there, so just to go there… (gets tears in his eyes) My mother-in-law told me that when you go through Norway to the Arctic sea, the views are so breathtaking as the sea is a hundred meters below you… so it would be interesting to see.

A similar case is that of Risto, the truck driver that we know from earlier quotes. He has travelled more than Pertti, although the destinations are those shared by many other Finns, Estonia and Thailand. There is a kind of cultural nationalism at work here that privileges the local and the national over the
foreign, based around an emotional attachment to the Finnish landscape.

**Risto:** Well I was born in ... the Southern Kainuu. I’m from the middle of the forests of Southern Kainuu where there is nothing... I was born in the middle of nowhere.

Risto further claims that he is “a product of the countryside” who hasn’t “had a lot of civilizing culture” and draws interesting dichotomies between urban vs. rural, civilized vs. authentic, modern vs. traditional, elite vs. ordinary people. Such connections represent a valorisation of the nation, which he might share with some of his social betters - though which offer a sharp contrast to the outward-looking sensibilities of some other of his compatriots.

**Conclusions: Cosmopolitanisms and the Cultural Imaginary in the UK and Finland**

This paper has attempted to provide some empirical, comparative detail to explore the claims made for cosmopolitan subjectivities, incorporating discussion of global cultural forms - including commercial culture and food - and orientations to the nation into discussions of taste in two distinctive
national spaces. We find in the interview data strong evidence of a “global,” cosmopolitan disposition in both countries – especially amongst the young and, in the case of the UK, amongst elite professional groups for whom the experience of international travel is mundane and unremarkable. If anything, the Finnish cosmopolitans (i.e. young professionals) are more cosmopolitan than the British. These interviews provide more evidence for the ready influence of travel, of the experience of difference, of the openness to and mastery of different languages that feeds through into tastes for non-Finnish forms of culture. In the youngest age groups in Finland (interviewees in their twenties and thirties) at least some degree of cosmopolitanism is shared by everyone, possibly because of the fact that nearly everyone speaks or understands a language other than their native language – i.e. English – and has a fairly recent experience of studying it from basic education.

There is a “banal cosmopolitanism” within the UK and Finland – perhaps of a slightly different form and intensity because of different “collective histories” – with age as well as class and education, roughly cultural capital, being significant factors in how this phenomenon is manifest. There are some differences between countries and some division within them, though. In Finland, on the one hand are those (usually the younger and more
educated of our qualitative samples) who like global or “foreign” cultural products with some belief in the value of engagement with diverse cultures. Such a position might represent a cosmopolitan version of cultural good will, understood in Bourdieu’s (1984) sense. On the other are those, usually older, who adapt global influences more restrictively. For older groups, including more educated professional people in the UK there retains a suspicion of global commercial culture, especially in relation to American films and TV. This may be a residue of older suspicions of a homogenising American popular culture – but this urgency is largely lost in relation to younger cohorts for whom, in both countries, the US is a rich source of alternative and more appealing image-scapes than those provided, for example, by national broadcasting.

Important for the Finnish cosmopolitan disposition is the explicit shunning of national cultural products: whereas some younger interviewees preferred Finnish food, nobody consumed only national cuisine in the ways that were claimed by older groups. This suspicion of the local is also shared by British younger professionals – though the value of the local and rural and a preference for “what we have in front of us” over the exotic or distant is also present in discussion of rural groups.
at some cultural and geographical distance removed the urban, metropolitan centres of cosmopolitan cultures.

Within Finland this distance was also evident, though with a more readily identifiable national orientation, among the older interviewees. Older interviewees with less education, especially the ones who live outside the influence of big cities and lack both cultural and economic resources, including skills in other languages except for Finnish, express a much more restricted cultural palette than their younger counterparts, i.e. less global influences and stronger preferences for national popular and folk culture. The most interesting group – and perhaps the group that indicates the substantive qualitative difference between the two nations in their relation to cosmopolitanism – are their better-educated, wealthier counterparts. These are participants who have consolidated their socio-economic position (unlike most of the younger interviewees) and have, in principle, enough capitals to like both cosmopolitan and national culture. This group takes the global context for granted, speaks English (and possibly other languages) and is more open to legitimate culture from beyond the nation – especially from within Europe. This cosmopolitan orientation makes it possible for this group to express, at the same time, a national emphasis in their tastes and make distinctions through
it. Among the upper-(middle)-class interviewees it was rare to listen to Finnish schlagers or admit watching domestic TV entertainment. In contrast, these high-status individuals emphasized their affection to local luxuries, re-claiming them as exotic (“Last time we had elk’s tongue that we fried in pan by the campfire”), patriotic activities with social gatekeepers (like belonging to a selective nationalist gentlemen’s club) or to other distinctive national goods which are definitely not available for everyone.

Encountering different cuisines and bringing these experiences home was a significant part of the experience of living and working abroad that was evident in our interviews with UK elites - most readily resonating with the cosmopolitan subjectivity of the here today, gone tomorrow “frequent flyers” of Calhoun’s (2003, 2007) critique. The position of the “nation” in Finland seems different. “Cosmopolitanism,” for older, high-status Finns, here is not so much characterised by an embrace or openness to the exotic or different - as it is so often imagined by theorists of this term - it is more a re-interpretation and reclamation of the familiar. One possible interpretation for the centrality of domestic cultural products in the sphere of a legitimate cultural consumption would be that the high-status interviewees already possess such a great amount of capitals
that they don’t “need” to distinguish themselves by any kind of cosmopolitanism. The Finnish interviews indicate the persistence of an emotional connection to the “national” that seems less present in the UK - though this does not preclude tolerance and openness to other cultures - except, as in the UK, amongst those with least stake in that kind of game.
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