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ABSTRACT

The Republic of Austria: A State Without a Nation

A thesis presented to the Global Studies Program
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Jill Morrissey

The Republic of Austria was created after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire in 1918. Although the state of Austria has a long and intricate history, an Austrian nation did not develop for many reasons. The very history of the Empire prevented a sense of nation to develop through increasing provincial identity, strong, long-lasting pan-German identity, and strong national identities in other ethnic groups in the Habsburg Empire. The First Austrian Republic was founded based on the ‘leftovers’ of the Empire and without a common national identity of its inhabitants—indeed, pan-German identity was dominant leading to the 1938 Anschluss. After World War II, pan-Germanism was no longer acceptable, and the State ‘muddled through’ the next few decades without having a national identity. Joining the European Union allowed the Austrian State to become a part of something larger, and gain a unifying identity as ‘European.’ The rise of far right political parties, especially the FPÖ, in response to increased immigration and the European issues shows the beginnings of an Austrian national sentiment. National identity did not have a role in the formation of the state nor did it become a possibility until long after the state formation.
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Chapter 1- Introduction

Reflecting on the course of development of the Austrian nation, Austrian historian Alexander Novotny said: “For millions of years the earth was circling the sun—and no one knew! For centuries an Austrian nation has existed; first dormant and finally—particularly after 1945—the Austrians realized that they are a nation.”

Austrian history stretches over centuries; however the Austrian nation is a relatively new concept, with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918 and the formation of the current Second Austrian Republic in 1955. Although Novotny states that the Austrian nation existed for centuries, can a nation actually exist without the acknowledgment of its people? Ernst Renan, in his 1882 Sorbonne lecture, asked “Why is Austria a state and not a nation?” In this paper I will explain how Austria as a state has developed without an Austrian nation, as a nation cannot exist without the will of its people.

The Austrian Empire dates back to the late 11th century and expanded throughout the middle ages. The war of Austrian Succession from 1740-1748 hinted that the Empire had reached its watermark. The Austro-Hungarian Empire ruled over nine ethnic groups, with even more languages and dialects spoken by its subjects. While the multi-cultural environment greatly contributed to shaping Austria, rising nationalism

---

2 Ernest Renan, “"What is a nation?"” in Nation and narration, ed. Homi K. Bhabha (London; New York: Routledge, 1990), 12.
and partisanship from ethnic groups within the Empire and the prevailing pan-Germanist thought prevented Austrian citizens from forming a united identity of what was uniquely ‘Austrian.’ Citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire who lived within the borders of today’s Austria viewed and defined themselves of what they were not- they were not Magyars, Slavs, Prussians, or Croats. This prevented Austrians from uniting under a common identity of what it meant to be ‘Austrian’ until after World War II and the formation of the Second Republic in 1955.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the development, or lack of, an Austrian Nation. First, we need to define our terms of ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism,’ and to do so I look at Liah Greenfield’s *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity* and how she describes the development of nations. Keeping these definitions in mind, we can explore the history of Austria and follow how the concept of an Austrian nation has developed to the present. As a result of the multi-cultural past of the Habsburg Empire, there are several minority groups who reside within the current-boundary of the Austrian Republic. The development of the idea of ‘nation’ within these ethnic groups in the Empire resulted with these ethnic groups gaining their own sense of identity aside from the empire, while residents within Austria viewed themselves as members of an Empire, not of an Austrian nation within that Empire. After the collapse of the Empire and the formation of the First Republic of Austria in 1919 and again after the Second Republic in 1955, the new Austrian State struggled to force an idea of nation amongst its population, and at the same time continued using the old remnants of the Austrian Empire. Joining the European Union was a way for Austria to get out of its own search
for identity by entering into a larger sense of community as European. Across Europe and Austria through the 1990s and the turn of the century, the rise of far right political parties and politicians was a response to changing demographics and identities. Despite the long and intricate history of the Austrian state, an Austrian national identity did not accompany it and was not used in creating an Austrian state.
Chapter 2- Definition of Terms

Before we can delve into a discussion of the origins of Austrian nationalism, we need to set a definition of what is meant through the use of an ‘Austrian nation’ and its subsequent ‘nationalism.’ Within my following definitions and explanations, I will be relying heavily on Liah Greenfeld’s work on nationalism in her 1992 book, *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Nationalism differs itself from other forms of identity as it finds the “individual identity within a people.” This population of people is not necessarily split among class and status lines, and can also combine several ethnic or linguistic groups. Nationalism revolves around a collective idea and agreement on a shared ‘nation.’

Greenfeld dissects “nation” into its semantic parts and follows the early evolution of the word through literature and usage. One development in the semantics of the word is important to note—the idea of a “nation” evolved past the meaning of a “community of origin” and began to describe a “community of opinion and purpose.”

To better describe the evolution of words, using “nation” as the main example, Greenfeld describes a “zigzag pattern of semantic change” where the meaning of a word evolves out of its original meaning to describe a new idea, and with this evolution new concepts and ideas become associated with the word. The old concept of the word

---

4 Ibid., 4.
5 Ibid.
becomes overshadowed by the new definition until eventually the ‘new’ definition is accepted as the norm. The idea of a “nation,” as we now understand it, emerged early 16th century England when the definition of a “nation” referred solely to the elite shifted and took on the new meaning of “people,” encompassing all within the “nation.”

Following this pattern, I mimicked the English transformation of the word ‘nation’ and created a similar pattern using the Austrian example.

---

\(^6\) Ibid., 6.

\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Ibid., 9, 11.
Greenfeld continues her discussion on nationalism through discussing the different ‘types’ of nationalism that branched off of the ‘original’ definition. Greenfeld finds that nationalism, with its focus on the equal membership of one in the states, is naturally ‘linked’ with democracy, and asserts that nationalism “developed as democracy.” However this link with democracy was moved away from as nationalist emphasis moved from “the sovereign character to the uniqueness of the people.” As this embodiment of nationalism rose in certain areas, emphasis moved from the individual as a member of the people to the people as a whole. Greenfeld terms this type of nationalism as a “collectivist ideology” and that they are inherently authoritarian, as opposed to the individualistic libertarian model of the ‘original’ nationalism. Greenfeld further classifies types of nationalism along the criteria for membership into the national identity, and draws it along ‘civic’ and ethnic’ lines. A summary of these ideas is replicated in the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of nationalism</th>
<th>Civic</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualistic-libertarian</td>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>Void</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivistic-authoritarian</td>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>Type III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lines defining the developing Austrian nationalism can rather difficult to draw, but follows the civic –individualistic pattern. Austrian nationalism did follow the ethnic-collectivist pattern during the Anschluss and Second World War, however it is arguable how much of that nationalism was uniquely Austrian and what was pushed on the Austrians by the Germans.

---

9 Ibid., 10.
10 Ibid., 11.
11 Figure is based on Nationalism, 11.
There are a few more comments pertinent to our discussion on nationalism that have yet to be stated. To reiterate, nationalism is a form of identity, and identity is how an individual views himself. This perception is self-given, therefore it cannot be assumed by others even if an individual follows certain patterns. The definition of ‘ethnicity’ can also therefore be fleeting. As a group ascribes an ethnic character to itself, this identity may contain different quantifiers than other communities’ ethnic definitions. An ethnic identity does not automatically turn into a national one; it does have that possibility but should not be assumed to follow that course. In order for a group of people to adopt a national identity, there must have been some incentive or impetus that caused the group to disregard their previous identity and take up a national one. If a national identity is not useful or meaningful to a group, they have no incentive or need to adopt it. Greenfeld’s thesis firstly ties nationalism with modernization, and secondly and more relevant to the discussion on Austrian nationalism, she asserts that nationalism “has made our world, politically, what it is” and that “national identity preceded the formation of nations.”

This discussion and definitions of ‘nation’ and ‘nationalism’ are essential when deciphering the emergence of Austrian nationalism. Greenfeld asserts that national identity precedes that formation of nations, which I am not sure is that case when one dissects the development of Austria as a nation and Austria as a state. Through studying the history of Austria I hope to determine a clear lineage of the use and development of the word “nation” as pertaining to Austria. To further clarify, I am looking to see if and

12 Greenfeld, Nationalism: 10.
when the idea of an *Austrian* nation separate from the past Imperial identity as well as separate from pan-German ideas emerged as the leading identity of Austrian citizens. In order for an Austrian national identity to be adopted, prior identities will no longer satisfy the needs of the citizens, who then embrace nationalism as a new and better way to identify themselves. This turning point in Austrian history needs to be determined
Chapter 3- History of Austrian Nationalism Development

To pinpoint the emergence of Austrian nationalism, first we need to determine the emergence of Austria as a nation, which can prove difficult with its Habsburg past. John-Paul Himka divided the emergence of nationalism in Austria into three periods. The first period lasted from 1526 to 1772 before the rise of nationalism was an influencing role, the second from 1772 to 1848 when the nationalism issue was “incubating” in Austria, and finally the period from 1848 to 1918 with the domination of nationalism in domestic and foreign affairs, leading to World War One.13 While I agree that the periods exhibit the different maturing forms of nationalism, Austrian nationalism was not fully formed and uniquely Austrian by the end of 1918—it was not until the aftermath of World War Two that Austria moved towards an Austrian identity separate from a German identity, and began to embrace the idea of an ‘Austrian’ nation.

Early Austrian History - 1848

Historians Helmut Kuzmics and Roland Axtmann argue that the Habsburg Empire needed to be separated from the Holy Roman Empire to advance the idea of an “Austrian” identity, as focusing inward on a specific idea of state had continually clashed

with simultaneously looking outward at an empire.\textsuperscript{14} The first hints of an Austrian state detached from both religion and its rulers can be seen in Maria Theresa’s modernization efforts in the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century. In a 1775 decree the monarch created the public high school as part of a system of ‘national education’\textsuperscript{15}. The French revolution in 1789 and Napoleon’s following rule continued to raise the importance of the idea of a nation as superior to the ruler and monarch. The Congress of Vienna from 1814-1815 squashed any thoughts of a German state, and the newly created German Confederation remained under Austrian rule.

1848 was a turbulent year in European history, as revolutionary fever reached a high point. As revolution spread across the empire, the mayor of Vienna asked for enforced protection. The government hesitated and then agreed to arm and expand its civic guard (the Bürgergarde), thinking that the arms might be later used against them. This hesitation proved well founded, for as violence spread through Vienna the civic guard did not join the military to side against the people. The guard began to juxtapose ‘freedom’ alongside ‘order and security,’\textsuperscript{16} showing that these citizens, mostly older and middle-upper class, were dually maintaining order and protecting the concessions won by the revolutionaries. When the revolutions calmed down, the new civic guard helped


determine the role of the new emerging middle-class. The guard also provided a new setting for citizens to gather and discuss politics—for which the citizens had high demand in the spring/summer of 1848. The journal Schwarz-Roth-Gold illustrated the new envisioned Austrian state with new liberal principles, writing “Teach your children that they are not Hungarians, Germans, Slavs, Italians but rather citizens of a constitutional Austrian State.” However, this does not mean that the journal was acknowledging or encouraging the existence of an Austrian nation, rather for more liberal policies within the Empire. Instead of encouraging partisan thoughts such as identity in one’s ethnic group, the journal was calling for all to come together under the Imperial umbrella of the Austrian Empire.

There were a series of elections held during this time, for representatives to the Austrian Parliament, delegates to the German Parliament in Frankfurt, and local councils as well as referendums to some of the changed provincial diets. These elections were not based on equal citizenship however. In Vienna, for example, a tiered system was set based on income and education. The representative numbers were divided into thirds, one third set aside to be voted on by citizens who paid up to ten florins in tax, another for middle-class educated citizens, and a third went to the wealthy elite, giving them proportionally higher representation.

The revolutions themselves saw the uprising of peoples gathered under the common unifier of nationalism, as they demanded the right to live in and gain states for

---

18 Ibid., 44.
19 Ibid., 54.
their various nations. Growing national consciousness also elevated ideas of individual nation’s culture and traditions as well as brought into clearer focus the language of the nation.\(^{20}\) Language played a central role in the focus of these new nationalisms, as “language expresses a nation’s way of thinking, one so perfect that in itself it is the same as national thinking.”\(^{21}\) The majority of liberals continued to look to the emperor as a sign of legitimacy, continuation, and the Empire itself and instead, as declared by the Society of the Friends of the People, “we declare ourselves opposed to the indolent nobility, which wedged itself between the people and the throne and which only wants to retain its ancient privilege and particularist interests.”\(^{22}\) The proposed preamble to the Austrian Constitution in the Parliament in January 1849 at first read “all sovereignty proceeds from the people” but was amended by the monarch to read “from the sovereign and the people.”\(^{23}\) Even the amended preamble shows how far the liberal revolution had succeeded in their goals—besides the people, only the sovereign is listed as having power, and even that power is on the same level as the people. The ‘people’ includes all members of the state, and not just the elite, showing the beginning of the government to treat all its citizens as equals. The amended passage to include ‘the sovereign’ also is important to note, as the Austrian monarchy is what keeps the Austrians apart from their German neighbors.

\(^{20}\) Kuzmics, Authority, state and national character : the civilizing process in Austria and England, 1700-1900: 104.
\(^{22}\) Judson, Exclusive revolutionaries : liberal politics, social experience, and national identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848-1914: 50.
\(^{23}\) Ibid., 64.
The revolutions of 1848 again brought into question the existence of a German state, as the push for German unification continues to grow. In 1848 all the German provinces, including Austria’s German provinces, held elections for an “all-German democratic parliament”\(^\text{24}\) seated in Frankfurt. A Czech historian named František Palacký wrote to the German National Assembly and referred to Austria as a “European necessity.”\(^\text{25}\) Palacký named the Habsburg Empire as such because it “relieved Europe of the burden of its eastern multinationality,”\(^\text{26}\) and Palacký, along with the other non-German ethnic groups of the Empire, was eager to avoid the prospective ‘germanization’ of the Empire if Austria joined Germany. The Austrian Empire was reluctant to separate its territories into German and non-German, and the German states held the inclusion of the non-German states of Austria as counter-productive to their goals. The assembly in Frankfurt voted to offer the crown to Frederick William of Prussia, and although the offer was rejected, the idea of Prussia, and not Austria, as a unifier was set.

**1848- Post-World War II**

Austria continued to be pushed out of emerging nation-states during the next two decades—losing their Italian provinces in wars in 1859 and 1866, and suffering defeat to Prussia in 1866 as well. The defeat effectively exiled Austria from the German states and allowed them to continue towards unification without Austrian influence or


\(^{26}\) Ibid.
membership. This exit was actually a central point in the Treaty of Prague with Prussia.\(^{27}\) The idea of a united German under Austrian leadership, the idea that had resulted in several foreign and domestic disputes over the past decades, was suddenly moot. Some factions still hoped for Austrian supremacy post 1866 with an alliance with the South German states, and this dream ended with the final unification of Germany in 1871 under Otto I’s leadership.\(^{28}\) 1866 also created a split within Austria that was to last for next seventy years. German nationalism within Austria grew, and factions broke off on different sides of the issue of the relationship to the unified German state in their backyard.

The Magyars in Hungary had also been experiencing a rise in nationalism since the turn of the century, and used the Empire’s recent military defeats to their benefit, striking a deal with Franz Joseph for autonomy over Hungary.\(^{29}\) The Ausgleich of 1867 created a system of dual monarchy in place of the former unitary Austrian Empire system. The state community of Hungary and the Kingdoms of Croatia, Slavonia, and Dalmatia were created, with the monarch Franz Joseph crowned as King of all territories. Croatia and Slavonia were given further autonomy under the Kingdom of Hungary while Dalmatia was kept under Austrian control and given the status of a province. This move granted Hungary as well as Croatia and Slavonia the status of “a


political nation” and allowed them self-rule over the issues of home affairs, justice, religion, and in 1913, national economy.  

In November of 1918, the Austrian National Assembly (which called itself the German-Austrian National Assembly) voted on unification with the German Republic, the politician Karl Renner exclaiming that “we are one tribe (Stamm) and one community of destiny (Schicksalsgemeinschaft).” The nation’s request was rejected by the victorious Allies unwilling to allow the defeated Germany to expand its borders.

Austrian Chancellors Dollfuss (in office from May 20, 1932 – assassination on July 25, 1934) and later Schuschnigg (in office from July 29, 1934 – March 11, 1938) promoted the idea that the First Republic was the ‘true Germany’ or even the ‘better’ one, not different from the national identity of Nazi Germany but rather a different interpretation of that same identity. Dollfuss also connected Austrian identity of the First Republic with its Habsburg past; a move intended to be nostalgic. This included bringing back the two-headed eagle symbol, Haydn anthem, imperial uniforms, and inviting the Habsburg family to move back. Ernst Karl Winter, the 1930s deputy mayor of Vienna, tried to unite the political non-Nazi right (especially monarchists) and the left under the negative goal of preventing a Nazi takeover. His attempt failed, and his fear

---

31 Bluhm, Building an Austrian nation; the political integration of a western state: 25.
33 Ibid., 172.
was proven when Austrian patriotism and Pan-germanism were unable to prevent the Anschluss.  

The Anschluss on March 12, 1938 occurred before Schuschnigg could hold a plebiscite on the question, and a Nazi plebiscite held a month later supposedly gained 99.7% support of the population in favor of the Anschluss. The Anschluss was an easy way out for an Austrian people still claiming their identity as ‘German’ and thinking of themselves as part of the greater German nation. While it would be unfair to say that the entire population was happy to see the Anschluss, the majority at the time were in favor or at least ambivalent about the issue. However, the idealism that accompanied the Anschluss wore off as occupation continued, especially as the Nazi regime banned the terms ‘Austria’ and ‘Austrian’ which created nostalgia for the old nation. At the end of the war in April 1945, Karl Renner stated after the Allied plan of restoration of Austria was announced, “We have no choice but to renounce even the idea of an Anschluss. Some may find this hard, but on the other hand after what has happened, after this terrible catastrophe, the fait accompli is a redeeming and liberating fact. We know where we stand!” This began the Austrian distancing from Pan-German ideas.

Austrian nationalism with a distinctive Austrian flair took off at the end of World War Two. The Austrians viewed themselves as the first victims of Hitler’s Germany, after all, “they had been betrayed by the international community and had resisted as much

34 Ibid., 174.
as they could; they had been a mere victim of National Socialist Germany.”

Contemporary Austrians were quick to point out that “One has to recall that we never formed a state together with today’s Germany. The Holy Empire was neither German nor a State; the German Confederation was German, but not a state either, and the German national state of 1871 was consciously put into place in opposition to us.” Not only were Austrians quick to deny the existence of a communal Austrian-German state, as Ernst Fischer, an Austrian author in Das Jahr der Befreiung wrote, “We Austrians have not simply left the German nation; we were never part of it.” It was only at this point in history among the aftermath of World War Two that Austrians began to finally relinquish their lingering national identity connection with the German states.

**Conclusion of Austrian National Development**

In order for nationalism to materialize, there needs to be the existence of an idea of a nation to support it. According to Greenfeld, the formation of a nation follows a national identity. The formation of the Austrian nation was forced upon it—the loss of Austro-Hungarian territories chipped away at the borders of the empire, and raising national and ethnic identities throughout the empire helped to decentralize a unified Empire identity. Austria, as a state, was formed first after World War One with the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. For the first time, Tyroleans, Carinthians, and Viennese were united and shared equally in a common state. Perhaps Austrians had

---

38 Ibid., 65.
previously commonly identified with their localities and states, however an overarching, uniting Austrian identity was not yet embraced at the time of the formation of the state. After the Anschluss, Austrians could not self-identify as part of a German nation, and needed to find a different identity. Novotny argues that an Austrian nation existed without the knowledge of Austrians, but as nation is a construct and identify formed and accepted by the people, this cannot be accurate.
Chapter 4- Austrian Minorities Introduction

The Austro-Hungarian Empire included vast areas of Central and Eastern Europe, encompassing territories that include modern Austria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and parts of Romania, Serbia, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, and Ukraine. In 1914 this Empire governed more than 52 million subjects over 261,000 square miles, and with the dissolution of the Empire and founding of the Republic of Austria in 1919, Austria found itself left with 6.5 million citizens and 32,377 square miles, less than 13% of the Empire’s total population and land area.

As a result of its multi-ethnic history, Austria is home to many minority groups, especially those communities that correspond to Austria’s neighboring states. As the idea of nation and nationalism spread through Europe in the 19th century ethnic factions in the Empire began to agitate for more self-governance. With the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire, many of these ethnic groups founded their own independent nations centered on the people who had developed a distinct national identity. The ‘rump’ state of Austria post-1918 included the ‘left-over’ parts of the former Empire that had yet to form a distinct national identity.

The southernmost province in Austria, Carinthia, hosts a long-standing Slovene minority in the south western basin. Burgenland, a former Hungarian land under the dual monarchy, was given to Austria in 1918 based on the large ethnic German
population by Allied victors attempting to form states along ethnic borders. The province has also historically been home for Croat, Hungarian, Roma, and Jewish populations. The South Tyrol issue between Austria and Italy showcases Austrian attitudes for German minorities outside of its borders. Here I will mainly highlight the development of Slovene national identity and the Carinthian Slovene Situation as a main example of the state of minorities in Austria and their impacts on Austrian identity formation, giving a brief overview of the Burgenland and South Tyrol cases to show that it is not a singular occurrence. Minorities in Austria and German minorities outside her borders are a reminder of its former Empire’s glory days and the official government attempts to promote German language and ethnic identity is an attempt to force together the formation and acceptance of an Austrian nation.

Slovene Introduction

The Slovenes are a small group of Southern Slav people, currently centralized in the Republic of Slovenia. Ethnic Slovenes also live in the Klagenfurt Basin in Carinthia and in Lower Styria in Austria, southwestern Hungary (Prekmurje and smaller districts), Carniola, and along the Adriatic coast in Croatia, and around the area of Trieste, Istria, Gorizia-Gradisca, and the coastlands. Some historians and German nationalists have falsely named the Slovenes as a ‘nonhistoric’ people, based on the dual facts that they have never had a ‘historic’ center of government or an independent state and that the people lacked a sizeable middle class and nobility.

Slovenes were under the control of the Habsburg Empire until 1918, and much of this time the idea of a Slovene nation remained dormant. After the Napoleonic Era,
however, Slovene national identity and nationalism awakened and grew alongside other nations affected by the French ideals of the nation as supreme, and not an emperor. The size of the Slovene nation at first led the leaders of the nationalist movement in the late 19th century to join with their southern Slav brothers and call for recognition of a greater Slav nation, although the calls were not for independence from Austria, but a separate-but-equal entity similar to the Hungarian Ausgleich of 1867, a solution called trialism. However the Southern Croats and Serbs were reluctant to include the Slovenes as equal brothers in their own search for a Slav state as they viewed the Slovenes as too ‘Germanized’ and assimilated to the German way of life.

The development of the idea of a Slovene nation caused a mirror reaction among the ethnic German along the ethnic borders or mixed areas- as the Slovene identity increased so did the idea of a German peoples in opposition to it. However, the Slovene people and populations were not looking to break away from Habsburg rule, and instead wanted acknowledgement and some manner of self-governance similar to the Hungarian situation. Germans living near large groups of ethnic Slovenes were often the most vocal opponents of any movement by the empire to appease their southern inhabitants. As neighboring identities developed and excluded the ethnic Germans in the Empire, the Germans looked towards the German states in search of developing their own, but were left on their own as the German states formation excluded any forms of an Austrian identity.
History of the Development of Slovene Identity

The Protestant reformer Primož Trubar is accredited by Slovene nationals as fostering an early ‘national’ awareness, as he wrote the first Slovene printed book in 1550. Trubar wrote in the local language as his concern was for the souls of his followers, and his books formed an important basis for the development of Slovene literature and the written language. The Catholic Counter-Reformation successfully ousted Protestantism from Habsburg lands, and the printing of Slovene books was not resumed until the late 17th century. At this time reforms made in Austria by Maria Theresa and Joseph II aided the reawakening of ‘Slovene’ nationalism, as their reforms required primary education and changed the legal status of Slovenes as agricultural laborer peasant-serfs.

Monks and priests began to take interest in the local language and worked to write and create primers and grammar collections. While there was some disagreement, most early linguists found the linguistic differences of the different regions inhabited by Slovenes negligible, and all Slovenes were brought together as one language unit which began to be seen as one nation of people. “Versuch eine Geschichte von Krain und der übringen südlchen Slawen Österreichs” (1788-91) by famous Slovene poet, playwright and historian Anton Linhart was a first attempt at consolidating the history of the Slovene people, and although it was written in German the books helped to further the idea of one Slovene nation by providing a tangible history for readers.

40 Ibid., 7.
The Napoleonic Wars not only brought new ideas to the Slovene people, but Austrian losses caused much of the southern Slav land to be ceded to the French, who formed a new separate political unit called the Illyrian Provinces. The provinces mainly consisted of Slovene and Croat populations with Ljubljana as the capital. Austrian rule was restored in September 1813, and Emperor Francis I quickly abolished all French laws and programs. The Slavs had had a taste of a separate Slav unit of governance and were encouraged to use their local languages by the French, both experiences that helped to encourage national sentiment growth among the southern Slavs. The use of term ‘Illyrian’ was banned by the Empire in 1843, causing the term “Yugoslav” to be used instead.\textsuperscript{41}

When the 1848 revolutions broke out a group of Slovene students studying in Vienna formed the organization “Slovenija” and drafted the first Slovene political program. The program made three demands—a unified Slovenia comprised of all ethnic Slovene territories in the empire with an assembly in Ljubljana, the use of Slovene in schools and government as well as the establishment of a Slovene University, and preserving Austrian independence from Frankfurt.\textsuperscript{42} This last point is especially important as the Slovenes felt that their goals of achieving acknowledgement as a minority ethnic group within the Empire would be jeopardized in the event of a larger union with the German States, a well-founded fear.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 12.  
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 15.
After the 1848 revolutions, the Austrian regime viewed all revolutionaries as a threat and dangerous, so the idea of a united Slovenia or Yugoslav political unit was put aside. Instead, nationalists focused on getting the Slovene language in schools and the local administration. National activities were limited to cultural pursuits.\footnote{Ibid., 18.} After humiliating losses in the 1860s the Austrian government began to feel that the “obstinacy of the national groups had contributed to domestic difficulties as well as to defeats and setbacks in Europe.”\footnote{Ibid., 19.} The 1866 Austrian territory losses saw about 27,000 Slovenes in the territory ceded to Italy, and the Ausgleich of 1867 with Hungary left another 45,000 Slovenes within that territory. After the 1866 losses, Austria was in a way forced to confront nationalism in Hungary with the Ausgleich, “but at a price of alienating most of the Slavs.”\footnote{Solomon Wank, “The Habsburg Empire,” in After empire : multiethnic societies and nation-building : the Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires, ed. Karen Barkey and Mark Von Hagen (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1997), 50.} Both cessions were blows to an already small Slovenian population. Combined with the sense of Austria’s impending collapse, the Slovene national interest was pursued with a greater ‘sense of urgency.’\footnote{Rogel, The Slovenes and Yugoslavism, 1890-1914: 22.} The small population of Slovenes caused leading nationalists to search for outside support, and they began to look towards a Southern Slav alliance as a solution. Throughout the 1880s and 90s more Slovenes were appointed teachers and public officials, mostly in Carniola. Where there were no Slovene public schools, such as in Carinthia, private ones were open and supported within the Slovene community.
Rise of tensions between Slovenes and Germans reached new heights with the shooting of two Slovene youths on September 20, 1908 after a week of conflict between the two sides. This incident awakened and angered even mildly-nationalist Slovenes, causing a mass replacement of German signs with Slovene-language ones and boycotts of German shops in Carniola. All three political parties were united in their reaction to the shootings, and mass support was given for monuments to the dead and the wounded, who are still honored today. Slovenes were still in the midst of dealing with the aftermath of this incident when the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina occurred on October 7th, 1908. Although this action incensed the Serbs, Turks and the Russians, Slovene intellectuals and politicians interpreted the annexation as a symbol of a pro-Yugoslav Austrian stance. They now looked to a Southern Slav union as a more plausible solution to the Slovene national question and the idea of trialism became more favorable. However, during the international crisis aftermath of the annexation, Austrian suspicion of anyone holding Serb loyalties grew, and the Empire’s paranoia shattered the Slovene confidence held up until 1908 of the future of their position in the empire with the sudden hostility that Vienna held toward all southern Slavs.

As World War I broke out, staunch supporters of Yugoslavism fled the monarchy and formed the Jugoslovanski odbor, South Slavic Committee in London, as well as

---

47 The initial confrontation began when a train carrying representatives of the Society of Cyril and Methodius, a Slovene society which raised funds and ran private Slovene schools in Carinthia and Styria, to a meeting in Styria on September 13, 1908 was denied police protection, resulting in the assault of the representatives by Germans and Pro-German Slovenes. This tension carried over to Carniola where a protest was scheduled on the 18th, which lead to anti-German rioting and the breaking of German store fronts. The military was called in to prevent further agitation; however their presence provoked even more anti-German sentiment, leading to further demonstrations and the shooting on the 20th.
several other groups abroad. Throughout the war, pro-Slav voices attempted to advocate for a south Slav nation to influence the Allied opinion, even going as far to say that the Austro-Hungarian Empire was a farce for German imperialistic expansion and that a strong Yugoslavia was needed to block the German advance to the Adriatic.

When the war ended and the new Yugoslavia was created, the Slovene nationalists at first began working towards independence within the new kingdom, as it seemed as though the different parts of the new Yugoslavia would be highly free. With the breakup of the Habsburg Empire, Austria was seen as the encompassing and becoming a German state and Yugoslavia (literally meaning South Slavia) was comprised of the Slavic peoples—Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.

**Slovene Political Parties**

Slovene politicians generally believed in Vienna’s good faith toward Slovene national aspiration, and any acts that appeared to contradict this were attributed to the pressures of German nationalism. Because of this, the majority of politicians and the parties formed their solutions to Slovene nationalism with the Empire always in mind.

The idea of trialism, or a separate unit of the Empire comprising of southern Slavs with autonomy comparable to Hungary after the 1867 Ausgleich, was the favored idea of Slovene nationalists at the turn of the 19th century.

---

50 For more information on the main Slovene political parties at this time, please reference Appendix 1—Slovene Political Parties.
**Carinthia Slovenes**

Carinthia is the southernmost province of the Republic of Austria, and has been home to both German and Slovenian ethnic groups starting in about the 5th century. Ethnic Slovenes in the Carinthian basin were mostly agricultural laborers while ethnic Germans filled the towns and urban centers. Slovene nationalism in the area grew alongside German nationalist ideas throughout the 18th century. The mixed ethnic area was brought to the international stage after World War I, with competing territory claims by Yugoslavia and Austria. A plebiscite on October 10, 1920 decided the dispute in favor of Austria, however ethnic tensions in the area are still pronounced today.

**Geography of Carinthia**

Carinthia has a length of 112 miles and a maximum width of 80 miles, bordering Italy and Slovenia to the south. The majority of the provincial borders follow the crest of mountains—the Karawanken and Carnic Alps to the south, the High Tauern in the northwest, and the Nordic/Lower Tauern in the north. In the center of these mountains, amongst the Drau and Gail rivers lies the Klagenfurt basin. In the west of this basin is Villach, a center of travel from the north and northwest, through the Tauern and Lienz, as well as southern areas of Trieste and Venice. To the east is the Wörthersee (Lake Worth) and Klagenfurt, the province’s capital. The geography of Carinthia is important to note, as it physically separated Slovenes living in the basin from those in Carniola to the south and Styria to the east. Because the Slovenes were spread across many different provinces during the Habsburg Empire, self-identity was first made as a “Carinolian” or a “Styrian,” and not as a Slovene. Indeed, Slovene intellectuals at first
referred to the Slovene language as “kranjska špraha” or the language of Carniola and not the people themselves, before the idea of a nation of Slovenes appeared.\textsuperscript{51}

Geographical Map of Carinthia\textsuperscript{52}

\textbf{Early History}

The Slovene people had lived and farmed in the Klagenfurt Basin since the 5\textsuperscript{th} century. In 811 the Holy Roman Emperor made the Drau river the border between the church lands of Salzburg and Aquileia, which is one main reason cited for the Slovene ability to better resist assimilation south of the river through the centuries.\textsuperscript{53} As early as the Middle Ages, Slovenes viewed knowledge of German as necessary to get ahead in society. In the sixteenth century wealthier Slovene families would send their male children to work and live on German farms to learn the language, as there was no public

\textsuperscript{51} Rogel, \textit{The Slovenes and Yugoslavism, 1890-1914}: 3.
\textsuperscript{52} Map taken from http://www.zonu.com/images/0x0/2011-07-04-14023/Mapa-de-Carintia.jpg
\textsuperscript{53} Barker, \textit{The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem}: 34.
school system. The split between the Slovene and German groups remained hierarchical, for if a Slovene peasant gained the education needed to rise in social standing, he entered into a German world. The business and government of the region were run by the Germans, and the only private schools were located in towns and purely in the German language. 54 A balance between the two ethnic group populations was formed in the Middle Ages and continued through the late nineteenth century, when the identified Slovene population began to wane. German nationalism is quite strong in Carinthia, following the common phenomenon “that nationality strife is especially intense in ethnic border regions. The more active Slovene nationalists became, the stronger their opposition. Indeed ever since 1848 German nationalism has been stimulated by its Slovene counterpart.” 55

The unique ritual in Carinthia of electing and installing the Duke has become something of a legend that has been interpreted since in many varying ways. The ceremony has especially been claimed as a central focus point for Slovene nationalists and cultural enthusiasts. For the installation ceremony, the new Duke of Carinthia, who was selected by the nobles and then later the emperor, would appear before the kosezi, a group of Slovene peasants, who had the right to ‘elect’ him56. This ceremony was conducted in Slovene and was last practiced in 1411. The rite took place on the Prince’s stone, formerly at the foot of the Karnburg now located in the Klagenfurt Museum, and not at the Ducal Chair near Maria Saal as previously widely thought. The Chair did play a

54 Ibid., 51.
55 Ibid., 81.
56 Ibid., 40.
role after the ceremony as the official seat of the ‘judge of the land.’\textsuperscript{57} Both the Prince’s Stone and the Ducal Chair became important symbols in the Slovene movement.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ducal_Chat.png}
\caption{Ducal Chair\textsuperscript{58}}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
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\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Prince's_Stone.png}
\caption{Prince’s Stone\textsuperscript{59}}
\end{figure}

18\textsuperscript{th} Century- 1914

The reigns of Maria Theresa and Joseph II enacted many reforms, and the end of the serf system aided population in increasing literacy, making the spreading of ideas easier for the Slovene population.\textsuperscript{60} The Catholic Church inadvertently aided in the spread of nationalism as it pushed Slovene literacy and literature for its constituents to spread religious ideals and many nationalistic clergy spread ideas of the nation to their congregations. A constituent assembly met in Vienna on July 22, 1849 to discuss new structures for the state, and one proposal in particular from Bohemian Germans met resistance from the Carinthian delegates. The proposal was to revise provincial borders and replace them with circuits established on a national basis, similar to the French départements. The Carinthian Diet protested the move, with the support of Slovene

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 41.
\textsuperscript{58} Milko Kos, \textit{Zgodovina slovencev; od naselitve do reformacije} (Ljubljana: Jugoslovanska knjigarna, 1933), 33.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{60} Barker, \textit{The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem}: 53.
\end{footnotes}
delegates, proclaiming Carinthia as an “invisible duchy.” After many attempts, Andrej Einspieler, a pro-Slovene activist, was elected in 1863 to the Carinthian Diet as the deputy from Völkermarkt and introduced three proposals, which quickly resulted in his arrest for being disloyal to the government. His three proposals were: “that the diet protocol also be kept in Slovene; that employees of provincial hospitals have a thorough knowledge of Slovene; and that there be a certain number of people in the provincial administration with a knowledge of Slovene.”

The utraquistic school system set up in 1872 remained in effect basically until 1959. Under this system, the town administrations and local school councils were to decide on the language of instruction, and as these positions were held by the German elite, the vast majority of school systems in Carinthia decided on instruction solely in German or with a carefully approved system using limited Slovene instruction. Jezersko was the only area that chose instruction purely in Slovene, and this area was ceded to Yugoslavia in 1919. Advocates of Slovene language instruction petitioned and protested the right to have instruction in the Slovene language, and in an 1891 November decree the rules of school instruction were set much more concretely, leaving less to the whims of the local officials. School instruction in utraquistic schools was to begin in Slovene but accompanied by German, with German becoming the primary language of instruction by

---

62 Barker, The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem: 68.
the third year. Slovene, as a compulsory subject from year three onward, was raised from two to three hours of weekly instruction.\textsuperscript{63}

As tensions between ethnic Slovenes and Germans in Carinthia and neighboring Styria rose throughout the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, many academic pursuits were undertaken in order to highlight differences between the ethnic groups. The ‘Anthropologist Gesellschaft zu Graz’ studied over 10,000 Styrian students in 1878 to try and to establish connections between mother language and phenotype using the colorings of hair, skin, and eyes. The results did not produce decisive differences between the German and Slovene students, leading the researchers to conclude that large portions of the German population were of Slavic descent.\textsuperscript{64} German nationalist Richard Foregger, in response to the success of Slovene parties in the 1890s, wrote a pamphlet that denied a separate Slovene culture or history of their own.\textsuperscript{65} This is one of the first uses of German nationalistic views entering into ‘academic’ dialogues. Ten years later the statistician Richard Pfaundler commented again on the Slovene population in Styria, writing of the industrial lag in Slovene areas, a “lower cultural level,” higher fertility rates and assimilation levels.\textsuperscript{66} Around the same time that Pfaundler was working with the Slovene population in Styria, German Martin Wutte was evaluating the Carinthia censuses regarding the Slovenes and concluded similar results. Later Wutte, in his popular \textit{Deutsch-Windisch-Slowenisch} pamphlet, asserted that the Carinthian Slovenian

\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{64} Christian Promitzer, “The South Slavs in the Austrian Imagination: Serbs ans Slovenes in the Changing View from German Nationalism to National Socialism,” in \textit{Creating the other: ethnic conflict and nationalism in Habsburg Central Europe}, ed. Nancy M. Wingfield (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003), 191. (64.2\% of Slovene and 61.5\% of German students had light eye color)
\textsuperscript{65} Ibid., 188-89.
\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., 189.
dialect differed from Standard Slovene and other dialects, making it difficult-to-impossible for Carinthian Slovenes to understand speakers of a different variety. This plus the geographical separation from the main Slovene population meant that a “natural” assimilation was in progress in Carinthia.\textsuperscript{67} One Viennese geographer, Erwin Hanslik, even suggested that the “German-Slavic linguistic frontier...was a cultural boundary between civilization and back-wardness.”\textsuperscript{68}

The increasing propaganda activity of the Slovenes worried German nationalists. When word leaked about a large pilgrimage planned by the Slovene Nationalists to Maria Saal and the Ducal Chair in response to an April 1914 “Carinthian Day” stressing “unity” and “understanding” between Germans and Slovenes\textsuperscript{69}, the Germans and pro-German Slovenes gathered around the chair to prevent the pilgrims from accessing it.

\textbf{The Aftermath of World War One}

As the War came to a close, German nationalists began to appear in Carinthia to protect food and weapon supplies from the moving Italian army and to hold their positions against the forming Slovene militants.\textsuperscript{70} Complicating the German attempt to protect stores and maintain positions was the intermingling of Serbian soldiers among the Slovene fighters, and the Austrian government in Vienna did not want to risk firing upon them after the armistice. Throughout the various meetings between the Yugoslavs and Austria, the new Yugoslavia seemed to think that they had the support and backing

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 196.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 190.
\textsuperscript{70} Barker, \textit{The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem}: 97-98.
of both the Serbs and Allied forces, and insisted that all land with “blood” ties become part of their new state, while the German Carinthians suggested a plebiscite.\footnote{Ibid., 101.}

Throughout the talks the Carinthian Germans insisted that they were only going to allow Yugoslav occupation in the previous agreement with the Drau River marking the boundary, which led to a period of armed conflict in Carinthia from December 15 through January 1919. Negotiations resumed in Graz on January 14 and ended with the placement of two American soldiers to act as ‘umpires.’ Lieutenant Colonel Sherman Miles and Lieutenant Leroy King were to visit the area in question and try to determine the wishes of the peoples living there. This was agreed on by both sides, and included a temporary cease-fire roughly along the Drau river. The American soldiers took on the role without first asking for permission from the American forces, but they and their direct superior, Archibald Cary Coolidge, felt that the mission was necessary and that lives would be saved. A Carinthian novelist described the mission of the Americans as such:

“For days they journey through the province, not hesitating to enter village paths, upon which the mud is frozen. They halt slow-moving peasant carts, question farmer and hired hand, converse with individual pedestrians in the lonely countryside of the Sattnitz/Gure Hills as well as in more thickly settled villages. They steer their way to isolated farmsteads as well as to more populated centers, talk with peasants and fieldworkers and even children. The Americans announce nowhere themselves in advance. They are expected in the east and turn up in the west...”\footnote{Ibid., 104.}
After two weeks of research on the ground, the “Miles mission” submitted its report to Coolidge, concluding that Carinthia should not be separated as it was a ‘natural unit.’

Coolidge sent the report onward to Paris, and heard nothing back for four weeks, as the Americans tried to cover up his unilateral act without consultation of the British or French. The report was not published; however it did serve as background information for the American delegates later in the discussions of the future of the area. The debate over Carinthia continued until on June 5, 1920, the final plans for a plebiscite were unveiled.

Disputed land was split into zone A and zone B, with Zone A next to Yugoslav land and Zone B further inland. If zone A voted to remain in Austria, both zones A and B would remain. If zone A voted for Yugoslavia, a second vote would occur three weeks later in zone B to determine its fate. The Carinthian plebiscite was set to take place on Sunday, October 10th, 1920.

Map showing the Plebiscite Area in Carinthia

---

73 Ibid., 105.
74 For more information on the debate proceedings, reference the Annex 2- Deciding on and Undertaking the October 10, 1920 Plebiscite
Deciding and Undertaking the October 10, 1920 Plebiscite

While the debates over the plebiscite raged in Paris, preparations on the ground were being made in Carinthia by both sides, with Yugoslavia having a head start as much of the land was occupied by their armies. To try and show that zone A would receive special treatment in a Yugoslav state, special road and school projects were undertaken. The zone was also sealed off from the rest of the basin, in an attempt to prevent Austrian propaganda from entering.  

The Carinthian Germans used propaganda that fit into four categories—emphasizing the economic relationship of the whole basin; the cultural unity of the area (with the slogan “Kärnten frei und ungeteilt“(Carinthia free and undivided) which remains to this day as the province’s official motto); portraying Yugoslavia as backwards and dictatorial; and German nationalism, used with discretion. The German nationalists took advantage and exploited the divide between Carinthian Slovenes, or the “Windish,” and their southern brethren. The main Yugoslav propaganda pieces were aimed at different points—namely that Austrians had and continued to subject the Slovenes; Yugoslavia was the “national liberator” and Slovenes in Carinthia were of the same blood; Austria was now poor while Yugoslavia prospered; and that the Yugoslav army would remain in the area regardless of the plebiscite outcome.

---

78 Barker, The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem: 153. Also see Appendix 3- Propoganda
On the day of October 10, sermons were prohibited in the daily mass to avoid last-minute appeals by the clergy. The voting itself took place fairly quietly, with an English observer noting that “the two parties were too evenly matched and too frightened of each other to do any damage.”79 When the polls closed at 6:00 pm, the ballots were collected and began to be counted with representatives from both Austria and Yugoslavia present, and the results were accepted without protest.80 The Austrian victory caused outrage in Ljubljana, and they accused Belgrade of not being sympathetic to their Slovene brothers when they refused to question the validity of the plebiscite. The results showed that Carinthian Slovenes had failed as a whole entity to adapt a sense of national unity, which led to the failure of Yugoslavia in the polls. Thomas Barker, who has studied the Slovene minority in Carinthia at length, concludes, “with respect to the plebiscite, the south Slavs showed poor judgment. Had they settled for a zone A limited to the region south of the Drau (minus the Völkermarkt region) they would have acquired it.”81 The Slovenes decision can also be attributed to the practical matter that the majority of Slovenes were farmers, and joining Yugoslavia would cut them off from nearby markets.

**Interwar Period**

Article 19 of the Basic State Law Regarding the General Rights of Citizens of the 1867 constitution became Article 149 under the 1920 Federal constitution, and affirmed “equal rights of all peoples of the state as well as their right to the preservation and
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81 Ibid., 143.
cultivation of their national identity and mother tongue”\(^82\) and equal rights of languages in the public sphere. However this second part was in effect canceled out by Article 8, which stated “the German language is the language of the state without affecting adversely the rights conceded by federal law to the linguistic minorities.”\(^83\) Carinthian Slovene nationalists needed to regroup, as they lost support from Slovenia and the border between them was now international and not merely provincial. Slovene national politics remained devoutly ‘catholic’, meaning that Slovene workers still found their political needs best met with the Social Democrats and Slovene business owners and prosperous farmers were best served politically by the German liberals.\(^84\)

One of the main controversies in the inter-war period was the presence and role of the Heimatbund in Carinthia. The association originated as a propaganda bureau, and enlisted scholars to redefine ‘Windisch’ to propagate the idea that Slovenes in Carinthia were a mixed people belonging within a larger German cultural family. The Heimatbund also worked with the Kärntner Bodenvermittlungsstelle in buying land from Slovenes and resettling ethnic Germans on the land. In 1933 and 1934 the national government also sent money to this end, at first 100,000 schillings and later 200,000 marks.\(^85\) The school system was another issue of controversy, as private Slovene schools were closed in 1921, and when reopened they did not have enough pupils to keep them open. The number of ultraquistic schools was reduced from their pre-war number, and a lack of

\(^82\) Ibid., 172-73.  
\(^83\) Ibid., 173.  
\(^84\) Ibid., 176.  
qualified Slovene teachers exacerbated this issue. Slovene language requirements were reduced and made elective instead of compulsory, and many poorer areas agreed to instruction only in German in exchange for new schools.

After the Anschluss, the Nazi administration did not immediately disrupt the Slovenes in Carinthia, making only a handful of arrests, perhaps hoping for Slovene support in the Hitler plebiscite. The Nazi putsch in July 1934 entertained the most support in Carinthia out of all Austria. Through the end of the year, the majority of Slovene officials were removed from office or forced to sever ties with their ethnic brothers, cultural gatherings were banned, and the Gestapo procured membership records of the Slovene Cultural Association. Schools became entirely German-speaking, all children were enrolled in Nazi organizations, and the use of Slovene was prohibited in both public and private spheres. Carinthia became a vacation destination for German youth organizations, and ethnic Germans were imported as Slovene workers were sent to work in the old Reich. Official resettlement policies began in 1942, the largest of which occurred on April 14 and 15, 1942 with the forceful removal of 171 Slovene families. Supposedly areas in southern Russia were designated for the Carinthian Slovenes, but this move was never realized with the turning of the war.

---


against the Germans. As the outcome of the war looked increasingly negative, violent actions against Slovenes increased in Carinthia.

Post-World War II

At the end of the war, Yugoslavia and Austria found themselves again putting forth territory claims before the Allied victors. Finally, in a meeting of foreign ministers in July 1949 ended agreement on Article 5 of the peace treaty, which restored Austria to its borders of 1938 and outraged the Yugoslav delegation.\[^{90}\] While Articles 5-7 of the treaty dealt with the issue of minorities in Austria, they were vague and unspecific as to what exactly constituted a minority, and therefore did not provide enough support for minority rights. At this point in time, even the most nationalist Slovenes would have opted to remain in Austria for economic and political reasons in comparison to Tito’s Yugoslavia. Great Britain occupied Carinthia and executed a wide swept de-nazification program. In 1945 the provisional Carinthian government reestablished ultraquistic schools and required all teachers and principals to have “necessary knowledge of Slovene.”\[^{91}\] Each ethnic group within the bilingual area was required to learn the language of the other.

1948 not only marked the reorganization of the Slovene nationalists, but the reemergence of the 350,000 former Nazis who had regained the right to vote.\[^{92}\] The VdU party emerged and was composed of German nationalists and former National

\[^{90}\] Tito at first refused to formally accept the decision, but by April 27, 1950 he declared, “The government of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia notes that the relations with our neighbor Austria are becoming more and more normal, for there is important economic cooperation which will doubtless contribute to good neighborly understanding.” Barker, *The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem*: 213. Werner Markert, *Jugoslawien* (Köln: Böhlau, 1954). 167.


\[^{92}\] Ibid., 221.
Socialists, and polled strongest in Carinthia. The party attacked the new school ordinances of 1945, but lost support over the following decade and continued to poll low. The Landsmannschaft in Klagenfurt was entrusted with protecting and propagating the Carinthian folk traditions, a strong tool for the German nationalists. A push for October 10th to be recognized as an official provincial holiday was not and continues to not be entirely accepted for economic reasons, but it is a school holiday throughout the province and celebrated with much pomp and circumstance. In 1958 the Governor of Carinthia, in response to the increasing pressure of German nationalists, issued an edict that allowed parents to petition for their children to be withdrawn from bilingual education.93

Despite the educational setbacks of the 1958 decree, the “strong motivation of the national-minded Slovenes is evident in the fact that per capita they have more of their progeny receiving academically-oriented secondary education than an equivalent number of German-speaking Austrians” during the 1960s and 70s.94 The Slovene nationalist group and journal Mladje tried and succeeded to expand their audience base by sponsoring lectures, exhibitions, discussions and readings throughout the province, with increased emphasis on bilingual presentations.95 Growing support or sympathy for the Slovene cause can be seen among the leftists, academics, and Austrian universities. A 1975 ORF special entitled “Strangers in Their Native Land” focusing on Slovenes in Carinthia elicited much protest and hate mail, especially from residents of Carinthia.

93 Ibid., 234.
94 Ibid., 250.
95 Ibid., 253.
There is a paradox facing the Slovene population; assimilation is expected of those who relocate into the urban economic centers for economic opportunities and prosperity; and yet to be able to firmly retain one’s culture and language they must choose to remain in the underdeveloped ‘backwoods’ of Carinthia.\(^{96}\)

The Carinthian Diet passed the “Law on Town Markers” on July 6, 1972 calling for bilingual signs in areas with at least a 20% professed Slovene population,\(^ {97}\) however this law fell far short of fulfilling Article 7 of the treaty, as it covered only a quarter of the bilingual area outlined in the Article. The implementation of this policy fell during the month prior to the nationalist celebration of October 10, and when only 36 such markers had been constructed neo-Nazis and right-wing radicals effectively destroyed all such signs and harassed the law makers who had enacted the law.\(^ {98}\) In 1976 there was a ‘census of a special kind’ to determine the percentage of minority groups throughout the entirety of Austria, and only in areas with a 25% minority population were bilingual signage and the official use of a language other than German to be established.\(^ {99}\) Several nationalist statues and museums opened and were dedicated in the period leading up to the census, and many of these were protested by Slovenes and sympathetic Austrians. In 1977 the erection of town markers in small hamlets and backwood villages caused a split in Carinthia; Slovenes felt that their wishes were ignored completely while German nationalists quibbled within their ranks and split into factions of “moderate and “radical” with some upset at the erection of any bilingual


\(^{97}\) Barker, *The Slovenes of Carinthia a national minority problem*: 278.
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signage.\textsuperscript{100} This debate continues to this day, as evidenced by an April 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2012 editorial saying that Article 7 still has not been fulfilled “either in the meaning or in the letter” of the law with the newly-erected 164 bilingual traffic signs.\textsuperscript{101}

**Slovene Conclusion**

The location of the Slovene population put its formation as a cohesive nation at a disadvantage, as the peoples were spread across various provinces in the Habsburg Empire and became united through the standardization of the Slovene language only in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Slovenia’s location also remained problematic as the Slovene early desire to unite with southern Slavs was not warmly welcomed by the Croats and Serbs, who viewed Slovenia as too “Germanized.”\textsuperscript{102}

The location of Slovenia called into question their internal and external boundaries as well as the boundaries of the German interests. As Slovenia is situated on the “cultural frontier marking the German ‘core lands’ of Central Europe,”\textsuperscript{103} Slovenia found itself within both the national and imperial interests of the German elite for much of its history. A bank note depiction of the Carinthian Furstenstein by the newly independent Republic of Slovenia in 1991 caused the Carinthian Landtag to send an official complaint to Slovenia ‘against the ‘abuse’ of a solely Carinthian symbol.’\textsuperscript{104} This argument was settled quickly and the stone is now a

\textsuperscript{100} Ibid., 297.
\textsuperscript{102} Location still remains an issue for Slovenia, who, along with Croatia, have staunchly categorized themselves as Central Europeans while other label them as in the Balkans. Back up this claim, Slovenia and Croatia declined to attend the first Balkan summit held in November 1997, as they do not consider themselves Balkans. Wingfield 12
\textsuperscript{103} Promitzer, "The South Slavs in the Austrian Imagination: Serbs ans Slovenes in the Changing View from German Nationalism to National Socialism," 185.
symbol of friendship between the two governments. An argument over a symbol from the Middle Ages highlights the ongoing tension as both Slovenes and Carinthians maneuver to form their separate identities.

**Burgenland**

The province of Burgenland is Austria’s easternmost province and was taken from Hungary and given to Austria in 1921 by the Allied forces in accord with the attempts to draw state borders that mimicked ethnic ones. The area was 75% German, and except for the city of Sopron which remained in Hungary, the majority of citizens voted for Austria in the plebiscite.\(^{105}\) Similar to the Slovene case, the vast majority of Hungarian speakers in this area were farmers and former peasants, and remained with their land when Burgenland was given to Austria, while most Hungarian intellectuals and middle-class citizens left for Hungary. There is also a sizeable Croat and Roma population in the province.

Burgenland differs from the situation in South Tirol in that Hungarian, Croat, and Roma people make up the minority in Burgenland, and from Carinthia and South Tyrol in that there was no major nationalist or pan-German movement in the province. The use of Hungarian and Croatian in the church and religious schools continued and was lawful after annexation in 1921, however Austria pushed the use of German in public schools and government bureaus, so minority families either had to pay for education in their

native tongue or switch to a German education system.\textsuperscript{106} After the Anschluss, the Hungarian and Croat populations were assimilated while the Roma and Jewish population were relocated, with a majority not returning after the Second World War.

In the 1955 treaty, the rights of minorities did not change much in Burgenland, as Hungarians and Roma were not even mentioned, and although the rights of Croats were written into law did not mean that they were enforced. Bilingual primary schools and kindergartens were reduced instead of increased, multilingual signs and laws have never been produced in Burgenland. Only in 1976 were Hungarians lawfully recognized as an ethnic group in Austria, and the Roma still have yet to be recognized as an official group.\textsuperscript{107}

\textbf{South Tyrol}

South Tyrol presents an interesting flipside to the Austrian stance on minorities. The area was ceded to the Italians in 1918 as part of a secret agreement for their entering their war on the Allied side, despite the fact that the area itself had never been occupied by foreign troops throughout the war’s entirety. In the last National Assembly in Vienna with South Tyrolean representatives present, the last speech made by South Tyrol representative Eduard Reut-Nicolussi he exclaimed passionately “In South Tyrol, a desperate struggle will now begin for each farm, each townhouse, each vineyard. This will be a struggle utilizing all the weapons of the mind and all the means of politics. And

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
it will be a desperate struggle because we—a quarter of a million Germans—are being pitted against 40 million Italians in what is truly not a battle of equals.\textsuperscript{108}

Italy highly promoted relocation of Italians and movement of Italian workers into the province to increase the Italian population. Italianization of the schools was prevalent, by 1928, Italian was the only language of instruction and in only 30 out of 760 classes was German even offered as an elective subject.\textsuperscript{109} An Austrian memorial to troops who fell in World War one was demolished in order to erect the controversial ‘Victory Monument’ to showcase not only Italian victory over their enemies in war, but also the victory of the Italianization of the Province.\textsuperscript{110} With the new alliance in 1939 between Mussolini and Hitler, many in South Tyrol hoped to be returned ‘home to the Reich,’ yet this anticipation was not fulfilled, and the agreement led to the harshest blow to the German minority with the introduced “Option.” South Tyroleans could either choose German citizenship and resettlement, or stay in their homeland and accept Italian citizenship and rule. Over 80 percent chose to leave and be resettled elsewhere, and although some migrated back at the end of the war, it was still a huge blow to the German population of the province.

With the interwar tension between the mixed German and Italian population, post-World War II the Allied victors pressured Italy to name the area an autonomous region. Italy joined the province with its southern neighbor Trient, so the ethnic Germans were in the minority of the new ‘autonomous’ province and had no chance to

\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 26.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., 35.
accede to the self-governance proclaimed by the Italian government. Throughout the 1950s and 60s there were many attempts of negotiations between the Austrian and Italian governments that were never completed satisfactorily, and terrorist acts became a common occurrence. On June 28, 1960 Austria formally brought the issue before the UN General Assembly, and the Assembly voted that the two countries should resume negotiations to settle the dispute, and that if these were not made in a reasonable time the countries could use ‘peaceful means’ as outlined in the UN Charter. Implementation of the 1969 “Package” continued through the next two decades, until Austria in May 1992 delivered a resolution of conflict before the UN with the government’s approval and acceptance of all implementations for autonomy and ethnic rights protection being successfully installed in the province of South Tyrol by the Italian government.

Bruno Kreisky speaking before the UN General Assembly in 1960 bringing up the South Tyrol minority issue. The Assembly called for Italy and Austria to settle their dispute.\(^\text{111}\)

\(^{111}\) Ibid., 122.
Chapter Conclusion

Populations in Burgenland, Carinthia, and South Tyrol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burgenland (total)</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>Hungarians</th>
<th>Carinthia (total)</th>
<th>Slovenes</th>
<th>South Tyrol (total)</th>
<th>Germans</th>
<th>Italians</th>
<th>Ladins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>285,698</td>
<td>42,011</td>
<td>15,254</td>
<td>371,227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>254,735*</td>
<td>193,271</td>
<td>27,048*</td>
<td>9,910*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>299,447</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>10,422</td>
<td>405,129</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>232,717</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>287,866</td>
<td>10,599</td>
<td>5,251</td>
<td>474,764</td>
<td>22,367</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>271,001</td>
<td>28,126</td>
<td>5,642</td>
<td>495,226</td>
<td>14,001</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260,351</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>272,319</td>
<td>24,126</td>
<td>5,673</td>
<td>526,759</td>
<td>17,014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>279,544</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>269,771</td>
<td>18,762</td>
<td>4,147</td>
<td>536,179</td>
<td>17,095</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>287,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>272,319</td>
<td>19,460</td>
<td>6,763</td>
<td>547,798</td>
<td>16,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>296,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>270,880</td>
<td>18,778</td>
<td>6,641</td>
<td>559,404</td>
<td>14,010</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for South Tyrol is from 1921

Populations in Burgenland, Carinthia, and South Tyrol as Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Burgenland (total)</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>Hungarians</th>
<th>Carinthia (total)</th>
<th>Slovenes</th>
<th>South Tyrol (total)</th>
<th>Germans</th>
<th>Italians</th>
<th>Ladins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>10.6*</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for South Tyrol is from 1921

Using the case study of the Carinthian Slovenes, it is easy to see how two ethnic groups in close proximity to each other often have a heightened sense of nation, however

---

113 Ibid.
in this example on the side of the Germans the national identity was equaled to the provincial identity of a united Carinthia. Burgenland provides another example showcasing the handling, or mishandling, of minority groups living within Austrian territory. In the official attempts to push German culture and language throughout the new country, the state was attempting to create a sense of shared unity, one that minority groups with their differing identities would threaten. In fact, with the 1992 end of conflict resolution with Italy over South Tyrol, the Austrian government had insisted upon the implementation and enforcement of the same regulations for the German minority that Austria herself reduced and denied for the minority groups within the state. The developing Austrian identity made room to accept ethnic Germans falling outside its territory with refusing to accommodate Austrian citizens with different ethnic heritage.

The existence and then later collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was problematic for the development of the Austrian nation. Robert Musil, an Austrian writer born in Klagenfurt, described the problems of identity with the Empire in his last novel, *The Man Without Qualities*.

“It did not consist of an Austrian part and Hungarian part that, as one might expect, complemented each other, but of a whole and a part; that is, of a Hungarian and an Austro-Hungarian sense of statehood, the latter to be found in Austria, which in a sense left the Austrian sense of statehood with no country of its own. The Austrian existed only in Hungary, and there as an object of distaste; at home he called himself a national of the kingdom and lands of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy as represented in the Imperial Council, meaning that he was an Austrian plus a Hungarian minus that Hungarian...”

---

The development of smaller ethnic nations throughout the Empire, here using the Hungarian example and earlier the Slovene example, complicates the identity of one who is from Austria. This problem is further exacerbated post-World War I, as Austria is left on her own to try and forge a new identity without her surrounding Empire. This proves a difficult question that the new Austrian state attempts to ignore as they muddle through the 20th century.
Chapter 5- Period of ‘Muddling Through’

After World War I and II, the Republic of Austria had to find a new way to operate in the world system. Austria clung to idea of German identity to assert its own right to exist and was unable to create a new identity and sense of nationhood. The structure of the government and even the political parties themselves are remnants of an old system, and the government design balancing power between the main political parties after World War II is to avoid having to ask difficult questions of identity. The Reder and Waldheim Affairs forced Austria to confront her past that they had tried to ignore. Joining the European Union was a way for Austria to avoid having to come to terms with its own identity and gain an overarching European identity. This also allowed Austria to accommodate the minorities within her borders and keep the state together.

Structure of the Austrian Federal Government

The constitution of the Second Republic of Austria was based on the old constitution of 1920 with the amendments from 1929. Austria is a federal state with two chambers in Parliament, the Lower House (Nationalrat) and the Upper House (Bundesrat). The Nationalrat has 183 directly elected members based on proportional representation every four years. There are two sessions each year, spring and autumn, which must last a total of at least 6 months. There are three presidents who open and close individual sessions and take turns chairing debates. The Presidents also form the agenda and business of the Nationalrat. For special ‘constitutional laws;’ there needs to
be a two-thirds majority with at least half the members present. Legislative proposals are mainly initiated by the federal government, but individual members also share this right.

The Bundesrat is composed of fifty-eight members indirectly elected by the nine state governments, and represent their state to the federal government. Each state sends representatives according to their proportion of the total Austrian population, although each state is guaranteed a minimum of three seats. Also, at least one seat of each state must go to the second largest political party in that state. The chair of the Bundesrat rotates every six months alphabetically through the states, and the chairman loses voting rights for the duration of his/her chairmanship. The Bundesrat has been accused of representing the interests of the parties rather than the states, and reform calls have been made to remedy the situation. The Bundesrat can submit legislation for consideration to the Nationalrat, but is relatively weak, for if at least half of the Nationalrat votes in favor of a bill, that bill becomes law without any input by the Bundesrat.

The Federal President of Austria is decided by a direct popular vote every six years, and one is eligible for re-election for one term. The President must be elected by more than half of all votes, if no majority is found, the top two parties have a run-off election and can replace their original candidate if desired. The duties are mainly ceremonial, although he is the official head of state and represents Austria abroad. He ceremonially appoints the Federal Chancellor based on national elections and members

of government on recommendation of the Chancellor. Even his official duties require a second signature by the Chancellor or a federal minister.\textsuperscript{116} The Federal Chancellor is the head of the government, and his election parallels the strength of the parties in the Nationalrat. He is in charge of recommending and dismissing members of his government and all retains all duties not specifically ascribed to the Federal President.

**Austrian’s People’s Party, ÖVP, and the Social Democratic Party of Austria, SPÖ**

The Austrian People’s Party of Austria, ÖVP, is the conservative, Christian party in Austria, the successor to the earlier Christian Social Party of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. The ÖVP platform includes maintaining social order and respecting traditions, it is not interested in strengthening the somewhat separation of church and state in Austria. Along those lines, the party is not in favor of affirmative action legislation, or legislation of LGBT rights. The party is self-defined as Catholic, anti-Marxist and anti-socialist, and its base of support includes business owners, white-collar workers, and farmers.

Conversely, the Social Democratic Party of Austria, SPÖ, has kept its socialist roots and is the descendant of the prior Social Democratic Worker’s Party of Austria. The SPÖ has ties with the trade unions, the Austrian Chamber of Labor, and has a large blue-collar support base.

**Reder and Waldheim Affairs**

In the early 1980s, the SPÖ found themselves in a coalition with the (then more liberal) FPÖ, and the opposition ÖVP tried to highlight the ideological rifts between

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid., 12.
these two parties whenever possible. In January 1985, the FPÖ gave a wide opening to the ÖVP when the FPÖ Federal Defense Minister, Friedhelm Frischenslager, official welcomed the return of Walter Reder. Reder was a convicted Nazi war criminal returning to Austria after thirty years in an Italian prison. The ÖVP used this occasion to force the FPÖ to return to emphasizing its nationalist aspects, as the more liberal the party was the more of a threat it was to the constituents of the ÖVP. This gave an opening to the more far-right members of the FPÖ, and Jörg Haider joined in the debate, saying “If you are going to speak about war crimes you should admit that such crimes were committed by all sides.”117 Haider also commented that “Walter Reder was a soldier like hundreds of thousands of others. He performed his duty as demanded by the soldiers’ oath... All our fathers could have met the same fate.”118 This marked the beginning of the Austrian media’s and people’s obsession and thorough coverage on the political newcomer Haider. The affair forced Austria to reflect on its wartime past and pushed the issue into the public political sphere.

Just a year later, Austria was again forced to confront and defend its past on an international scale when accusations that Federal Presidential candidate and two-term UN General Secretary Kurt Waldheim had concealed details of his association with the Nazis. International boycott threats and accusations against Waldheim caused the ÖVP’s campaign to shift to be highly ethnocentric and xenophobic. The election slogan became


“We Austrians elect whomever we want”\textsuperscript{119} and anti-Semitism grew, especially when speaking about the World Jewish Congress. Waldheim vehemently proclaimed his innocence of such involvement, and the investigation by the Austrian government found no proof of wrong doing by Waldheim. Haider supported Waldheim in the elections, which put him at odds against the liberal FPÖ leadership.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{der_spiegel}
\includegraphics[width=0.45\textwidth]{kronenzeitung}
\caption{Cover of \textit{Der Spiegel} showing the 1988 Waldheim Affair\textsuperscript{120} and Cover of the \textit{Kronen Zeitung} after the Austrian Referendum to join the EU\textsuperscript{121}}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Joining the EU}

After 1945, the Austrian government focused on cultivating its ‘victim’ status and distancing itself from Germany, preferring Austrian nationalism over the old pan-Germanism ideals. In the negotiations following 1945, Austria agreed to ‘permanent neutrality’ as a condition of their peace treaty in order to have the Soviet Union agree to

\begin{footnotesize}
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\item Ellinas, \textit{The media and the far right in western Europe : playing the nationalist card}: 52.
\item Ibid., 295.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
withdraw their occupying troops. This neutrality has been interpreted differently both in domestic and international policies, but it did not impede Austria’s inclusion in the United Nations (1955) or the Council of Europe (1956), so the ‘permanent’ neutrality did not need to exactly mimic the Swiss model.  

Austria applied for EU membership on July 17, 1989 and began negotiations alongside Sweden and Finland in Brussels in February, 1993 which were completed a little more than a year later, in March 1994. The aspect of ‘permanent’ neutrality caused concern when Austria first applied to join the EU. After many negotiations with Brussels, Austria reduced its concept of neutrality to simply the ‘military core’ to comply with Article J(8)2 of the European Union Treaty needing unanimity on joint action for the common defense policy.  

It was also declared that Austria would not work towards a defense community or binding foreign policy with majority decision making in the future.  

There were other domestic government structures which would need to be adapted to comply with EU membership. Three main problems included “how to coordinate the governmental policy-making process; how to involve the regions in it; and how to secure parliamentary scrutiny of government policy within the Union.”

---

European policy is now organized through the Federal Chancellery (under the control of the SPÖ) and the Foreign Ministry (under control of the ÖVP). Also, the government meets once a week to discuss Austrian positions in preparation for the next meeting of the Council of the EU. The parliament’s main commission is informed of all initiatives with the Union. With the huge amount of information that the commission receives, it is only able to respond to a small majority of ‘important’ issues. To highlight the amount of paperwork that is put in front of this commission, 37,642 EU projects from 1996-1997 were delivered to the main commission, who dealt only with 106 of them and made 11 statements.\textsuperscript{126} The constitution binds the federal government to inform a province of all EU matters “which affect their independent sphere of action or may otherwise be of interest to them.”\textsuperscript{127} The province then provides an opinion to the government, and if the government diverges from the province’s provided guidance they must explain their decision in eight weeks. The involvement of each individual province in the federal government was not a new precedent. A liaison office in Vienna was created in 1951 for the Austrian provinces and the conference of the Governors meets twice annually to discussion positions and advise/influence federal law.\textsuperscript{128} In 1974 each province was given the ability to sign its own treaties with neighboring states on issues that impacted their autonomous competition.\textsuperscript{129} So the involvement of each province in EU matters pertaining to it continued the pattern of state-federal balance, and did not disturb it.

\textsuperscript{126} Wessels, Andreas Maurer, and Jürgen Mittag (Manchester, UK ;: Manchester University Press ;: 2003), 340.

\textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 344.

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Austrian foreign policy in historical context}: 188.

\textsuperscript{129} Ibid., 188-89.
A national referendum was held on June 12, 1994 to approve the constitutional changes needed to accede to the EU. The date of the July 12 referendum was chosen to be before the national elections in October, to separate a likely protest vote of the government in connection with ascension to the EU. All political parties aside from the FPÖ were in favor of the ratification. Propaganda for the referendum on both sides quickly degenerated into scare tactics. Leading the voice against the EU was Haider and the FPÖ, with stories predicting mass immigration, job loss, and Mafia-like corruption. There were even reports circulating that imported chocolate made from blood and yoghurt infested with lice were plausible occurrences if Austria joined the EU. The government retaliated against these stories highlighting potential currency crises, higher taxes and unemployment if the EU was not joined.

Results of the June 12, 1994 Austrian Referendum on EU membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Turnout votes</th>
<th>Turnout %</th>
<th>Yes Votes</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No votes</th>
<th>No %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>199,099</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>146,947</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>50,062</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiermark</td>
<td>722,531</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>493,308</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>224,902</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kärnten</td>
<td>339,455</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>228,461</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>107,417</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Österreich</td>
<td>999,738</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>670,303</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>318,405</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorarlberg</td>
<td>175,603</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>115,883</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>58,754</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>810,473</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>529,384</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>274,721</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-Österreich</td>
<td>823,839</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>532,929</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>282,687</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>282,161</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>181,790</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>98,310</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirol</td>
<td>348,402</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>195,483</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>150,970</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td>4,705,297</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>3,095,260</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>1,556,779</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Votes</td>
<td>64,155</td>
<td></td>
<td>51,484</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,769,452</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,145,981</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>1,578,850</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The provinces recording higher-than-average ‘yes’ votes were Burgenland, Carinthia, Styria, and Lower Austria, all provinces that shared borders with central and eastern Europe.\textsuperscript{133} All provinces recorded a majority ‘yes’-vote, even in Tyrol where the majority of negative environmental aspects were feared to occur. Austrian economic woes throughout the 1980s was a major cause leading to the vast support to join the EU, as the economy was basically entirely dependent on foreign trade, which would significantly benefit as an EU member.\textsuperscript{134}

Austria had several issues and points of contention during the process of joining the EU. Austria placed a high value on environmental issues, although as it was joining the EU alongside Norway and Finland so an acceptable outcome during negotiations was likely. The EU was aware of the highly sensitive political issue that the environmental issues possessed and wanted to reach an outcome in negotiations so that a referendum was not needed.\textsuperscript{135} Along the same lines of environmental concerns was transit through Tyrol. Due to geography and Swiss restrictions, transit from North to South through Tyrol grew at an alarming rate, (around 22% per year form 1967-1980)\textsuperscript{136} and joining the EU would be sure to enhance transit. Austria wanted to limit the number of trucks and have some control of the emissions that affected high tourist and agricultural areas.

\textsuperscript{133} The 1995 enlargement of the European Union: 71.
\textsuperscript{134} Heinisch, "Austria: Confronting Controversy," 271.
\textsuperscript{135} The 1995 enlargement of the European Union: 66.
\textsuperscript{136} "Austria: Confronting Controversy," 275.
Private property rights also concerned Austria, who feared outsiders buying up second houses creating land shortage for Austria. They also wanted to maintain the interests of the domestic labor force in light of free movement of workers and uphold certain domestic standards, such as a ban on night work for women. Austria had also been wary of the planned eastward expansion of the EU, fearing influxes of workers. The issue of anonymous bank accounts was also contentions, and by 2000 Austria had to end a practice that had been in place since 1819.\textsuperscript{137} Protection for Alpine agriculture was also vital, as Austria claimed they were necessary for maintaining the Alpine environment. Indeed, as of 2001 Austria contributes about 0.5% of its annual GDP, about $2.5 billion, to the EU and receives about 2 billion back in agricultural subsidies.\textsuperscript{138} The welfare state of Austria has been positively impacted by the EU with the increased redistribution of income between high and low income earners, the employed and unemployed, different generations, employers and employees, and between the sexes.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{2000 Measures against Austria}

The Treaty of Amsterdam signed in 1997 called for fundamental European rights and principles, such as justice, nondiscrimination, and democratic principles. Its purpose was meant as a tool for scrutinizing additional members to the EU. Actions by the EU against Austria were in reaction the ÖVP-FPÖ formed coalition in 2000, and not to a particular Austrian transgression, even though the new coalition included a preamble
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maintaining its commitment to the principles outlined in the Treaty of Amsterdam. The negative reaction to the Austrian coalition was likely related to the dual fears of the rise of other conservative parties gaining political power and the popularity of Haider halting eastward expansion ambitions of the EU. The official statement of the European Union’s actions against the Austrian coalition was presented to Austrian officials on January 31, 2000 and read as follows:

Statement from the Portuguese Presidency of the European Union of Behalf of XIV Member States

Today, Monday, 31 January, the Portuguese Prime Minister informed both the President and the Chancellor of Austria, and the Portuguese Minister of Foreign Affairs notified his Austrian counterpart of the following joint reaction agreed by the Heads of State and government of XIV Member States of the European Union in case it is formed in Austria a Government integrating the FPÖ:

- Governments of XIV Member States will not promote or accept any bilateral official at political level with an Austrian Government integrating the FPÖ;
- There will be no support in favor of Austrian candidates seeking positions in international organisations;
- Austrian Ambassadors in EU capitals will only be received at a technical level.

The Portuguese Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign affairs had already informed the Austrians (sic) authorities that there would be no business as usual in the bilateral relations with a Government integrating the FPÖ.

The immediate aftermath of these actions caused for the transformation of the EU’s ‘model student’ into the EU’s ‘boogieman.’ There is prohibition against external intervention in domestic affairs under international law in the United Nations, but this action sets an emerging precept for intervention in EU law. The EU decision to boycott Austria “represented a clear attempt to influence, if not reverse, the outcome
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of a democratic election and thus constituted blatant interference.”\(^{144}\) Lord William Rees-Mogg in his weekly commentary in *The Times* described the measures as “an unlawful attempt to coerce the democratic choice of a small European nation,” which had not happened “since 1938.”\(^{145}\) Switzerland distanced itself from the EU nations who boycotted Austria, saying the government shouldn’t be judged because “of any preconceived notions” but rather on its actual actions. The Austrian government made its first foreign visit in 2000 to Switzerland.\(^{146}\) The candidates for membership in the EU, namely the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Hungary, showed hesitation at the implementation of the sanctions, and Hungary emphasized “the good neighbor policy” towards Austria.\(^{147}\) These candidates for EU membership who did not approve of the sanctions had a history with Austria through the Hapsburg Empire. Unsurprisingly, the sanctions also resulted in a decrease of domestic Austrian support of the EU, with only 34% of the population in the spring of 2000 agreeing that membership in the EU had benefitted Austria.\(^{148}\)

**Provincial Identity**

Several Austrian provinces—Carinthia, Styria, Upper Austria and Lower Austria—have history dating back to the Middle Ages, and the provinces of Voralberg, Tyrol, and Salzburg have been united as geographical entities since 16\(^{th}\) century. The ‘centuries old history of the Länder (provinces) continues to this day to strengthen their identity and
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to enable them to make better use of their legal and political powers. During the Habsburg Empire, Austrians held allegiance to their home province, viewing each territory as an individual while the empire as a whole emphasized multi-ethnicity and politico-cultural diversity.

The provinces in Austria still play an important role in the government. The constitution binds the federal government to inform a province of all EU matters “which affect their independent sphere of action or may otherwise be of interest to them.”

The province then provides an opinion to the government, and if the government diverges from the province’s provided guidance they must explain their decision in eight weeks. The involvement of each individual province in the federal government was not a new precedent. A liaison office in Vienna was created in 1951 for the Austrian provinces and the conference of the Governors meets twice annually to discuss positions and advise/influence federal law. In 1974 each province was given the ability to sign its own treaties with neighboring states on issues that impacted their autonomous competition. So the involvement of each province in EU matters pertaining to it continued the pattern of state-federal balance, and did not disturb it.
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Austria after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, Austria struggled to find and create its own identity. The structure of the government is a leftover of the Empire, with the political parties themselves having roots from the Empire era. Each province in the Austrian republic has a history that, in some cases, outdates the Habsburg Empire itself. Still today, many Austrians identify first with their province before with the state. European Union ascension allowed Austria to align itself with Europe as a whole, jumping over the need to create a self-identity. Otto von Habsburg, the last Crown Prince of the Habsburg Empire, was an early and stout supporter of a European Community, serving as Vice President and later President of the International Paneuropean Union. The Reder and Waldheim affairs, as well as the 2000 EU sanctions against Austria, forced Austria to reevaluate her position on how she viewed herself.
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Chapter 6- Rise of the Far Right

Austrian nationalism developed comparatively late, with the first completely distinctive Austrian feelings emerging after the forced German Anschluss of 1938 and gaining momentum at the end of the Second World War through the Allied occupation. The main far-right party in Austrian politics in the Freedom Party of Austria, or FPÖ, had originally focused its aims on larger, pan-Germanic goals, only embracing Austria as a legitimate, separate nation under Jörg Haider’s leadership in the 1990s. The structure of the Austrian government and the platforms of the main political parties did play a small role in aiding the rapid gains of the FPÖ leading up to the election results of 1999, but Haider’s party management and exploitation of issues important and relevant across Austria also helped to explain the success. Even though the FPÖ lost significant ground in the 2002 elections and experienced party fracture, they remained influential and regained votes in the late 2000s. This trend is a current issue and the future is unknown in Austria, as the FPÖ and later BZÖ’s charismatic and controversial leader, Jörg Haider, died shortly after the 2008 elections, and major federal elections have not been held since his death. The impacts of the popularity of the right parties have major implications for Austria and her position in Europe, especially if this trend proves to not be just a trend but a long-lasting change in Austrian politics.
Development of the FPÖ, Freedom Party of Austria

The roots of the FPÖ Party can be traced back to the revolutions of 1848, when liberalism and nationalism combined. The original pan-Germanic roots, stressing Austria as a part of Germany, continued from these early revolutions and carried decent weight in the party up until the 1990s. Georg von Schönerer was the founder of the first right-wing pan-German party. His movement failed to gain momentum, but his views were popular among students. One of his followers, Victor Adler, later went on to found the Social Democratic Party when increasing anti-Semitism forced him to leave the right-wing party. Georg Schönerer and his followers wore blue cornflowers and the symbol remains for German nationalists. The blue color remains the representative color of today’s FPÖ.\(^{154}\)

The early combination of liberalism and nationalism formulated the Greater German People’s Party (Großdeutsche Volkspartei, GDVP) and the Liberal Party (LB) during the First Republic. And while all parties were united in the desire to unite with Germany, the GDVP was the most vocal and adamant, stressed the same nation and culture between the two states. The LB constituted a more liberal side of the right, and leaned toward the CSP, Christian Social Party. The continued existence of a pan-German party highlights the absence of an all-encompassing ‘Austrian’ nationalism, it was
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German. GDVP essentially was consumed with the rise of the Nazi Party, as most
German-Nationals deserted from the former to the latter.\footnote{Wolfgang C. Müller, “Political Parties,” in Contemporary Austrian politics, ed. Volkmar Lauber (Boulder, Colo.: WestviewPress, 1996), 62.}

After 1945, only two parties were given a ‘license’ to operate by the Allied
victors, the ÖVP and SPÖ. In 1949 the League of Independents, (Verband der
Uabhängigkeit, VdU) was founded, giving a forum to the German-Nationals and whose
main platform was the abolition of denazification rules. The Viennese leader of the VdU
was Fritz Stüber, who “announced his pride in following the tradition of Schönerer.”\footnote{Sully, Political parties and elections in Austria: 101. Fritz Stüber, Ich war Abgeordneter. Die Entstehung d. freiheitlichen Opposition in Österreich (Graz; Stuttgart: Stocker, 1974). 126.}

As a member of the VdU in the Nationalrat, Stüber was the only member to refuse to
vote for the State Treaty in 1955. When the Allied occupiers left Austria, the VdU
merged with a right-wing ‘Free Party’ and became the FPÖ, Freedom Party of Austria.
The party included the German-Nationals, meaning those who had been involved in Nazi
organizations. The new FPÖ fared even worse than its predecessors in elections, and
lost many elite members of the VdU who felt that the party had moved too far to the
right.

The FPÖ was led until 1958 by Anton Reinthaller, the founder of the FP and an
ex-Nazi who had been a cabinet member in the post-Anschluss government. He was
succeeded by Friedrich Peter, a former SS officer who dismissed the idea of Austria as a
nation and who spoke positively of the “soldier who had defended the Fatherland in the
Second World War.”\footnote{Sully, Political parties and elections in Austria: 103.} Peter was succeeded in 1978 by Dr. Alexandra Goetz, who had
become the mayor of Graz, Austria’s second largest city, in 1973. The FPÖ was hoping
that the ‘Graz model’ could be repeated on a national scale, but election results in 1979 showed that that was not the case. Instead of working with Chancellor Kreisky as Peter had, Goetz launched a series of attacks and advocated for more confrontation in politics. Goetz at first tried to fill both his roles as mayor parliament member, and ended up withdrawing from the Nationalrat to remain in Graz and resigning as party leader. The search for a new leader almost split the FPÖ as it decided between the more liberal Dr. Norbert Steger and Dr. Harald Ofner, Goetz’s protégé. Steger was elected leader at the party conference in 1980 with 247 out of 451, showing the split that had emerged and weakened the party.\(^{158}\)

As the FPÖ moved more towards the center it became more acceptable to the other two parties, with government participation in 1983 and 1986 in a coalition with the SPÖ. Since then, under Haider’s leadership, the FPÖ has again revived more controversial stances and become a populist protest party.\(^{159}\) This shift back to the right created a splinter group, the Liberal Forum (Liberales Forum, LF) to form in 1993.

The FPÖ switched positions on joining the EU from 1989 to 1990, first being pro-EU and then switching to an anti-EU position. The official application to join the EU was submitted in 1989, and a national plebiscite was held on June 12, 1994. The FPÖ was joined by the Green Party and what was left of the Communist party in opposing EU entry. Voting turnout was 82.4 percent, with 66.6 percent of the Austrian population in favor and only 33.4 percent against joining the EU,\(^{160}\) the highest percentage out of all
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EU-15 countries. Austria officially joined the EU on January 1, 1995. The FPÖ was the only party to reject a single currency, and after joining the EU focused on the loss of Austrian jobs.\textsuperscript{161} Polls in 1999 and 2000 showed that Austrians were strongly against EU easterly enlargement, with only 29 percent in favor and 59 percent against it.\textsuperscript{162} On one hand, this seems surprising given their shared history with the Habsburg Empire; on the other hand this sentiment correlates to the growing anxiety against foreigners in the 1990s.

The basic policies of the FPÖ shared the ÖVP the reliance on a free market, and sided more with the SPÖ on being anti-clerical, although this has begun to change in the 90s. The FPÖ and predecessor GDVP, as German-Nationalists, were in favor of uniting with Germany and welcomed the Anschluss, although have had to reform these views with the outcome of the Second World War. The FPÖ has accepted the existence of an independent Austria, but still stated that Austria and Germans are one nation in terms of culture- effectively ignoring any multi-cultural aspects leftover from the empire or foreigners in Austria.\textsuperscript{163} This view distinguished the FPÖ from both the ÖVP and the SPÖ until Haider in the mid-1990s began to change the party platform. The family plays a central in the FPÖ for transmuting Germanic culture to future generations, and early in the party’s history, the family had a duty to insure that hereditary diseases were not passed on, and the party encouraged voluntary sterilization where ‘needed.’\textsuperscript{164} The FPÖ’s strength is centered in small towns and areas where the ‘threat’ to Austria is felt

\textsuperscript{161} Ellinas,\textit{ The media and the far right in western Europe: playing the nationalist card}: 69.
\textsuperscript{163} Müller, "Political Parties," 88.
\textsuperscript{164} Sully, \textit{Political parties and elections in Austria}: 114.
the most, among the self-employed, academics, the young, and more recently, the oldest voter demographic as well. The states of Salzburg, Vorarlberg and Carinthia have historically held more political support for the FPÖ than other Austria states.

**Jörg Haider**

Jörg Haider was born January 26, 1950 in Bad Goisern, Upper Austria (Oberösterreich) to parents Robert Haider and Dorothea Rupp. Robert Haider was a shoemaker and Rupp was the head of the gynecology wing at the Linz hospital. Robert Haider joined the German National Socialist Worker’s Party (NSDAP, Austrian affiliation of the German Nazi party) in 1929 at the age of fifteen, four years before Hitler’s rise to power in Germany. He served two years in the German military, having moved to Germany for his political beliefs, and returned to Austria after the Anschluss in 1938. He served in the Wehrmacht, reached the rank of Lieutenant, and married Dorothea Rupp in 1945. Rupp had been a leader in the League of German Girls (Bund Deutscher Mädel). At the end of the war, both of Haider’s parents were investigated for their Nazi membership and activities, and classified as “Minderbelastet,” or only minorly compromised as they had only been in the low ranks of the NSDAP.

Jörg Haider supposedly achieved high marks in high school and attended the University of Vienna, graduating in 1973 with a degree in law. He then spent more than the mandatory time in the Austrian army, returned to the University to teach law, and married Claudia Hoffmann on May 1, 1976. From 1970 to 1974 Haider was the leader of the FPÖ youth movement, and in 1976 he was appointed party affairs manager in Carinthia. He was the youngest delegate, at 29, in the Nationalrat in 1979. Haider
inherited the estate “Bärental” in Carinthia from Wilhelm Webhofer, who was no relation by blood, in 1983. It was at this time that Haider began to become more critical of party leaders, and rose to the head of the FPÖ in Carinthia. Haider would use dialect in giving interviews and in more formal situations, suggesting that he speaks “the common people’s language.”

On his televised fiftieth birthday party, Haider was given a snowboard and immediately took it out on the slopes, showing his modern, youthful, and athletic side.

Austria as an immigrant nation, early precedent and later change

After World War Two Austria’s reputation as a “country of asylum” began and over two million refugees have lived in the country since 1945. In total, about 615,000 people, including 300,000 ethnic Germans from the Sudeten area of Czechoslovakia, have received asylum in the country. After the 1956 Warsaw pact invasion of Hungary, about 180,000 Hungarians fled to Austria, and the 1968 Prague Spring saw 160,000 Czechs and Slovaks in Austria seeking asylum. 30,000 Poles fled Poland following the 1981 declaration of martial law by General Jaruzelski. The fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989 made Austria the throughway from East to West. Austria’s negative response to the
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increasing wave of asylum seekers in the late 1980s and early 1990s can been seen in the numbers- in 1989, 2,879 of 21,862 applicants were approved, in 1990, 1,596 of 22,800.\textsuperscript{168}

The Austrian view of foreigners changed with the influx of refugees from the east, and many expressed fear that the country was becoming ‘overrun’ with foreigners. Censuses show that in 1991, around 5.3 percent of the total population of Austria was foreigners (roughly 400,000). This number corresponds to the percentage of foreign workers in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{169} Polls in 1990 returned numbers of 45 percent of the population agreeing that foreigners were a threat to Austrian identity and way of life, even though 84 percent also reported no negative experiences with foreigners prior to the poll.\textsuperscript{170} Even though all foreigners were not welcome, Hungarians and Czechs fell into a separate category than other Eastern European immigrants and were treated slightly better, perhaps as a remembrance of the Empire days.\textsuperscript{171}

The Austrian Citizenship act of 1949 established basic nationality, but did not provide for nationals living in other countries. In 1965 the Act was amended to “prevent marriages of convenience between Austrians and foreigners to get citizenship.”\textsuperscript{172} Women who married foreigners were allowed to retain their citizenship, but their children were not able to inherit citizenship from their mothers. The Citizenship Act of 1985 gave citizenship to children with one or more Austrian parents, and one could
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apply for naturalization. The Alien Employment Law established quotas for the employment of foreigners, and non-citizens can join trade unions but are barred from leadership positions.\textsuperscript{173} This Act also limits what job opportunities are available to foreigners, which has had a large impact on foreign women in Austria. Migrant women are pushed towards domestic work, and as a result are viewed as “representing underdeveloped societies and traditional ways of life.”\textsuperscript{174} These women often are unable to obtain a work permit, forcing them to work under the table and rely on their employer’s benevolence for fair working conditions.

**The resurgence of the FPÖ under the leadership of Jörg Haider**

In September 1986, following the fallout of the Waldheim affair, the split within the party was obvious, and Haider won the election for chairmanship at the annual party’s conference. His supporters “reportedly made “Seig heil” calls (to Haider) and told Mrs. Steger that her husband ought to be gassed.”\textsuperscript{175} In response to the party’s regress from its liberal side, the party was expelled from the Liberal International political group and SPÖ chancellor Franz Vranitzky ended the partnership with the party, calling for new elections. The move of Vranitzky to exclude the FPÖ allowed Haider to create the image of the true opposition party.

Carinthia was a warning ground predicting what was to come—it should have been no surprise to see the FPÖ taking State government over in 1999. Haider was first appointed Governor in 1989, and had stated that “The Carinthian way could help Austria
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get well.”

The FPÖ and ÖVP were in a coalition that had allowed Haider to reach the governor’s office in the first place, however he was ousted from office after commenting that “In the Third Reich, they had a proper employment policy, which cannot be said of the government in Vienna.”

Haider wasn’t ousted entirely from power; he had to instead accept the number two spot in Carinthian government. The aftermath of this event also signaled the beginning of Haider to abandon pan-German ideas, as easily seen with his 1992-1992 “Austria First!” initiative.

On October 21, 1992 Haider presented the government with twelve demands regarding immigration and foreigners in Austria. If these demands were not met, he threatened to call a referendum to close Austria to immigration. The FPÖ had previously created a list of eight demands regarding immigration in 1989, (commonly called the St. Lorenzen Declaration) and the radicalization between the two lists of demands is easy to see. On the new 1992 list, the first demand was to add the slogan, “Austria is not a country of immigration” to the constitution, and all citizens from Eastern European countries were automatically viewed as potential violators.

One could say that the aim of the 1989 demands was to limit access to Austrian citizenship of foreigners, and that aim changed in 1992 to removing foreigners from Austria. The “Austria First” petition fell short of excepted signatures, but succeeded in bringing immigration issues


into the public’s mind and creating the idea that the FPÖ was the best party to deal with these issues.\(^\text{179}\) Along this line, Haider said in 1995 that “the right of natives to Heimat (homeland) is more important that the right of immigrants to family life.”\(^\text{180}\)

The twelve points of the “Austria First” referendum of 1992\(^\text{181}\)

1. Constitutional amendment: Austria is not a country of immigration
2. A freeze on immigration until an adequate solution for the illegal immigrants has been found, until there is no more problem with housing, and until the unemployment rate is under 5 percent.
3. Obligation for foreign workers to carry an identity card at their place of work. This identity card must show their work permit and health insurance.
4. Increase in law enforcement (alien’s branch of the police; detectives); pay raises and better equipment to cope with the problem of illegal foreigners and organized crime.
5. Immediate installation of a permanent border control instead of the army.
6. Easing of the situation in schools by reducing the percentage of pupils with foreign mother tongue in primary and vocational schools to a maximum of 30 percent; instruction of foreigner classes if more than 30 percent of the pupils speak a foreign language.
7. Easing of the situation in schools by making satisfactory knowledge of the German language mandatory.
8. No voting rights for foreigners.
9. No early access to citizenship.
10. Rigorous measures against illegal action (e.g. unions and clubs for foreigners) and against the misuse of social benefits.
11. Immediate deportation of foreign criminals.
12. Establishment of an East European Foundation to eliminate migration.

Starting with this initiative, Haider began to downplay the traditional pan-Germanism of his party, as the FPÖ had nothing to gain with that position. By this time, the vast majority of Austrians viewed Austria as a nation in its own right. The party had to find a way to compound pan-Germanism with Austrian nationalism, and it did so by concentrating further on immigration and foreigner issues, uniting against those outside of pan-Germanism.\(^\text{182}\) The FPÖ had first capitalized on the growing fear of foreigners in
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its campaign prior to 1990 elections, putting up “Vienna must not be allowed to become Chicago!” posters throughout the city. Haider did not sever ties with organizations linked to the pan-German camp—he remained proud and involved with his ‘Burschenschaft’ history and the magazine Die Aula, published by the pan-German fraternities. In 1997, Haider also reversed the party’s longstanding anti-clerical traditions and said that he viewed the FPÖ “as an ideal partner of Christian Churches.”

Throughout the FPÖ’s rise in the 1990s, the party focused on multiple ‘easy’ targets, growing its support base. Such targets included trade unionists receiving dual incomes, public funding for the arts, especially for arts with immoral/unpatriotic tendencies, alleged African immigrant ‘drug-dealers,’ against EU expansion for the Czech Republic and Slovakia, and against the Austrian court’s decision to uphold and even to suggest improving Slovenian minority rights. Haider brought in party outsiders to stand for government posts, which in essence insured that all candidates would remain dependent on Haider alone, as they lacked independent footholds within the party. Up until 2000, Haider alone made all key decisions, often making his decisions public before and without consulting other party members.

The elections of 1999 put the FPÖ as the second largest party in Austria, gaining 28.6 percent of the vote. Protests in Vienna on November 12, 1999 against the ÖVP-FPÖ
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coalition took the motto “No coalition with Racism.” Jörg Haider was not an official member of the coalition government, remaining governor of Carinthia, and yet it was he who appeared alongside Schlüssel before international media on February 2, 2000 to inform them of the coalition and not party leader Susanne Reiss-Passer. The other fourteen EU members had agreed on January 31, 2000 to impose sanctions against Austria if the coalition was formed. This decision was not on a EU-level decision, but an agreement of all EU nations on a national level. The sanctions ended all bilateral contacts with the Austrian Government, stated that they would not support Austrian candidates internationally, and they would receive Austrians ambassadors on a “technical level” only. (Compare this reaction with that of the to the Waldheim affair, which resulted in only Israel pulling its ambassador from Austria.) Sanctions ended on September 12, 2000, saying that Austria had “not violated European values” although the FPÖ’s development was “uncertain” and a “special vigilance toward this party and its influence on the government” must be carried out.

The twenty-percent of the vote that the FPÖ received in 1999 can be categorized into three groups of voters. The FPÖ attracted young male workers disenchanted with the socialist party of their parents, small family businesses, especially those involved in the tourism industry, and those families and individuals in the lower middle class looking for upward social mobility. The majority of all voters listed the FPÖ as the party best

suited to deal with immigration and the foreign population of Austria. That same election season as the large FPÖ gain in Austria, the right wing Swiss People’s Party led by Christoph Blocher also won huge gains in Switzerland. The EUCM published a report in 1999 showing that racism and hostility in both countries have increased more sharply than in other EU countries, even though Switzerland and Austria have relatively low unemployment and higher levels of affluence.\(^{191}\)

The government of the ÖVP-FPÖ was not as illiberal as was predicted, and focused on issues concerning labor and management, budget balancing, and the Aliens Act of 2002. The act “tightened immigration and asylum policies, introduced mandatory citizenship and language classes for new immigrants, and proposed twenty-four-hour fast tracking of asylum applicants.”\(^{192}\) The FPÖ proceeded to collapse under the combined incidents of Haider’s friendly visits to Saddam Hussein, debates about the party’s core, and the resignation of Susanne Riess-Passer, FPÖ party leader and Vice Chancellor. Haider’s visit to Hussein coincided with Reiss-Passer’s first official visit to Washington. Schlüssel used the confusion to his advantage, (although he insists he was not trying to kill his partner\(^ {193}\)) calling new elections in 2002 which saw a huge growth in his party, the ÖVP, while the FPÖ dropped from fifty-two to eighteen seats in the Nationalrat, only receiving ten percent of the vote.

The FPÖ split as a result of this division, with Haider breaking off and creating his own ‘orange’ BZÖ (Alliance for the future of Austria) and leaving the FPÖ headed by
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Heinz-Christian Strache. The 2006 elections saw sixteen percent of the vote gained jointly by both parties, with eleven percent for the FPÖ and five percent for the new BZÖ. However, in 2008, the two older parties lost support while both right-wing parties gained votes—together they were as strong as either the SPÖ or ÖVP. The FPÖ had 17.5 percent of the votes, gaining fourteen seats, and the BZÖ gained almost eleven percent and now totaled twenty-one seats.194 This election result was also a result of having lowered the voting age from 16 to 18—in this age group almost 50 percent voted for the FPÖ, a total of thirty-six percent of young voters (under 30) voted for one of the right-wing parties. Haider’s BZÖ gained huge support in his native Carinthia with 38.5 percent of the votes, just about doubled from two years prior.195

Haider had dominated the TV debates prior to the election, and was surprisingly more demure and subtle with his right-wing policies. He was the only candidate to have had higher ratings from the TV debates than actually garnered in the election.196 However this new side of Haider was not seen for long, as he died on October 11, 2008, as a result of drunk driving on mountains roads in Carinthia. His death shocked the country and especially Carinthia, and his funeral was televised live and attended by all political dignitaries. In Klagenfurt on the anniversary of his death, Haider still commands front-page news, moments of remembrance on the radio, and talks and meetings in town.
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Rise of the Far Right—What does this mean for Austria and Europe?

In Austria, the success of the FPÖ needs to be a wakeup call for the older parties—the old political ways are over. Gone are the days that party memberships are a lifelong commitment, shaping various areas of the voter’s life, organizations, clubs and leisure activities.\textsuperscript{197} This is bad news for the SPÖ and ÖVP, for “if fewer and fewer Austrians are interested in “belonging” to a party, ... then the parties cannot maintain their control over society (and government).”\textsuperscript{198}

The impacts of rising right-wing parties, especially as they focus on issues such as immigration and foreign national policies in Austria, also correlate with rising racism and xenophobia, the negative effects of which have already been seen. In December 1993 a series of terrorist bombings took place in Austria, each targeting “natural enemies” of the right-wing.\textsuperscript{199} In February 1995, four Austrian Roma were killed with a letter bomb. This rising negative outlook on foreigners is becoming universal, even against those once viewed as “brothers” in the Habsburg Monarchy. This does not bode well for the future of the Austrian welfare state, as reports have shown that the influx of young foreign workers are needed to keep the current benefit system in place.

Political opinion polls taken in January, 2011, show the combined FPÖ-BZÖ with 30.7 percent support (25% FPÖ, 10.7% BZÖ) and 42% of voters under 30 support the FPÖ.\textsuperscript{200} These pools show that even with the death of Haider, right-wing party support continues to grow. These parties are not the first far-right parties in Europe, and Austria
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is not the only state with a strong far-right party. The Austrian democratic system and old majority parties need to accept the people’s voices and work with the new party as much as they are able.
Chapter 7- Conclusion

The state of Austria since its first formation after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire has faced the obstacle of trying to reify its existence in the eyes of its population. An Austrian ‘nation’ had never truly existed, and the rise of nationalism in the surrounding ethnic groups in the Empire resulted in the Austrian provinces being put together as the ‘left overs’ of the Empire, with Austrians self-identifying as ‘German’ rather than Austrian. One cannot deny the elaborate and extensive history of Austria as a state, yet national identity did not have a role in the formation of the state nor did it become a possibility until long after the state formation.

There are still ongoing tensions between Austria and her neighbors over defining what objects and symbols make up each nation’s culture. This month, the news has covered a new disagreement between the two governments- over the name of a pork sausage. Slovenia wants the EU to name its ‘kranjska klobasa’ with special Protected Geographical Indication status, while Austrians staunchly refuse to even consider a name change from their ‘Krainerwurst.’ While this spat may seem excessive, it highlights the problem that Austria has of extracting a unique identity from the ashes of the Habsburg Empire. Somewhat paradoxically, the history of the Empire also allows the governments to work closely together on issues that do not call into identity politics or
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heritage questions—for example the governments of Carinthia, Slovenia, and Friuli Venezia Giulia in 1989 signed for an agreement for a joint 1998 Winter Olympics bid under the motto ‘senza confine’ (without borders). 202

Starting in the 19th century with different imperial ethnicities experiencing a rise in the ideas of nation and nationalism, Austria has struggled to create a unique nation of its own. Early ideas of this nation were merely remnants of German nationalism and then later focusing on the nostalgic past of the Habsburg Empire—without thinking of the present or future of the nation. This muddling through carried on throughout the 20th century, and only with the rise of the Far Right in partial response to increased immigration did the idea of an Austrian Nation gain footing and become accepted in open dialogue. Polls taken show a continual growth of acceptance and belief in an “Austrian nation” by Austrian citizens. Austrians finally began to come together and accept Austria as their nation, without defining the nation solely by what it lacked.

This pride in an Austrian nation is still young and developing, as easily seen in arguable the most patriotic Austrian song, Rainhard Fendrich’s I Am From Austria. 203 This is perhaps the most well-known and well-loved song about Austria, only written in 1990 and yet the Viennese German, excepting one line, is known and beloved by Austrians who ‘cannot help but to sing along.’ The song describes in great detail the beauty of the country and the loyalty of its people, and yet the sole English line ‘I am
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from Austria’ depicts that this newfound nationalist sentiment is yet developing, as one can only claim their heritage in a foreign, and not native tongue.

This patriotic song highlights Greenfeld’s zig-zag semantic pattern of change in regard to the idea of nation. The idea of an Austrian nation celebrating its unique Austrian citizens has been propagated by the government since the aftermath of World War II, however this ‘new’ definition of an Austrian nation needs to be accepted as the norm to have meaning. *I am from Austria* pinpoints the current national sentiment in Austria—after years of asserting itself as a nation, Austrians finally believe the idea that they constitute their own nation. This acceptance of the new definition of nation is still in progress, hence the highly nationalistic lyrics that are known to practically all Austrians, and yet the key line, ‘I am from Austria’ is in English, not German. Although the process of accepting and identifying as an Austrian nation is underway, it is not yet complete.

Despite Alexander Novotony’s claim that “for centuries an Austrian nation has existed; first dormant and finally—particularly after 1945—the Austrians realized that they are a nation,” nation-building is a process over time and not an instant enlightenment of the people. A nation cannot exist without its people identifying collectively as a nation. The case of Austria presents an unusual situation where identity as an Austrian develops much later than the state, with the delay due in part to increased provincial loyalty and pan-Germanism. Over the past two decades, the
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Austrian nation is beginning to take hold and unite its populace, and it will be interesting to see how the Austrian state will be affected with the new sense of nationhood.
Appendix 1- Slovene Political Parties

Slovene People’s Party

Slovene Catholic politicians strongly dominated Slovene politics pre-WWI. The party was formed in 1890 as the Catholic Political Society, renamed Catholic National Party in the mid-1890s, then again in 1905 to Slovene People’s Party, and in 1909 as the All Slovene People’s Party. These political participants were also designated as ‘clericals.’ The monthly publication Rimski Katolik (the Roman Catholic) stressed that Catholic politics was “prime requisite for the well-being of both Slovenes and Austria, that without the definitive identifying factor of Catholicism neither could service.”

Anton Mahnič was a driving force behind the publication, and he strived to make a strong connection between Rome and Slovene Catholics. Mahnič maintained “that to serve the Slovene nation best one had to preserve its religious and cultural heritage; a people deprived of its faith lost its real identity to say nothing of its prospects of eternal salvation.” However many Catholic Leaders did not like the idea of being subservient to Austria, much less Rome. Mahnič’s early influence came to an end with the end of the Taaffe era.

The journals Katoliški Obzornik from 1987-1906 and Čas from 1907 to 1942 became the new media for the Slovene People’s Party and both were edited by Aleš Ušeničnik with many contributions from priest Janez Evangelist Krek. The new political leaders in the party during the pre-WWI period were again Krek and lawyer Ivan Rogel.
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Šušteršič. A Slovene nationalist program that was strictly Catholic emerged under the shaping of Catholic thought by Ušeničnik and Krek and Slovene politics by Krek and Šušteršič. Krek published Socializem in 1901, and found the principle of socialism quite compatible to the Catholic faith. Krek viewed the nation as an extension of the family, and viewed liberalism as a huge threat to society. His conclusion was that the Slovene well-being rested in continued connection to Catholic Austria and to extend the national ‘family’ to all Catholic south Slavs.

The clericals had therefore a pro-Austria Slovene approach as they viewed both the Germans and Russians as threats. These clericals viewed the Austrian state’s mission as fighting the Turks and defending Western Christianity. One Clerical wrote in 1904 “the Austrian State idea from the beginning was that she protects European nations from the Turkish threat.” The Slovene’s People’s Party also had an association with the Croat Party of the Right, whose main goal was to seek a separate political unity consisting of all Croat people and be given status and autonomy equal to Hungary and Austria. The Clericals decided that there was room in the Croat platform to include the Slovenes and that their main ideas were compatible. To borrow Rogel’s definition, this concept has been referred to as trialism, and can generally be defined as “a program for union of the south Slavic territories of Austria-Hungary, for the purpose of creating a third large administrative unit in that Empire.”

Archduke Franz Ferdinand was always vague towards the idea of trialism, which led
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many to believe that he would have been in favor of the proposition. The 1908 Austrian annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina helped to convince the Clericals that Austria was filling its true destiny, and that Austria was on their side.\textsuperscript{213}

\textbf{National Progressive Party}

In 1890 the Clericals and Liberals separated and many Liberals remained in the Clerical camp as a matter of convenience and a way to further their own careers, as the newly formed Liberal camp was an unsafe bet. However in face of much Clerical anti-liberal and anti-capitalist sentiment, the liberals were forced back together to defend themselves from the Clerical onslaught. The Liberal political base was found in the middle class in opposition to the Clerical base in the countryside. The liberals elected usually came from towns and were dominate in the Carniola diet until 1910 and held the Ljubljana mayor post from 1896-1921 with Ivan Hribar and Ivan Tavčar. The Liberal mayors worked to strengthen the middle class and expand and beautify the town. The National Progressive Party was a supporter of the Saint Cyril-Methodius Society founded in 1886 that funded private schooling in the mother tongue for Slovenes living in the minority territories. Liberals also wanted the founding of a Slovene university so that students would not need to attend a German institute for higher education and to make the requirements for a teaching post easier to achieve for Slovene students. The Slovene liberals were vehemently anti-German and viewed Germanizing as a “violation of natural freedom.”\textsuperscript{214}
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The domination of the Slovene People’s Party caused the Liberals to withdraw some of their anti-German sentiment, as they worked together with German landowners in opposition to the Clericals. This contradiction and collaboration from 1986-1908 did not improve the popularity of the liberal party. With the 1908 shooting of two Slovene students in Ljubljana, Hribar and other liberals helped to lead an anti-German mass-protest, and the coalition with the German landowners was discontinued.\(^{215}\) Liberals began to worry that Austria was becoming more German, and the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina without consultation of the population of the territory caused Liberals to view of Austria as anti-Slavic.\(^{216}\) One journal, the Solvenski narod, claimed in 1912 “We Slovenes have a universal historical role to fulfill, to prevent Germandom from reaching the Adriatic and the Balkans.”\(^{217}\)

In October of 1905 the policy of the liberal Croat and Serb political parties gave hope to the Slovene Liberals. The Croat-Serb liberals formed a coalition saying that they were one nation by blood and language and minimized religious differences, stressing liberal values. The coalition ignored the Slovenes not wanting to get involved in the fight over Trieste; however the Slovene Liberals remained supportive of this action and the idea of a ‘liberal Yugoslav.’\(^{218}\) The Slovene Liberals were disappointed as the coalition worked towards different ends and saw the Bulgarian and Serbian clash over Macedonia instead of the triumph of liberal principles.

**Yugoslav Social Democratic Party**

\(^{215}\) Ibid., 45.  
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The third party to organize pre-World War I was the Yugoslav Social Democratic Party (Jugolovanska socialnodemokratična stranka, JSDS) based on Socialists tradition from as early as 1869\textsuperscript{219} and drew support from organized workers. During the 1880s the party members became less focused on overthrowing the capitalist society and instead worked for greater benefits—demanding the vote and an eight-hour work day.\textsuperscript{220} The Slovene organization had the opportunity to work within the larger Austrian Social Democratic Party (SPÖ) with its founding in 1888-89, yet contact with the Austrian party was not well-maintained. Etbin Kristan was the first leader of the party and founded and edited the \textit{Delavec-Rdeči prapor}, which became the leading Socialist paper. Workers were proud to have Kristan and other intellectuals in their party, precisely because they were intellectuals.\textsuperscript{221}

In attendance at the Brno Congress in 1899 were delegates from all over the Empire, and although they all insisted that national sentiment was “bourgeois,” the congress decided that the party line was in favor of preserving the Empire, seen as the best solution for the proletariat.\textsuperscript{222} The Slovene Social Democrats led by Kristan participated in the congress but had offered a different final program which later was furthered by the Austrian Social Democrats Otto Bauer and Karl Renner. Kristan proposed a two-tiered federalization, with one tier being purely administrative and the other focusing on national and cultural matters. This principal was meant to protect an individual’s national and cultural rights throughout the Empire. It rejected bourgeois
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political nationalism while keeping cultural national rights in place. The JSDS never called for a solution outside the Empire and instead tended towards an Austrian Yugoslav Solution.\textsuperscript{224}
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Appendix 2 - Deciding on and Undertaking the October 10, 1920 Plebiscite

Post-war, each of the victors had pre-disposed biases concerning the Yugoslav border issue. France was more sympathetic to the Yugoslavs based on Austria’s expressed desire of Anschluss with the Germans, Italy was anti-Yugoslav. Lower Styria, encompassing a majority Slovene population, was to be ceded to Yugoslavia while the Carinthian border had yet to be determined. In Carinthia both the United States and Great Britain were thinking of a compromise along the Drau River. The issue of Carinthia Slovenes first appeared before the victor conference on February 18, 1919, and the submitted Yugoslav proposal for the boundary included the entire basin excluding only the St. Veit area. Žolger, a Yugoslav delegate to the conference submitting the proposal, elaborated the position further by saying where it “was possible to show that fifty years previously Slovenes had been in possession, they should have ownership restored to them.” Pamphlets propagated by the Slovenes at this time made claims that Klagenfurt was economically already a part of Yugoslavia and that Klagenfurt and Villach had no connection to the rest of Carinthia. Another claimed that the cities could not be separated from the rest of the basin, and that argument ironically later worked against the Yugoslavs in propagating the Austrian stance of the indivisibility of Carinthia.

As the committee discussed different border solutions, the British and French delegates expressed uncertainty and concern for the inhabitant’s wishes. The Italians first dropped the word ‘plebiscite’ and the committee tentatively agreed to give the entire basin to Austria with the border following the Karawaken Mountain crest and then allow the people to protest. This decision was not yet final, and on May 9th the issue reappeared in front of the allied Victor’s Council. The Council as a whole accepted the proposal of the Karawaken border, and Britain, France and the United States pushed for some sort of ‘enquiry’ of the population. Italy was worried about the economic and railroad routes put into question by the border proposal, and so the Karawaken proposed border at first left the Rosenbach tunnel out of the Austrian territory and the districts of Tarvis, the Kanal Valley and the southeastern zone would be in the hands of the Allied powers, securing Italy’s worries about railroad and communication lines. Later the Italian concern was resolved by agreeing that if a future plebiscite would rule in favor of Yugoslavia, Austrian territory holding the key railroad lines would not be included.

The ruling was put before the “Big Four” on May 12, and the idea of a plebiscite began to take shape. The Yugoslav delegation put forth a proposal reducing their demands in an effort to forgo a plebiscite, and divided the basic in a northern and southern zone; the southern zone was to go to Yugoslavia and the northern to Austria. (This “green line’ eventually became the dividing line between the two zones of the plebiscite.) This suggestion was shrugged off by the American delegation, and the
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debate of the exact areas and execution of the plebiscite began. After many debates and political negotiations, the plebiscite compromise was unveiled on June 5. The area was split into two zones, A and B, by the ‘Green line’ earlier used by Yugoslavia. If the southern zone A voted to remain in Austria, both zone A and B would remain. If Zone A voted for Yugoslavia, zone B would vote three weeks following the first election to see if it would be ceded along with zone A. The Yugoslav delegation continued to send suggestions and protests against the declaration of the Allied Council. In preparation of the plebiscite, the Yugoslavs were only to occupy zone A, and after much persuasion withdrew their forces to that territory. A neutral strip of 600 meters was kept between the zones, and Klagenfurt’s water and electricity supply were promised to be continued.

An Interallied Plebiscite Commission was created to prepare and insure impartiality of the plebiscite by April 1930. The Treaty of St. Germain took force July 16, which set the date of the plebiscite in zone A occurring before October 16, and, if needed, in zone B 3 weeks later. The date was set for Sunday, October 10, and the Commission quickly set up preparations. The Yugoslavs refused to relinquish their strict control of the demarcation line, despite orders from the Allied Powers, saying they had a right to undo the germanization of the previous decades before the plebiscite date, and finally removed barriers on August 23.230 Throughout September voting lists were written up, and both sides blame the other for bringing in extra people from outside the region to influence the vote one way or another.
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Appendix 3- Propaganda from the October 10, 1920 Plebiscite

Kärnten ewig ungeteilt

The phrase ‘Carinthia forever undivided’ in front of the Landhaushof, the seat of regional government, in Klagenfurt with the Carinthian coat of arms.

Unsere schwerste Zeit

A cartoon showing the Yugoslav threat to Carinthia coming over the Karawaken Mountains.
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Collection of Cartoons

233 Die Lage der Minderheiten in Kärnten und in Slowenien: 13.
This shows a small Yugoslav soldier trying to keep the two friends or brothers on opposite sides of the wall, which is unable to keep them apart.

‘Our ballot papers are white, Germany made from Green!!!’ This references the voting method used in the plebiscite- there were two pieces of paper, with different colors for each country, and the voter would tear the country they were voting for.

I don’t want to fight for King Peter

“Mom don’t vote for Yugoslavia, I don’t want to fight for King Peter!” This poster fed on the fears post-WWI of mandatory conscription in Yugoslavia.

Kärnten in Gefahr!

‘10 October 1920! Today, as then, Carinthia remains German!’
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Appendix 4- I am From Austria\textsuperscript{239} by Rainhard Fendrich

Dei hohe Zeit, is lang vorüber,
und a die Höll host hinter dir,
von Ruhm und Glanz ist wenig über,
sog ma wer zieht noch den Hut vor dir,
auß mir?
I kenn die Leit, i kenn die Ratten,
die Dummheit, die zum Himmel schreit,
i steh zu dir, bei Licht und Schatten,
jederzeit.

Da kann ma mochn wos ma wü,
da bin i her, da ghör i hin,
da schmilzt das Eis von meiner Sö,
wie von am Gletscher im April,
a wenn mas schon vergessen ham,
i bin dei Apfel du mein Stamm,
so wia dei Wasser talwärts rinnt,
unwiderstehlich und so hell,
fost wie die Tränen von am Kind
wird auch mei Bluat auf einmal schnell
sog i am End der Wöt voi Stolz
und wenn ihr wollts a ganz allan,
I am from Austria (2x)

Es worn die Störche oft zu beneiden,
heit fliag i no vü weiter furt,
i siech di meist nur von da Weitn,
wer kann vastehn wia weh des manchmoi tuat

Da kann ma mochn wos ma wü,
da bin i her, da ghör i hin,
da schmilzt das Eis von meiner Sö,
wie von am Gletscher im April,
a wenn mas schon vergessen ham,
i bin dei Apfel du mein Stamm,
so wia dei Wasser talwärts rinnt,
unwiderstehlich und so hell,
fost wie die Tränen von am Kind
wird auch mei Bluat auf einmal schnell
sog i am End der Wöt voi Stolz
und wenn ihr wollts a ganz allan,
I am from Austria (2x)

\textsuperscript{239} "I am From Austria".
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