

EUROPE: NEW VOICES, NEW PERSPECTIVES

Proceedings from the Contemporary Europe Research Centre
Postgraduate Conference, 2005/2006

Edited by Matt Killingsworth



Chapter 5 *Julie Thorpe* "Belonging in Austria: Citizens, Minorities and Refugees in the Twentieth Century"

Copyright © 2007 by the Contemporary Europe Research Centre

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this publication may be made without written permission from the Contemporary Europe Research Centre, Level 2, 234 Queensberry St, The University of Melbourne Victoria, 3010, Australia.

ISBN 978-0-646-47263-8

Published by the Contemporary Europe Research Centre in April 2007.

Email: cerc@cerc.unimelb.edu.au

Website: <http://www.cerc.unimelb.edu.au/>

Julie Thorpe,

'Belonging in Austria: Citizens, Minorities and Refugees in the Twentieth Century' in Matt Killingsworth (ed.), *Europe: New Voices, New Perspective: Proceedings From The Contemporary Europe Research Centre Postgraduate Conference, 2005/2006* (Melbourne: The Contemporary Europe Research Centre, The University of Melbourne, 2007), pp.90-104.

Julie Thorpe completed her PhD thesis, entitled "Pan-German Identity and the Press in Austria, 1933-1938", in the School of History and Politics at the University of Adelaide in late 2006. Her thesis examined the construction of a national identity in the German-nationalist press in Vienna, Styria and Salzburg and the points of convergence or overlap with competing identity constructions in the Austrian state, notably National Socialism and 'Austrofascism'.

Currently Julie is a Visiting Scholar at the National Europe Centre at the Australian National University carrying out research on the topic of refugees and citizenship in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in World War One.

julie.thorpe@adelaide.edu.au

BELONGING IN AUSTRIA: CITIZENS, MINORITIES AND REFUGEES IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Julie Thorpe

This article shows how a distinction was made between 'citizens' and persons of 'undesirable' nationality in the Austro-Hungarian Empire during World War One. It argues that citizenship was constructed along both ethnic and civic lines of belonging, not just for the duration of the war, but also in the interwar period as a way to exclude minorities, especially Jews, from the boundaries of the 'German' Austrian state. In so far as it examines the interactions between diverse groups in an ethnically pluralist region in Central Europe, this article seeks to contribute to transnational studies of national identity and citizenship in Europe.

The war in Yugoslavia during the 1990s was a turning point in the debate on Austria's national identity. Just as the fall of the Berlin Wall and German reunification had also been turning points in the debate on Germany's national identity, the disintegration of a multinational country whose history was entangled with Austria's own multinational past widened the peripheral vision of at least a few Austrian historians. In 1994, the American cultural historian, Michael Steinberg, threw down the gauntlet to Austria's historians to embrace the perspective of 'outsiders' in 'transcending the historiographical repetition of historical exclusionism'. Having already probed the question of nationalist ideology in Austria in his book, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival*, Steinberg now asserted that Austria's national identity had been founded on a myth of homogeneity that disregarded the stories of immigrants, minorities and refugees from the process of constructing that identity.¹ A number of other historians agreed with Steinberg. In a highly critical essay on contemporary Austrian history, Thomas Angerer pointed out in 1995 that the debate on immigration in Austria 'takes place in a historiographical vacuum' and called for historians to engage more rigorously with the history of migrants and minorities in order to de-mythologise the origins of nationhood and look instead to the

¹ See Steinberg's review of Gerald Stourzh, *Vom Reich zur Republik: Studien zum Österreichbewusstsein im 20. Jahrhundert*, Vienna, Atelier, 1990, in Günter Bischof and Anton Pelinka (eds.), *The Kreisky Era in Austria* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1994), pp.250-51. See also Steinberg, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival: Austria as Theatre and Ideology, 1890-1938* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

political or psychological consequences of national identification.² Similarly, Gernot Heiss has advocated for a 'historiography transgressing borders' focusing less on the state and the nation and more on regional or cross-regional interactions.³ He has subsequently contributed to this historiography by co-editing a volume with Oliver Rathkolb on refugees and immigration in Austria from World War One to the collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe.⁴ The arrival of refugees in Austria from war zones in neighbouring Yugoslavia during the mid-1990s cast into sharp relief, in the minds of these historians, the exclusionism of Austrian identity since imperial days. Their calls for a transnational approach to national identity carried a greater sense of urgency following the collapse of another multinational state at the close of the twentieth century.

As Steinberg, Angerer and Heiss all pointed out, the debate on Austria's national identity has been insular and polarised to extremes. At times, it has assumed similar proportions to the West German *Historikerstreit* during the mid-1980s. But whereas the West German controversy was concerned with the apparent dangers of relativising the Nazi regime and the Holocaust through comparisons with other dictatorships and genocides, Austrian historians were divided on a far more preliminary question of Austria's place in German history. Austria's *Historikerstreit* was sparked when a German scholar, Karl Dietrich Erdmann, proposed in the mid-1970s that the history of Austria after 1945 should be included alongside the histories of West and East Germany. Most Austrian historians were on the side of Austria's separate historical development (and, consequently, separate national identity) from Germany, but a few called for Austria's inclusion within a broader German historiography.⁵ The problem was that this debate

² Thomas Angerer, 'An Incomplete Discipline, Austrian *Zeitgeschichte* and Recent History', in Anton Pelinka and Günter Bischof (eds.), *Austria in the Nineteen Fifties* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1995), pp.226-27.

³ Gernot Heiss, 'Pan-Germans, Better Germans, Austrians: Austrian Historians on National Identity from the First to the Second Republic', *German Studies Review*, Vol.16, No.3, 1993, p.426.

⁴ See Gernot Heiss and Oliver Rathkolb (eds.), *Asylland wider Willen: Flüchtlinge im europäischen Kontext seit 1914* (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1995).

⁵ For a taste of some of the recent contributions to this debate, see Harry Ritter, 'Austria and the Struggle for German Identity', *German Studies Review*, Vol.15, Special Winter Edition, 1992, pp.111-29; Margarete Grandner, Gernot Heiss, and Oliver Rathkolb, 'Österreich und seine Deutsche Identität: Bemerkungen zu Harry Ritters Aufsatz "Austria and the Struggle for German Identity"', *German Studies Review*, Vol.16, No.3, 1993, pp.515-20; Harry Ritter, 'On Austria's German Identity: A Reply to Margarete Grandner, Gernot Heiss and Oliver Rathkolb,' *German Studies*

took place within the constraints of a nation-state approach that overlooked the interactions between diverse groups across ethnic, national and state boundaries and reduced the multiple layers of identity to a one-dimensional 'Austrian' or 'German' identity. The strong reaction against Erdmann by Austria's post-war generation of historians was understandable in the light of their attempt to break with the German-nationalist historiographical tradition of their predecessors. But in their efforts to create a new 'Austrian' national historiography, these historians have tended to steer away from the nationality question in the Habsburg Monarchy (leaving that to their Anglophone counterparts abroad), and have played down attitudes towards minorities in the Austrian state since 1918.

An approach that goes beyond traditional nation-state interpretations might provide a useful way forward for understanding the diverse historical processes and exchanges between Central Europeans.⁶ A transnational approach to national identity in Austria could explore the ways that Austrian Germans encountered Hungarians, Slovenes, Slovaks, Czechs, Ukrainians, Poles, Romanians, Italians, Serbs, Croats, Jews and other Germans in Central Europe, placing under closer scrutiny the relationship between multinational empires and their successor states (one can also include Yugoslavia and Soviet Union in the first category). It could explore the ways in which citizenship and national identity were constructed at particular moments and in particular places where these groups have encountered each other, whether voluntarily (through business, schools, communal councils, family contacts, or by reading about these groups in the press, for example), or involuntarily (through forced deportations and expulsions and other forms of involuntary migration). Ultimately such an approach could lead to a more nuanced understanding of identity, citizenship and conflict in ethnically pluralist regions.

Review, Vol.16, No.3, 1993, pp.521-23. There is also a debate among cultural historians about the inclusion of Austrian writers and artists in the German cultural nation. See, for example, David S. Luft, 'Austria as a Region of German Culture: 1900-1938', *Austrian History Yearbook*, Vol.23, 1992, pp.135-48.

⁶ Philipp Ther has developed a model of comparative German and European history that draws on what he calls the 'entangled' histories of relational processes and structures within similar units of historical analysis. See his 'Beyond the Nation: The Relational Basis of a Comparative History of Germany and Europe', *Central European History*, Vol.36, No.1, 2003, pp.45-73.

This paper draws on transnational historical methods by examining the construction of national identity in Austria through the lens of population displacement and minority politics in the First World War. The internment of refugees and prisoners of war, media censorship, denunciations and 'fifth column' accusations against 'enemy' groups, were not only directed towards winning a war, but they also enabled the state to homogenise the body politic and alienate entire groups by distinguishing between 'citizens' and any person of 'unreliable' nationality who threatened to tear apart the social and political fabric of the state. We will see how the state constructed the boundaries of citizenship along ethnic and civic lines, and how wartime policies of surveillance reinforced these boundaries between citizens and non-citizens at every level of mobilisation for total war.

By the end of September 1914, less than two months after the outbreak of war, between 60,000 and 70,000 refugees had arrived in Vienna from the Russian-occupied eastern front.⁷ By 1915, the Ministry for the Interior estimated that the number of refugees who were eligible for state support was 600,000, of whom 450,000 came from Galicia and Bukowina on the eastern front and 150,000 came from the southwestern front on the Italian border. Transported by train to purpose-built refugee camps in the German-speaking hinterlands, the Austrian War Ministry sought to group refugees according to nationality for ease and speed of repatriation, and to prevent their assimilation into the surrounding communities. In Gmünd, Lower Austria, for example, around 30,000 Ruthenes were housed together in military barracks; another 10,000 Ruthenes were interned in Wolfsberg and St Andrä, Carinthia; 30,000 Poles were interned in Leibnitz, Styria; another 20,000 Poles in Chotzen, Bohemia; 20,000 Jews were housed in Nikolsburg, Pohrlitz and Gaya, Moravia; and another 3,000 Jews in Bruck an der Leitha. Refugees of all nationalities and religious groupings were crammed together in the major cities and in provincial towns across the Empire, either fending for themselves or lodging in makeshift shelters. Around 200,000 of these refugees ended up in Vienna and another 100,000 in Prague, Graz and Brünn; 120,000 Poles, Jews and Italians were scattered throughout Bohemia, and the rest were dispersed across Moravia, Upper

⁷ Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p.93. For an overview of refugees in the Austrian half of the Dual Monarchy during World War One, see also Walter Mentzel, 'Weltkriegsflüchtlinge in Cisleithanien 1914-1918', in *Asylland Wider Willen*, pp. 17-44.

Austria, Lower Austria and Hungary. Around a third of the refugees had returned to their homes by the beginning of September 1915, but the number of refugees eligible for state support rose in 1917 to 760,000 (not including returnees). A 1930 report for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, examining the economic and social history of the war in Austria-Hungary, found that the increase from 1915 was due to two factors: firstly, the number of refugees applying for state support, who had previously been fending for themselves, increased with the duration of the war; and, secondly, refugees from the periphery of the Empire who migrated to the cities during the war, did not return home, but found work in the cities selling everyday goods and wares.⁸ The refugee situation worsened as the war progressed, and while the economic cost of housing and supporting refugees drained the war economy, the social and psychological consequences of displacement, both on the refugees themselves and on the surrounding population, had a dramatic effect on wartime relations between nationalities in the Empire.

If internment can be defined as ‘the concentration, within a camp, of a group, without trial, regarded as hostile, by a host or invading society’, then the War Ministry’s policy of interning refugees in camps reveals the hostility of the central authorities towards the non-German nationalities of the Empire.⁹ The internment of Ruthenes (Ukrainians), Poles, Italians and Jews by the Austrian War Ministry resembled the treatment of ‘enemy aliens’ in Canada, Britain and Australia during the First World War, where even those who had become naturalised found themselves behind barbed wire for the duration of the war.¹⁰ In Austria-Hungary, the majority of internees were citizens of the Empire. Prisoners of war (predominantly Russian) were also isolated and treated with hostility by the ‘host’ society, often being subjected to scientific experiments in the camps and forced to perform degrading tasks in front of cameras for propaganda purposes. One film, showing scientists making clay moulds of POWs with fellow prisoners holding the clay to assist, was shown along with photographs of

⁸ Wilhelm Winkler, *Die Einkommensverschiebungen in Österreich während des Weltkrieges* (Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1930), pp.25-26.

⁹ For this definition, see Panikos Panayi, ‘Dominant Societies and Minorities in the Two World Wars’, in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Minorities in Wartime: National and Racial Groupings in Europe, North America and Australia during the Two World Wars* (Oxford: Berg, 1993), p.7.

¹⁰ Though the incarceration of naturalised individuals occurred less often in Britain than in Australia. See *Ibid.*, p.8.

live and plaster cast heads and bodies of Russian prisoners at the Vienna War Exhibition during 1916-17, seen by one million visitors throughout the year.¹¹ However, refugees had the opportunity of immersing themselves in a more familiar routine of attending school classes, going to church, baking bread, sewing clothes, and other everyday tasks that contributed to the running of camp life. The internment of war refugees was not an instrument of propaganda, as it was for POWs, but rather, a means of separating ‘citizens’ from ‘unreliable’ nationalities. Maintaining this line of separation was much more difficult in the major cities where refugees mingled with the local population. But the extent of prejudice against these refugees in the cities, and against non-German nationalities generally, showed that internment was only one of many forms of exclusion and hostility in wartime.

Denunciations were another tool of exclusion during the war that served to divide between ‘citizens’ and ‘unreliable’ minorities and refugees. Non-German nationalities were the target group of this practice with the number of denunciations of non-German nationalities disproportionately higher than those of Germans in Austria-Hungary. Sheila Fitzpatrick and Robert Gellately have pointed out in a comparative history of denunciation in modern Europe that denunciations can be against three main groups: individuals whom the state (and the population backing it) regards as ‘enemies of the people’; those whom the state defines as ‘aliens’ or outsiders; and, finally, ‘everyday’ victims, such as a neighbour, colleague or relative, whom the denouncer dislikes or has a personal grievance against.¹² The fact that the Austrian War Ministry singled out priests, politicians, and community leaders in eastern Galicia, Bohemia, Moravia, Carniola and other Slovene-speaking areas for denunciations and arrests, suggests that the authorities did indeed see Poles, Czechs, Slovenes and other non-German nationalities as ‘enemies of the people’ whose loyalty to the state could only be guaranteed by dissolving the religious, institutional and cultural ties of their communities. Instead, as one report on the Austrian war government revealed soon after the dissolution of the Monarchy, the victimisation of the non-German nationalities at the hands of the military and civil authorities fostered a deep discontent towards the Monarchy and towards the war among the peasantry in those regions. This double

¹¹ Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, pp.113-14.

¹² Sheila Fitzpatrick and Robert Gellately, ‘Introduction to the Practices of Denunciation in Modern European History’, *Journal of Modern History*, Vol.68, No.4, 1996, pp.762-763.

discontent meant that none of these nationalities regretted the passing of the Monarchy when it did dissolve relatively peaceably in 1918.¹³

The third target group of denunciations identified by Fitzpatrick and Gellately – individuals denounced by acquaintances for unpatriotic behaviour – is particularly relevant to wartime refugees living amongst their fellow citizens in the cities and the countryside. Food scarcity, housing shortages, the disruption to family life caused by military service, convalescence or war fatalities, and the underlying psychological trauma of civilians mobilised for ‘total war’, gave citizens plenty of reasons to resent the presence of refugees in bread queues, overcrowded apartments, and side streets selling goods on the black market. Women who donated their gold wedding rings to the war effort might have felt pride in their valuable contribution on the home front, but the sight of a Pole selling metal wares for profit was just as likely to enrage even the most charitable person.¹⁴ Not only German Austrians, but their Polish and Czech-speaking fellow citizens who lived in the cities, having arrived one or two generations previously, were no less susceptible to anti-refugee sentiment. A nine-year-old Polish-speaking boy from Czernowitz, Stanislaus Grenddecki, was denounced in 1915 by an acquaintance of his friend’s mother after telling the friend (a fellow Polish-speaker) while watching a war film at the cinema that Emperor Franz Josef should be shot because his father was sick in hospital.¹⁵ Perhaps the mother was worried that her ten-year-old daughter was spending too much time with a boy whose father was absent, so she told her neighbour or a work colleague about her concerns. That person in turn wrote in to the authorities to denounce Stanislaus for his lack of patriotism to the Emperor. Denunciations of this ‘everyday’ sort, as Fitzpatrick and Gellately point out, can tell us a great deal about the relationship of citizens to the state, and of citizens to their fellow citizens.¹⁶ That the relationship between citizens of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was fractured in wartime along ethnic lines, as well as civic lines of assimilation

¹³ Joseph Redlich, *Austrian War Government* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), p.90.

¹⁴ In return for giving their wedding rings, citizens were given commemorative iron rings that were consecrated by priests. By September 1914, 90,000 had already donated their rings or other valuable metals to the ‘Gold gab ich für Eisen (I Gave Gold for Iron)’ programme, a campaign that was replicated again in World War Two in Fascist Italy. See Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, p.117.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p.103.

¹⁶ Fitzpatrick and Gellately, ‘Introduction to the Practices of Denunciation’, p.763.

and prejudice, suggests that citizenship itself was being negotiated as a dual ethnic and civic practice of excluding foreign and ‘unreliable’ groups.

This combination of ethnic and civic practices of citizenship in Austria-Hungary is important because it refutes a popular myth in nationalism and citizenship studies that ‘ethnic’ forms of nationhood are somehow distinct from ‘civic’ forms. This myth has grown up over a century of scholarship that regards Germany and France as the exemplar models of ethnic and civic nationhood. Since 1882, when Ernest Renan claimed in his speech at the Sorbonne, *Qu’est-ce qu’une nation?*, that nations are formed primarily by voluntary civic commitment to the collective political will, and since the publication of Friedrich Meinecke’s *Weltbürgertum und Nationstaat* in 1907, which distinguished between the German *Kulturnation* and the French *Staatsnation*, the ethnic and civic varieties of nationhood and citizenship have become synonymous with the German and French prototypes. Notably the ethnic variety has come to stand for the entire bloc of nations in Central and Eastern Europe. Scholars have only recently begun to see the ethnic-civic dichotomy as idealised types that do not exist in practice, and which essentialise the Central and Eastern European nationalities in particular. Tara Zahra’s important work on Czech nationalists seeking to reclaim children who had been raised in bilingual German- and Czech-speaking families, or who had attended German schools, demonstrates the presence of both ethnic and civic discourses, not unlike the attempts of nineteenth-century French republicans to create a centralised French-language primary education system that could socialise children into the nation.¹⁷ If nationalism can be redefined as a process that combines both ethnic and civic practices of exclusion and inclusion, then we will be better able to understand the multiple ways that citizenship is practiced at the official and the everyday level in multinational societies.¹⁸ The relationship between the state and citizens in Austria-Hungary in the

¹⁷ While Zahra does not explicitly link the actions of Czech nationalists to an ethnic-and-civic paradigm of nationalism, she does reject the binary understandings of liberal/illiberal, east/west and she makes the point implicitly in her conclusion, that ‘[a]t the heart of popular politics and everyday life, nationalist claims on children and reclamations of children were at the heart of Czech understandings and expectations of democracy.’ See Tara Zahra, ‘Reclaiming Children for the Nation: Germanization, National Ascription, and Democracy in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1945’, *Central European History*, Vol.37, No.4, 2004, pp.542-543.

¹⁸ For a discussion of the ethnic-civic dichotomy, and an approach that seeks to overcome this dichotomy, see Oliver Zimmer, ‘Boundary Mechanisms and Symbolic Resources: Towards a Process-Oriented Approach to National Identity’, *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol.9, No.2, 2003, pp.173-93.

First World War is a case in point of the dual ethnic and civic mechanisms used to construct the boundaries of citizenship and national identity.

If citizenship can also be described as a 'spectrum' ranging from nominal rights, based on residency and state protection, to participatory rights in the public sphere, then we might also be able to see it as a trajectory of increasing contact with the state, or alienation from the state, as a result of mobilising for total war, for example.¹⁹ During World War One, women and children in the Austro-Hungarian Empire identified more directly with the state as a result of their wartime experiences, in spite of the fact that their citizenship was legally determined by marriage or patriarchal lineage. Children who lost their fathers during the war were encouraged to see themselves as heirs of the Empire, just as the three children of Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie, had also become royal orphans after their parents' assassination in Sarajevo on the eve of the war.²⁰ Women identified with the state through acts of charity, through the donation of their wedding rings, and by contributing labour to the state war economy. In turn they also made demands of the state to supply basic provisions for them to feed their families. The heightened contact with the state during wartime illustrates how citizenship was a personal and social experience defined not by legal rights, but by a contract between state and citizens.

However, for foreign-born residents, women married to foreign-born residents, and for non-German nationalities generally, citizenship in wartime was a more precarious commodity. Legal definitions of one's civic status could not be counted on in situations of extreme hostilities. We have already seen how internment and denunciations discriminated against non-German nationalities in spite of their full legal and civic equality alongside their German fellow citizens. But they were also vulnerable in other spheres of everyday life. Their written correspondence in wartime was more heavily scrutinised by censors, as were their newspapers, than the German-language correspondence and press, and they had greater difficulty obtaining work or state benefits, even if they were German by birth but happened to be married to a non-German. In 1915, a Serbian-born woman married to an Austrian citizen, and therefore herself an Austrian citizen by marriage, had her application for a translator's job in the police censor's department

¹⁹ On citizenship as a 'spectrum', see Nancy F. Cott, 'Marriage and Women's Citizenship in the United States, 1830-1934', *American Historical Review*, Vol.103, No.5, 1998, pp.1440-74.

²⁰ Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, pp.218-19.

rejected on the grounds that she might have Serb loyalties. In a reverse case of discrimination, an Austrian woman who was married to a Serbian citizen, was ruled ineligible for wartime welfare payments from the Austrian government in 1915 after her husband was interned as an 'enemy alien' in Austria. But perhaps the most famous case of an Austrian citizen whose citizenship status was regarded as equivocal was the Italian-born Empress Zita, who became empress of Austria on the death of Franz Josef in 1916. In the eyes of women's journals and auxiliary groups, the extent of Zita's 'Austrianness' was determined not by her position or marriage to the Emperor Karl, but by such factors as national and political orientation, language proficiency, the military credentials of her male relatives, and whom she employed as her domestic servants.²¹ In all three examples, women of foreign birth and those married to foreign-born men were seen as 'unreliable' on the grounds that their alleged national loyalties lay outside the boundaries of 'German' Austria.

The boundaries between citizens and refugees had to be redefined again in Austria (and elsewhere) after the formation of new nation-states in 1918. International peace treaties after the war stipulated that nationalities of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire be allowed to opt for citizenship in one of the successor states in which they identified 'according to race or language' with the majority of the state's population. The ambiguity of this definition meant that legal practitioners could refuse to grant citizenship on the grounds of race alone. Thousands of Galician Jews stranded in Vienna after the war were thus ineligible for citizenship in the new Austrian state because they could not prove their affiliation with the German language (they had no way of retrieving the documentary proof that they had attended a German school in Galicia), and their chances of qualifying on racial grounds were slim to zero.²² It is important to note, however, that the majority of Austrian politicians, lawyers and journalists in the interwar period were not so much interested in racial differences between Jews and non-Jews, than in the differences between citizens and non-citizens in the

²¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 139, 189-90, 193. On wartime censorship of the press and postal services in Austria-Hungary, see also Mark Cornwall, 'News, Rumour and the Control of Information in Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918', *History*, Vol.77, No.249, 1992, pp.50-64.

²² For an overview of citizenship laws in the new Austrian Republic, and the situation of Jewish refugees in Austria after 1918, see Margarete Grandner, 'Staatsbürger und Ausländer: Zum Umgang Österreichs mit den jüdischen Flüchtlinge nach 1918', in *Asylland Wider Willen*, pp.60-85. See also Beatrix Hoffmann-Holter, 'Abreisendmachung': *Jüdische Kriegsflüchtlinge in Wien 1914-1923* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1995).

Austrian state. The most salient and widespread stereotype of Jews in Austria after the war was the '*Ostjude*', the Eastern European Jewish immigrant. Jews were depicted in much of the popular press as illegal immigrants, fraudulent dealers, currency smugglers and passport forgers, who were connected to an international Jewish underworld with no allegiance to any one country and, therefore, a threat to every country. Politicians and public figures in Austria also had plenty to say on what should be done about the stateless Jews. Their claims that Austria's labour force, holiday resorts, neighbourhoods and public safety were under threat by the *Ostjuden* provided a reasonable and sound rationale for enacting policies that prevented Jews from being naturalised as Austrian citizens or from immigrating in the first place. Traditional animosity towards an allegedly corruptive Jewish influence on the economy and society certainly did not dissipate after the war, but it found new legitimacy and the appearance of respectability in the language of state protectionism. Despite a now flourishing body of scholarship on anti-Semitism in Austria, there still has been no serious attempt to explain this new pervasive stereotype of the foreign Jew after World War One. Historians have so far drawn only speculative links between the wartime experiences of Jewish refugees on the streets and in the neighbourhoods of their fellow citizens in the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the 'expulsion fantasies' of Austrians against the Jews in the interwar period.²³

The status of minorities in the interwar Austrian state was also uncertain after 1918. Austria's borders with Hungary and Yugoslavia (then the Kingdom of Serbs, Croat and Slovenes) were still contested up until 1920, and Hungarians in particular left Austria in droves. The issue of non-German schools in the mixed German- and Slovene-speaking regions of Carinthia continued to vex the local German-speakers who claimed that Carinthia was and always had been the 'cradle' of German civilisation. Notwithstanding a number of local studies of the Carinthian Slovenes, and the Czechs in Vienna, scholarship of this period has so far not grappled with the question of how these minority populations were integrated at a federal and local level, and what interaction (if any) they had with their

²³ Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire*, pp.311-13, refers to the 'expulsion fantasies' in popular anti-Semitic rhetoric and in legislative practices after the war, but her case study of Vienna finishes in 1918. Her speculative projection of this phrase onto the interwar period is interesting and points to the need for future research to develop this theme of exclusionary nationalism in Austria.

German-speaking fellow citizens on a day-to-day basis.²⁴ If denunciations of non-German nationalities in wartime were an indication of the ethnic and civic lines of belonging in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, what avenues of research might point to the construction of national identity and citizenship along similar lines in the interwar period? Might we be able to see, for example, another form of denunciation in the sensationalist boulevard press that suddenly boomed in the interwar years with the lifting of press restrictions after the war? And what did pedagogical journals make of the private Slovene and Czech schools in Austria that were sanctioned by international laws on the rights of minority populations? It is these sorts of encounters that could shed light on the entangled histories of Central Europeans who share a common, yet contested past.

These interactions between Central Europeans also belong to a wider phenomenon of 'border crossing', which has come to the fore in recent efforts to understand ethnically pluralist societies from the perspective of 'transnational' history. Border crossers do not just describe refugees fleeing war zones, but they also refer to people who crossed imaginary ethnic and linguistic boundaries as part of daily life.²⁵ The latter, less spectacular occurrences of border crossing became much more significant after 1918 as nationalists in the successor states took over the public and ideological spaces left by their predecessors. Border crossing then moved from a localised everyday event to a large-scale international event involving mass movements of people and creating a spectacle of difference and displacement that endured throughout the twentieth century. When this happened, hysteria and paranoia set in and made it possible for nationalists to exploit the margins where people lived and experienced diversity. The examples shown here suggest that this hysteria and paranoia became entrenched as a result of the population upheavals during the First World War.

²⁴ On the Carinthian Slovenes, see Hanns Haas and Karl Stuhlpfarrer, *Österreich und seine Slowenen* (Vienna: Löcker and Wögenstein, 1977). On the Czech minority in Vienna, see, for example, Karl M. Brousek, *Wien und seine Tschechen: Integration und Assimilation einer Minderheit im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1980).

²⁵ While borders and borderlands have become a fast-growing interdisciplinary area of research, the phenomenon of border crossing is newer and still emerging in many disciplines, in history notably. See, for example, the recent contributions in Madeleine Hurd (ed.), *Borderland Identities: Territory and Belonging in North, Central and East Europe* (Eslöv: Gondolin, 2006).

Debates about citizenship and immigration have had a remarkable durability in twentieth-century Austrian history. Wartime policies of internment, surveillance and denunciations that deliberately targeted non-German nationalities, as we have seen here, suggest that exclusionary nationalism tends to crystallise in moments of acute social and political instability during war, or amid a threat to the country's borders, such as the wave of refugees from Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union since the 1990s. That this form of exclusion preceded, and has outlived, the radical years of the Nazi dictatorship suggests that national identity in Austria has little to do with a post-1945 matrix in which 'German' represents the exact opposite of 'Austrian'. Rather, it builds on the legacy of the multinational Habsburg Monarchy, a legacy that continues to inform debates about identity and belonging in Central Europe at the end of the twentieth century.

REFERENCES

- Angerer, Thomas, 'An Incomplete Discipline, Austrian *Zeitgeschichte* and Recent History', in Anton Pelinka and Günter Bischof (eds.), *Austria in the Nineteen Fifties* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1995).
- Bischof, Günter and Pelinka Anton, (eds.), *The Kreisky Era in Austria* (New Brunswick: Transaction, 1994).
- Brousek, Karl M., *Wien und seine Tschechen: Integration und Assimilation einer Minderheit im 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1980).
- Cornwall, Mark, 'News, Rumour and the Control of Information in Austria-Hungary, 1914-1918', *History*, Vol.77, No.249, 1992, pp.50-64.
- Cott, Nancy F., 'Marriage and Women's Citizenship in the United States, 1830-1934', *American Historical Review*, Vol.103, No.5, 1998, pp.1440-74.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila and Gellately, Robert, 'Introduction to the Practices of Denunciation in Modern European History', *Journal of Modern History*, Vol.68, No.4, 1996, pp.762-763.
- Grandner, Margarete, 'Staatsbürger und Ausländer: Zum Umgang Österreichs mit den jüdischen Flüchtlinge nach 1918', in Gernot Heiss and Oliver Rathkolb (eds.), *Asylland wider Willen: Flüchtlinge im europäischen Kontext seit 1914* (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1995).

- Grandner, Margarete, Heiss, Gernot, and Rathkolb, Oliver, 'Österreich und seine Deutsche Identität: Bemerkungen zu Harry Ritters Aufsatz "Austria and the Struggle for German Identity"', *German Studies Review*, Vol.16, No.3, 1993, pp.515-20.
- Hass, Hanns, and Stuhlpfarrer, Karl, *Österreich und seine Slowenen* (Vienna: Löcker and Wögenstein, 1977).
- Healy, Maureen, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Heiss, Gernot, 'Pan-Germans, Better Germans, Austrians: Austrian Historians on National Identity from the First to the Second Republic', *German Studies Review*, Vol.16, No.3, 1993.
- Heiss, Gernot, and Rathkolb, Oliver, (eds.), *Asylland wider Willen: Flüchtlinge im europäischen Kontext seit 1914* (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1995).
- Hoffmann-Holter, Beatrix, 'Abreisendmachung': *Jüdische Kriegsflüchtlinge in Wien 1914-1923* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1995).
- Hurd, Madeleine, (ed.), *Borderland Identities: Territory and Belonging in North, Central and East Europe* (Eslöv: Gondolin, 2006).
- Luft, David S., 'Austria as a Region of German Culture: 1900-1938', *Austrian History Yearbook*, Vol.23, 1992, pp.135-48.
- Mentzel, Walter, 'Weltkriegsflüchtlinge in Cisleithanien 1914-1918', in Gernot Heiss and Oliver Rathkolb (eds.), *Asylland wider Willen: Flüchtlinge im europäischen Kontext seit 1914* (Vienna: Jugend und Volk, 1995).
- Panayi, Panikos, 'Dominant Societies and Minorities in the Two World Wars', in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Minorities in Wartime: National and Racial Groupings in Europe, North America and Australia during the Two World Wars* (Oxford: Berg, 1993).
- Redlich, Joseph, *Austrian War Government* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929).
- Ritter, Harry, 'Austria and the Struggle for German Identity', *German Studies Review*, Vol.15, Special Winter Edition, 1992, pp.111-29.
- Ritter, Harry, 'On Austria's German Identity: A Reply to Margarete Grandner, Gernot Heiss and Oliver Rathkolb,' *German Studies Review*, Vol.16, No.3, 1993, pp.521-23.

Steinberg, Michael, *The Meaning of the Salzburg Festival: Austria as Theatre and Ideology, 1890-1938* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Ther, Philipp, 'Beyond the Nation: The Relational Basis of a Comparative History of Germany and Europe', *Central European History*, Vol.36, No.1, 2003, pp.45-73.

Winkler, Wilhelm, *Die Einkommensverschiebungen in Österreich während des Weltkrieges* (Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1930).

Zahra, Tara, 'Reclaiming Children for the Nation: Germanization, National Ascription, and Democracy in the Bohemian Lands, 1900-1945', *Central European History*, Vol.37, No.4, 2004.

Zimmer, Oliver, 'Boundary Mechanisms and Symbolic Resources: Towards a Process-Oriented Approach to National Identity', *Nations and Nationalism*, Vol.9, No.2, 2003, pp.173-93.