

It was a long, hard road: A Longitudinal Perspective on Discourses of Commemoration in Austria

Journal Article

Markus Rheindorf
& Ruth Wodak

This paper examines recent Austrian commemorative discourse about World War 2, the Holocaust and Nazi war crimes on the official political level (speeches) as well as in the media (reportage). In a discourse-historical framework, it traces discursive strategies employed in the construction and transformation of national identities since 1945, focusing in particular on the roles of perpetrators, victims and bystanders in the context of increasingly transnational commemoration and a resurgence of nationalisms. This longitudinal perspective, with detailed case studies contrasting 2005 with 2015, indicates notable changes from generalised and collectivised representations of perpetrators and victims to a critical engagement with Austria's responsibility and past failure to acknowledge that responsibility. Moreover, the media in 2015 covered war crimes, especially final phase crimes, and presented biographies of perpetrators and victims, revealing political continuities in post-war Austria.

1. Introduction

Among the genres of political discourse that contribute to the construction of *national identity*, in particular in highly public and representative settings, commemorative speeches are the most salient and widely studied. In the field of political action, commemoration serves primarily an integrative function (Reisigl 2007) or resolves tensions (Ensink & Sauer 2003; Ensink 2009), but may also play a “disintegrative role” (Reisigl 2007) or have the potential to “destabilize” (Forchtner 2016) the collective subject they construct. Although either function may serve the political goals of the speaker, commemorative occasions evoke what have been called difficult, bitter or dark pasts (Diner et al. 1988) and commonly require the speaker to negotiate issues of *past failure, guilt and responsibility* while maintaining some positive and unifying sense of a collective self (de Cillia & Wodak 2009a, 2009b).

In Austria, whose commemorative discourses are the empirical focus of this paper, politicians, the media and civil society have long struggled with such difficult pasts, in particular related to World War II and the

Holocaust. For decades after the war, hegemonic discourses in Austria externalised guilt by constructing the myth of Austria's role as “first victim” of Nazi Germany. Austrian representatives or politicians have acknowledged *Mitschuld* or co-responsibility only since the late 1980s and early 1990s (Wodak et al. 1994; Uhl 2006; Heer et al. 2008), signifying a major if slow shift in how a *shared political past*, narrativised in commemorative contexts, is construed as informing the collective, national identity.

This paper presents work done within the framework of the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) as part of a larger research project on the discursive construction of national identities.¹ After reviewing the core concepts and previous research on commemorative discourses in the context of national identity, focusing on Austrian commemoration of World War II and the Holocaust, we discuss two salient discursive fields of action (political representation and media) as well as related genres (commemorative speeches and print news, respectively) that are covered by the subsequent analysis.

¹ This paper reports research conducted as part of the FWF-funded research project *On the discursive construction of Austrian identity/ies 2015: A longitudinal perspective* (P 27153).

Here, we present a longitudinal perspective by comparing two key speeches from the major commemorative years 2005 and 2015 as well as important media coverage.² We pursue the following questions:

- (1) How do commemorative discourses relate to Austria's (co-)responsibility in World War II in general and in the Holocaust in particular?
- (2) How do commemorative discourses relate to political continuities between the Nazi regime and post-war Austria?
- (3) How do commemorative discourses narrativise historical events and represent social actors (e.g., perpetrators, victims, bystanders)?
- (4) How do commemorative discourses account for Austrians' positioning towards the Nazi dictatorship both during and after World War II?

² Political speeches, in particular commemorative speeches, have played an important role in advancing the political and public debate on Austria's and Austrians' role during World War II. A prominent example is Chancellor Franz Vranitzky's 1991 speech in the Austrian Parliament which first acknowledged Austrian co-responsibility.

Across all four questions, the longitudinal perspective reveals a notable shift in official commemoration as well as media coverage.

2. Discourse-historical Perspectives on National Identity

The discursive construction of national identities has become a crucial field of research in cultural studies and the humanities since the 1990ies. Research focusing on the constitutive role of discourse – and particularly language – in this respect has drawn on the valuable contributions of work on national identity made in historiography, sociology and political science (e.g., Gellner 1983; Anderson 1994; Billig 1995; Haller et al. 1996; Rathkolb 2011). This development was also informed by linguistic research conducted in 1995 and a follow-up study in 2005 at the University of Vienna, focusing on the discursive construction of Austrian identities in the commemorative years 1995 and 2005 (e.g., Wodak et al. 2009; de Cillia & Wodak 2009a). The analytic approach developed in these projects is an interdisciplinary framework that integrates a form of Critical Discourse Studies with approaches from the political sciences, historiography and sociology in the *Discourse-Historical Approach*.

The *Discourse-Historical Approach* (DHA, for short) is distinguished by its systematic acknowledgment of historical context, its adherence to the principle of methodological triangulation and its critical perspective (in the tradition of the Frankfurt School) (Krzyżanowski 2010; Wodak 2011a, 2011b; Reisigl & Wodak 2016; Rheindorf forthc.). It has been applied in studies of the discursive construction of national identity in numerous countries in Europe, North and South America, Australia and China (Ricento 2003; Blackledge 2009). While the approach has proven both robust and flexible, international research has extended the framework and adapted it to the respective contexts and social developments. This includes controversial debates over the role and meaning of *citizenship*, the rising significance of *cultural aspects* such as language/s for national identities ('*Kulturnation*', e.g., in debates over the 'integration' of migrants), the impact of *financial and/or economic crises* that have dominated political discourses on many levels since 2008 (Fuchs 2013; Ichijo 2013); the evolving and often ambivalently received *role of the EU vis-à-vis its member states* (Risse 2010); or new possibilities for participation and deliberation in *Social Media* and *Web 2.0* (Loader & Mercea 2011). This succinct list

indicates that not only is the construction of national identity dynamic, but that its means, spaces and strategies themselves are also subject to both social and media-technological change.

Prominent commemorative occasions, given that they are themselves highly selective products of discursive meaning-making processes informed by national identity building and legitimation (Halbwachs 1992), present both opportunity and obligation for countries to affirm, invest in or revise their national identities. For Austria, 2015 presented a whole cluster of such occasions: 20 years of EU membership, 70 years since the Founding of the Second Republic, 60 years since the State Treaty, etc. Given previous work mentioned above, this provides the unique opportunity to trace the discursive construction of Austrian identities in a *longitudinal perspective* (1995 -2005-2015). Commemorative speeches given by high representatives of state as well as the media's engagement with commemoration and the historical events commemorated are both crucial to such an endeavour.

3. Transnational Commemoration and the Lessons of History

Internationally, commemoration has moved to the centre of discourses on national identity since the 1980s, especially in political and representational contexts in which national identity is performed in ritualistic events and spectacle (e.g., Kellner 2003; Alexander 2004; Uhl 2008). While such trends are less visible in Austria than, e.g., Germany, coming to terms with the past (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*) and securing past wrongs (*Vergangenheitsbewahrung*, Assmann 2010: 105) have become cornerstones of commemorative practices. Commemoration, in this perspective, does not simply narrativise difficult pasts but constructs specific meanings or lessons to be learned for the present. Forchtner (2016: 1) argues that commemoration has become deeply intertwined with implicit and explicit claims to recognising or knowing the lessons from the respective past. Rhetorically, such claims are characteristically realised in the topos of *historia magistra vitae* or *history as a teacher*. Concomitant with the transnationalisation of commemoration, there has been a resurgence of this mode of arguing in recent

years, making it a “promising rhetorical option in public and private debates” (Forchtner 2016: 2).

Due to the constructedness of collective memory, such lessons are by necessity also constructed, neither obvious nor simply waiting to be found – although they may appear natural and self-evident if one looks at the collective past as a source of equally collective learning. World War II and, more specifically, the Holocaust signify such a difficult past that can be re-visited to learn particularly important if painful lessons for the present and future (Lebow et al. 2006; Pakier & Strath 2010; Karner & Mertens 2013). As mentioned above, Forchtner (2016: 117) argues that a *rhetoric of penitence* strongly fuses past and present: “there is a complex dialectic of rupture and continuity at work as the in-group embodies a temporal continuum which, at the same time, cannot be affirmed in a straightforward, heroic way”. While acknowledging past wrong-doing of the in-group, the narrative also requires a demarcation from those past wrong-doings, a sort of internal othering. Thus “being pushed and pulled between continuity and rupture”, the collective We is reconstituted as a reformed moral being,

both good now and forever marred by what “We” did then.

4. Genres: Commemorative Speeches and Historical Reportage

The construction of a nation’s collective past often uses the form of a (heroic) narrative. Significantly, such narrativisation entails the selection and representation of, inter alia, key events, actors, and places to establish a meaningful framework in which to interpret the existence and continuity of the nation or people, given that communities of this scale or nature are not real but imagined in Benedict Andersen’s (1994) sense. Due to their reach and salience, albeit in strikingly different ways, *commemorative speeches* as a genre of political discourse and *reportage* as a genre of media discourse present salient aspects of the discursive construction of national identities. Before presenting our comparative case study of those two genres in 2005 and 2015, we briefly discuss genre characteristics that determine some of the rhetorical figures and discursive strategies applied.³

³ By genre, we mean text types embedded in social structures, working as stable patterns of purpose-

Typically delivered on public days of remembrance, which are usually associated with the ‘magic of numbers’ (Huter 1994), commemorative speeches primarily serve to retrieve the past for the present. The atmosphere of anniversaries legitimates re-affirming or introducing new ways of dealing with the past, selecting affirmative and problematic elements from the past in order to justify present states or future actions. Commemorative speeches do not exclusively serve the positive self-presentation of the speaker and the audience addressed; they also have an ‘educational’ function in the sense of invoking certain political values and beliefs as shared characteristics and identities, thus creating consensus and mobilising a collective identity, which in turn is appealed to as a model for future political action (see Perelman 1980). To achieve this complex aim, commemorative speeches draw on judicial and deliberative elements of classical oratory, e.g. in discussing, justifying or condemning problematic actions and

ful, goal-oriented interaction. Genres are “ideals” or “mental constructs”, “characterised first and foremost by the functions which they perform”. The function of a genre in turn guides features including structure, register, and formal criteria (Bax 2011: 60–61; Rheindorf & Wodak 2014).

events such as the Nazi past (Ottmers 1996; Forchtner 2016).

Modern mass media may relate to commemoration as a discursive practice in various ways (Wodak et al. 1994), most significantly perhaps in *reporting* on commemorative practices (such as speeches given by politicians, commemorative events etc.) and in *engaging* in commemorative practices themselves, e.g. by directly covering the historical events commemorated as well as their conditions and consequences. Whether and to what degree a particular medium engages in likely depends on factors such as journalistic quality, self-understanding and mission, resources, and (unofficial) political orientation. While some Austrian media thus only report on commemoration undertaken by politicians or civil society, others actively engage with the commemorative occasions themselves – leading to strikingly different texts. Here, we are concerned only with the latter and will therefore not cover the genre of *news report* but the more comprehensive and in-depth *reportage* or “Reportage” in German.

As a well-established genre in the German-language context, reportage can be described as a factually oriented journalistic genre that draws on eye witness accounts,

details and narrative techniques to convey an authentic, gripping story (Straßner 2000). Given the historical nature of most subjects related to commemoration – excepting, for instance, present-day consequences and commemorative practices themselves – the genre variant of *historical reportage* seems to be an apt classification of the texts covering events pertaining to World War II, the Holocaust, and the immediate post-war period. It must be assumed that for any medium to devote resources to producing such texts presents a significant commitment to the issue beyond *news reporting*. Although commemorative discourse in media has been studied in the Austrian context in the early 1990ies (Wodak et al. 1994), no studies have recently covered this field.

5. The Historical Context: Austria

Since context is pertinent to commemoration, our paper follows the concept of context as defined in the DHA and thus takes into account:

- (1) the immediate text-internal co-text (distinct and unique utterances in texts⁴);
- (2) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses (reformulations, recontextualization, mediatization of these utterances);
- (3) the language-external social variables and institutional frames of a specific situational context (the detailed chronology of events); and
- (4) the broader socio-political and historical context in which the discursive practices are embedded and to which they are related (the commemorative events and their history) (Reisigl & Wodak 2016).

Austria became a democratic state in 1918 (First Republic) and struggled through the

⁴ By text, we mean “a naturally occurring manifestation of language, i.e. as a communicative language event in a context. The surface text is the set of expressions actually used; these expressions make some knowledge explicit, while other knowledge remains implicit, though still applied during processing” (Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981: 63).

change from a large multi-ethnic and multi-cultural monarchy to a small state. After the period of Austro-Fascism between 1934 and 1938, Austria was occupied by the Nazis from 1938 to 1945 and treated as a part of the Third Reich. Many Austrians welcomed the so-called ‘Anschluss’ and the state did not resist annexation, militarily or otherwise. Austrians were drafted into the *Wehrmacht*, became part of every organization and worked on every level of the Third Reich. Since 1945, Austria has undergone many political and social changes: occupation by the Allied forces until 1955, the signing of the State Treaty in 1955, attaining the status of neutrality although clearly retaining a pro-western orientation, and the creation of a social-welfare society based on the ‘Swedish Model’. A notable change occurred in 1989–90 when the ‘Iron Curtain’ fell and new immigrants entered the country. In 1995, Austria became part of the European Union, which required a re-conceptualization of its neutrality and role in Europe and the world.

Throughout these decades, however, the moral problem of the responsibility of Austria, i.e. the participation of its people in the National-Socialist state and its crimes, was not adequately debated in the political and public sphere. Despite the beginnings of a broad reflection process after the so-called

'Waldheim Affair' in 1986 (see Wodak et al. 1990; Mitten 1992) and more recent political acknowledgements of co-responsibility, related questions have remained part of Austrian scholarly debates and political discussions until today (Uhl 2011).

The collapse of Nazi Germany forced many in Austria to confront the extent of the crimes and atrocities committed in the name of National Socialism. Feelings of doubt and guilt, and with them also the need to justify or rationalise one's behaviour, led to the development of a range of strategies for 'coming to terms with this past' (e.g. Wodak et al. 1994). For decades, this meant playing down, relativising or denying the Nazis' crimes, or at least Austrians' involvement in them. Moreover, the Moscow Memorandum of 1943 allowed Austria to point to its officially recognised status as the 'first victim' of Hitlerite aggression, providing a readily available argument to deflect responsibility. The so-called 'victim thesis' ("Opfermythos") thus legitimised a positive Austrian self-presentation through externalising all guilt for World War II and the Holocaust, but it also legitimised paying no reparations and was instrumental in suppressing long-standing divides due to the Austro-fascist rule of the Christian Social Party (1933-38).

In this context, the construction of a new national identity hinged on the validation of Austrian distinctiveness, especially vis-à-vis Germany, which negated all connections with the Nazi past. This in turn reinforced an exclusionary definition of insiders and outsiders, of 'us' and 'the others' on all levels of discourse (de Cillia et al. 1999). Given these conditions, World War II took the most prominent position in Austria's official public memory about the Nazi period, while the Holocaust was relegated to a marginal place (Reisigl 2007), as was Austria's involvement in that difficult past. This silence was broken during the 'Waldheim Affair' in 1986 and the commemorative year 1988 (Wodak et al. 1990, 1994). Public controversy slowly opened up a discursive space for replacing the victim thesis with the 'co-responsibility thesis' (Uhl 2006: 63). In the 1990s, Austrian politicians began to openly debate the question of Austrian responsibility and a high-profile exhibition on the crimes of the *Wehrmacht* (Wodak 2006; Heer et al. 2008) further contributed to lifting the taboo.

The year 1995 marked a salient commemorative year during which many party-internal conflicts occurred, mostly surrounding the status of neutrality (Benke & Wodak 2003; Kovács & Wodak 2003). The

two big parties that formed the government constructed a principally consensual narrative of history, but had markedly different views on one point: their interpretation of Austrian neutrality in light of Austria's EU membership. The Social Democrats (SPÖ) regarded neutrality as an essential part of Austrian identity, whereas the conservative People's Party (ÖVP) – as well as the Austrian President, closely aligned with the ÖVP – saw neutrality as more or less open to negotiation. The leader of the far-right opposition party FPÖ, Jörg Haider, tried to destabilise this consensual narrative, e.g., by highlighting foreign control over the founding of the Second Republic in the spring of 1945, and accusing the figurehead and first President of the Second Republic, Karl Renner, of being an opportunist. He also linked the 'so-called liberation' with crimes committed by the Soviet Army, thus relativising National-Socialist crimes (Wodak et al. 2009).⁵

⁵ Contesting whether Austria was 'truly' liberated in 1945 (which would denote a liberation from Nazi Germany) or only in 1955 (which would denote a liberation from the Allied powers) remains a persistent ideological divide between the mainstream and the far right in Austrian politics today – particularly because the latter scenario casts the liberators of the former as oppressors.

Following general elections, the People's Party entered a coalition with Haider's far-right FPÖ on 4 February 2000 (Wodak & Pelinka 2002). The 14 other member states of the European Union (Kopeinig & Kotanko 2000) reacted to this break of a taboo with the so-called 'sanctions' against the Austrian government, leading to a new chauvinistic wave in Austria characterised by a stark opposition of 'us' versus 'them'. As a political and diplomatic exit strategy, the report of the 'three wise men' established that Austria should still be regarded as a democratic country. Under significant pressure, the government decided restitution towards survivors of forced labour and Jewish survivors in January 2001. In 2005, the first of the two commemorative years we are concerned with in this article, there were several major commemorative events: 60 years since the founding of the Second Republic and the end of the World War II as well as 50 years since the State Treaty of 1955. In this context, Chancellor and leader of the People's Party, Wolfgang Schüssel, held a speech on 27 April 2005 as part of a commemorative event, describing Austria as the first victim of Nazi Germany and thus following the script of the "victim thesis" narrative (Wodak & de Cillia 2007; see below).

6. Longitudinal Perspectives on Austrian Commemorative Discourse

6.1 Case Study I: Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel on 27 April 2005

This section presents a comparative case study of commemorative discourses in 2005 and 2015, carried out as part of a longitudinal study on the construction of national identities. The data comprises texts from official commemorative discourse (*speeches*) and from media discourse (*historical reportage*). For the former, speeches given by Chancellor Wolfgang Schüssel delivered on 27 April 2005 and by President Heinz Fischer on 27 April 2015 are analysed and compared. For the latter, articles published in the weekly magazine *Profil* in 2005 and in 2015 are analysed and compared (see below for details).

Schüssel's speech, given here in the authors' translation, explicitly constructs a narrative of Austria reborn in a European context. This (re)definition of the relevance of Austria allows constructing a new founding myth for Austria and *Heimat*, a concept which was previously negatively connotated because of its extensive use by the National Socialists. Moreover, Schüssel constructs a large in-group ("us"), which could encompass

all Austrians involved in "discussing", "understanding" and "discovering" this "new homeland".

Mr President, Right Honourable Cardinal, President of the National Assembly! I have come to [. . .] for the initiation of our festive gathering and can put on record that the 27th of April 1945 was, first and foremost, a day of joy. It was the birth hour of the Second Republic, [. . .]

The 27th of April was, in Vienna [. . .] in any case, a spring day 60 years ago, in ten days the Second World War in Europe will have ended, ten days ago the big Austrian parties were founded. Their founders returned from concentration camps and detention, and together with other democrats created the Second Republic. The drama of this six-year war and the trauma of the National Socialist terror regime, however, throw sombre shadows onto the cradle of this red-white-red rebirth, but the child lives. In midst of ruins, need, hunger and desperation lives this small, new Austria, because on this day everyone looks ahead. The nightmare is over. But the horror was not over for everyone, and not every horror was over. The displacements continued, in all of Europe, especially in Central Europe over ten million people were displaced, lost their

home, whole convoys of refugees were on the move looking for a new home. (Schüssel, 27 April 2005)

This passage shows marked elements of hegemonic historical interpretation: the year 1945 as “birth hour of the Second Republic” or Austria’s “rebirth”, the State Treaty as a birth certificate, and the period following 1945 as a success story, for which the founding generation must be thanked. In contrast, the period before is vaguely portrayed as a natural disaster (e.g. “catastrophe”) in a metaphorical scenario (Musolff 2006). Indeed, the conceptual scenario of “rebirth” frames Schüssel’s entire speech. The period immediately following the ‘re-birth’ is highlighted as dramatic for Austria, without explicitly naming Austrians’ involvement in the Nazi terror regime. Quite to the contrary, as a new-born child Austria is without blame. The metaphor thus carries an additional meaning – Austria is not simply restored as a state, it is also innocent like a new-born child.

A particularly striking aspect of the above-quoted segment is that the victims of Nazi terror who were murdered in concentration camps are discursively placed on the same level as the soldiers who waged the war of aggression (*topos of equation*). A vast community of victims is thus constructed, in

which all Austrians are victims of the “nightmare”. This is substantiated by the predication of historical events as “horror” and “dark age”, which could encompass the atrocities of war, the Nazi terror and the displacements after 1945. In the peculiar enumeration that follows, some perpetrators are included, although not in their function as perpetrators but in a numerical juxtaposition with their victims. Through all this, passive voice prevails and obscures both the liberators (“were liberated”) and the murderers (“were murdered”) (see Wodak & De Cillia 2007 for details).

Hundreds of thousands of Austrians were wounded or dead, hundreds of thousands had to recognise their error, their terrible error, but in the end both were liberated: the victims and perpetrators. The victims of this horror must be named: 100,000 Austrians died in the concentration camps or in captivity, most of them Jews. Many had to lose their lives because of their political or religious convictions, also thousands of Roma, Sinti, ill and disabled people were murdered. 50,000 civilians were killed, 100,000 political prisoners lost years of their lives. 250,000 soldiers were killed, 250,000 came back from the war badly injured or mutilated, and in the following

years 500,000 prisoners of war had to pay for this criminal war having been started.

On this grand scale, all victims are evaluated equally: those murdered in the Nazi concentration camps, those killed in action in the Nazi war of aggression, the civilian bomb victims and those expelled from their homeland as a result of WWII.

The *lessons from history* that Schüssel derives in his speech are not related to fascism as such, but to Austria’s new role in Europe and thus to a vision of Europe itself. The entire second part of the speech is concerned with the period following the founding of the Second Republic. The 27 April 1945 is thus surprisingly interpreted as the origin of European unification, as

[...] the deep-seated reason that we now have the good fortune to have lived in peace, freedom and wealth throughout the past 60 years. And therefore this new Europe is actually the fruit of the day of joy on 27 April 1945, and at the same time also a commitment for us Austrians.

Given that the European Community was only founded after the Treaties of Rome with signatories Germany, France, Italy, and the Benelux countries in 1957 and given also that Austria only joined the EC in 1995, this

is certainly a bold reconstruction of European history. The main lessons, then, do not concern political responsibilities but a more general outlook on the future:

Maybe we could follow the example of those who gave us courage in the year 1945. Maybe we sometimes need oral vaccinations against pessimism and faintheartedness or a little course of vitamins for hope and happiness. Optimism certainly could not hurt in those days.

Dehistoricisation and depoliticisation of historical events are the ultimate result. The discursive construction of identity narratives which link the past to the present and future necessarily involves a quasi-coherent, teleological argumentative sequence of events, which proposes explanations for traumatic experiences and does not list the perpetrators. Thus, such speeches seek to construct consensus and avoid alienating possible political opponents, fulfilling the official purpose of commemoration. The deletion of actors also shows the colonisation by the discourse of terror: everything was terror and horror; no difference is made between actors, causes and events. Numbers (“hundreds of thousands”), collectivised groups (“50,000 civilians”, “100,000 political prisoners”) and abstract nouns (“their error”,

“this horror”) depict the horror as depersonalised, dehumanised, and essentialised. Austria and Austrians are presented as a nation of victims, as innocent and unaware as a new-born baby.

As Forchtner shows in his analysis of a speech given by Social Democrat Barbara Prammer (then president of the Austrian National Council) on 5 May 2008 – the National Day against Violence and Racism in Memoriam of the Victims of National Socialism – more recent commemoration in Austria included allusion rather than self-reflexive acknowledgment of the “victim myth” (Forchtner 2016: 119). In his speech on the same occasion, the second president of the National Council, Andreas Khol, also attempted to “balance the traditional story of victimhood with more recent developments toward co-responsibility” (Forchtner 2016: 126–127).

6.2 Case Study II: President Heinz Fischer on 27 April 2005

In contrast to these earlier speeches, President Heinz Fischer’s speech, delivered on occasion of the 70th anniversary of the founding of the Second Republic on 27 April 2015, does not simply commemorate and in doing so narrativise the commemorated e-

vents, linking them to the present; Fischer also narrativises Austria’s troubled history of commemorating those events, adding a self-reflexive meta-level to the ongoing commemoration. This creates a split of the collective self not only in the moment of commemoration (Forchtner 2016: 123), but also in the narrative itself.

Although an annual occasion, the event was exceptional that year not only because of the notable number but also because it was for the first time attended by a foreign head of state – German President Joachim Gauck – in fact, Gauck did not merely attend but followed Fischer’s speech with a speech of his own. Prior to both speeches, a documentary by the well-known Austrian journalist and filmmaker Hugo Portisch was shown on site. After a brief opening welcoming the audience, Fischer addresses the commemorative occasion:

Today we celebrate the 70th birthday of our Second Republic and thus the restoration of an independent and democratic Austria in April 1945. How dramatic the events were at that time has been shown in the film by Hugo Portisch, which we just saw, and for which we are grateful to Hugo Portisch and the ORF.

Between March 1938 and April 1945 Austria was erased from the map. Those were years of an inhuman dictatorship, a terrible war and the incomprehensible Holocaust. But there was a rebirth as the war was approaching the end and the dictatorship of National Socialism was crushed: On 27 April 1945 the Republic of Austria was re-erected as an independent democratic state with the Declaration of Independence. It is to this new beginning that today's hour of celebration is dedicated to.

Fischer draws on the topos of "rebirth" (similarly to Schüssel) as well as the topos of authority ("the film"). Both – birth and testimony – here serve to construct a shared, collective political past ("our Second Republic"). This past, however, is strictly delineated, beginning only with 27 April 1945. The period between Austria's being "deleted" from the map in 1938 and the "restoration" of a democratic Austria in 1945, however, opens up an inconsistency, since the former does not correspond to the latter: Austria did not cease to be a democratic country in 1938 but earlier, during the so-called "Ständestaat", an authoritarian form of government that is also referred to as Austro-fascism (see above). This seemingly minute inconsistency in Fischer's narrative is in fact one of several traces of a persistent

conflict in Austria's political domain – and, indeed, within the government coalition – over the role and assessment of this particular historical period: While the Social Democrats clearly denounce that regime as fascist, the People's Party to this day refuses that term for the authoritarian government installed by the Christian-Democrats, the precursor to their party (Tálos 2013).

Fischer's speech then extends his construction of a collective past into a shared political present and future:

An hour of celebration that is for the first time attended by the head of state of a neighbouring country, namely the German President Joachim Gauck, whom I hereby welcome very warmly. I feel that this is a special moment that we are commemorating this birthday of the Second Republic with the highest representative of the country with whose history we were in many ways so closely connected – at times also disastrous ways – while today, with a new self-understanding, we are working together towards a peaceful European future.

After a lengthy greeting of the political and religious dignitaries present, Fischer launches into a deeply personal narrative, returning again to the moment of "birth", on which hinges his construction of a shared political

past, present and future. He reprises the pivotal historical moment within an autobiographical narrative, recounting his perceptions as a child. Unlike the previously appealed-to authority of historical documents, Fischer now gives testimony as an eye witness to the birth of the nation.

In the school year of 1944/1945 I was attending first grade of primary school, first in Pamhagen in Burgenland and then in the little village Loich an der Pielach, where my mother found lodging with my sister and me when at the end of the war the fighting was coming dangerously close, first reaching the Burgenland border and soon after Vienna. [...] On Friday, 27 April 1945, on a day on which the fighting was still going in parts of Austria and on which thousands of murders were still being committed in concentration camps and many other places, the constitutive session of a provisional government took place, with permission of the Soviets, in the Vienna town hall.

In the following section of his speech, Fischer returns to the end of the war on a collective level and continues his constructive strategy. He evokes the heroic accomplishments of restoration and exchanges the metaphor of "birth" for that of "building" in both noun and verb form.

In Vienna, at the end of April 1945, it was already possible to celebrate, but it was only on 8 May that National Socialist Germany surrendered unconditionally and thus ended the war in Europe. The end of war and dictatorship and the declaration of independence of 27 April laid the foundation for erecting our Second Republic. But not even the building site was clearly delineated and entirely useable. Austria was occupied by four allied armies, the border to Yugoslavia at first contested. Numerous towns or neighbourhoods lay in ruins, the infrastructure was largely destroyed and there were more than a million refugees and displaced persons on Austrian soil. In Vienna, one knew little about the situation in the west of Austria and in the west one knew little about the situation in Vienna. Even less was known in Austria about what was being considered or planned in Washington, Moscow, London or Paris for the future fate of Austria. Despite all that, the damage caused by the war was being removed at an incredible rate. And the political reconstruction, so decisive for the future, was also very successful. The political and material development of the seven decades since 1945 can, on the whole, be called a success story without a doubt.

Characteristically for a commemorative speech, past adversities are emphasised when they serve to highlight the heroic past – in the case of Austria, *reconstruction*. At this point, Fischer has not yet confronted Austria’s difficult past – active involvement in the crimes of National Socialism. His strategy in doing so is strikingly different from Schüssel (see above): He addresses Austria’s mistakes and neglect in dealing with the National Socialist past and gives an account of the controversial debates about Austria’s responsibility and the issue whether Austria was liberated in 1945 or 1955.

It was a long, hard road, which did not remain free from mistakes and neglect, which looking back one can more easily recognise as such and should admit. Special attention is due to the treatment of the NS past and of the victims of the NS period, but in doing so the specific historical conditions must also be considered.

Already when Hitler, a few hours after an outrageous ultimatum, had the German Wehrmacht to invade Austria on 12 March 1938, and it was cheered enthusiastically on its march to Vienna and even in Vienna, two points of view emerged. The one said, Austria – and thus also the Austrians – were the first of Hitler’s victims. The brief

summary of this wide-spread view was that the evil of National Socialism came from outside, the orders came from above, and we were the victims. The others reminded that Hitler was welcomed in Austria with greatest cheering, that the Swastika flags were already mounted on many houses before the first German soldier set foot on Austrian soil, and that the Austrians therefore accordingly had to carry a share of guilt and responsibility for the further developments, including the crimes and war crimes.

This summary of Austria’s past engagement with the National Socialist past reduces the controversy to two opposing positions, placing both in the collective past (“Already when Hitler”, “The one said”, “The others reminded”), and thus historicises the debate. However, his position on the two “views” is not equidistant: The verb semantics of “said” and “reminded” clearly put the speaker at more distance to the former than the latter. Nonetheless, Fischer does not resolve this opposition by siding with either; instead, he proceeds to offer a third, distinct view as “truth” and names the guilt of a large part of Austrians.

The truth – which took Austria a long time to state in a clear and unambiguous manner, however – is indeed: Many Austrians were

without a doubt opponents and also victims of the NS system, but a depressingly large part were sympathizers, supporters and also ruthless perpetrators. In addition, deliberately looking the other way, thoughtlessness and opportunism made it easier for the ruling regime to pursue and reach its goals. It is the knowledge of this truth that commits us to the principle “Resist the beginnings”, dear ladies and gentlemen!

While clearly assigning blame, the phrasing remains abstract: The perpetrators’ actions are all nominalised, partly functionalising the actors (“supporters”), partly as processes (“looking the other way” or states (“thoughtlessness”), which avoids the grammatical positions of agent and patient.

Following his appeal to resist, Fischer lists the obligations neglected by the republic after 1945: to persecute war criminals and take responsibility for the victims of National Socialism. In this context, Fischer addresses further “fundamental questions” of the collective past:

In the 70 years since the founding of the Second Republic, other fundamental questions that were at first very controversial could be solved. Was there not for a long time debate about the question whether Austria was actually liberated in 1945, or

whether it did not rather go from unfreedom in Greater Germany into unfreedom through the occupying powers?

As before, Fischer presents this question as historical, as already solved: Indeed, the question he actually poses is merely whether there had not been a debate; the truly fundamental question is only embedded within this rhetorical question. Thus, the answer he provides is to that issue rather than to the question asked.

The clear answer is as follows: Austria was liberated in 1945 from an inhuman, criminal dictatorship. Indeed, the allied occupation was a heavy, burdensome weight including transgressions, violations of human rights and arbitrary acts. But it did not prevent the reconstruction of Austria as a democratic country with European values and thus facilitated the path from the liberation in 1945 to complete freedom in the year of the State Treaty 1955.

Yet again Fischer does not choose one of the two answers presented, but formulates a third. His answer can be read as a compromise, partly because of its ambiguity: While he refers to “liberation” in 1945, “complete freedom” is only reached in 1955.

This concludes the part of the speech focused on self-reflection and constructing a shared past; it is also central to establishing a sense of penitence, in Forchtner’s terms, on which the rest of the speech builds. In this, Fischer draws lessons from history for the refugee crises of 2015.

Today, one cannot use these terms, namely human dignity and opportunities for life, without being reminded of the fate of thousands of men, women and children, who are risking their lives and all too many cases also lose their lives in the attempt to cross the Mediterranean. [...] I am certain that many decades from now, one will still speak about these refugee catastrophes, but also about the way in which we reacted to them – just like today one still speaks about, discusses and judges the treatment of refugees in the post-war era. That means we must face the judgement of history.

The final part of the speech connects these lessons from history to the international community and praises the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the European Union as the foundation of the future.

7. Commemoration in Austrian Media 2005 - 2015

Among the Austrian media, the weekly magazine *Profil*, founded in 1970, represents a quality publication well-known for investigative journalism and its critical engagement with politics in Austria. While its self-understanding and journalistic ethos made *Profil* an outspoken critic of the far-right in Austria, it has a history of scrutinizing parties left of the centre, such as the Social Democrats, with equal fervour. For instance, the magazine ran articles on former NSDAP members finding a new home not only in the right-wing Freedom Party but also in the People's Party and the Social Democrats. Our choice of this particular publication is thus motivated by its long-standing role as an active observer of Austrian politics, including memory politics, engaging in *historical reportage* rather than merely news-reporting or interviews on the subject.

In the course of 2005, the magazine published 25 articles on subjects related to commemorative occasions, mainly World War II, the Holocaust, and the founding of the Second Republic. These articles were part of its weekly editions, some comprising series with several parts, and included the genres *reportage*, *interview*, *report*, *commen-*

tary or *gloss*.⁶ In 2015, *Profil* ran 101 articles comprising similar subjects and genres, 24 of which were published in a special issue of *Profil History*, a recently founded series focusing on key aspects of Austrian history. This particular issue was entitled “Die Stunde Null 1945. Ein Land in Trümmern: Österreichs schwerer Neubeginn” [The Zero Hour 1945. A country in ruins: Austria's difficult new beginning]. Many of the articles published in 2015 continued or updated themes from 2005, but we identified only a single identical reprint.

To provide a comparative overview of the thematic focus in both years, we conducted a content analysis of the topics covered by these articles (see Table 1, next page) using the following categories: World War II in general, World War II military action, the Holocaust, war crimes, biographies of perpetrators, biographies of victims, final phase crimes, the founding of the Second Republic, immediate post-war period, post-war period (up to 1955), political continuities, reconstruction, and reparations. Most categories, including ‘perpetrator’ and ‘victim’, were clearly self-ascribed

by the journal's texts in our corpus. The final two categories included in Table 1, ‘past and present memory politics’ and ‘acknowledgement of scientific research’, provide some indication of the orientation and grounding of the journalistic texts and help us understand to what degree the texts are reporting on commemoration as a topic or dealing with the subject matter of commemoration itself.

The comparison indicates several striking changes regarding the weight and breadth given to individual topics: The percentage of articles covering World War II in general and reconstruction has almost halved, while the coverage of more specific topics has significantly increased regarding military action, the Holocaust, war crimes and especially final phase crimes as well as the biographies of perpetrators and victims. Temporally, we note a shift towards the final phase of the war and the immediate post-war period, focusing closely on the “Zero Hour”. Spatially, the articles in 2015 provide a strikingly more fine-grained picture of, e.g., military action and war crimes, by detailing individual instances – sometimes instead of, sometimes in addition to sweeping overviews or statistical totals (see below).⁷

⁶ Genres were determined by self-labelling in the journal where present and according to journalistic genre conventions following Straßner (2000) where absent.

⁷ For a much broader corpus-based analysis of print media discourses on commemoration in Austria, see Rheindorf (forthc.).

Content	Articles 2005	Articles 2015
World War II in general	24% (6)	6,9% (7)
World War II military action	8% (2)	11,9% (12)
Holocaust	12% (3)	21,8% (22)
War crimes	8% (2)	14,9% (15)
Final phase crimes	4% (1)	13,9% (14)
Biographies of perpetrators	12% (3)	18,8% (19)
Biographies of victims	4% (1)	10,9% (11)
Biographies of resistance fighters	-	1% (1)
Biographies of post-war figures	4% (1)	5,9% (6)
Founding of the Second Republic	8% (2)	7,9% (8)
Immediate post-war period	8% (2)	15,8% (16)
Post war period 1945-1955	8% (2)	8,9% (9)
Political continuities	12% (3)	11,9% (12)
Reconstruction	12% (3)	5% (5)
Reparations and restitution	4% (1)	6,9% (7)
Past and present memory politics ⁷	16% (4)	33,7% (34)
Acknowledges scientific research	16% (4)	14,9% (15)
Total articles	25	101

Table 1

Topical spread in *Profil* articles related to commemorative topics (2005/2015)

The following passage is taken from part one of the three-part series “Die Stunde Null. 60 Jahre nach dem Kriegsende” [The Zero Hour. 60 Years after the end of the war], entitled

“The Battle for Vienna” [Schlacht um Wien], that *Profil* ran in 2005.

Nosebleed? No problem. The “Kleine Wiener Kriegszeitung” [Small Viennese Wartime Paper], the last remaining local newspaper, had advice to give in its section “You only need to know how to help yourself” even on 1 April 1945: “Put vinegar-soaked cotton in your nostril.” The smell of sweat should be dealt with by watered vinegar.

On this day the Red Army stands at Baden near Vienna. When its soldiers advance into Vienna’s outer districts five days

later, the paper ran the headline “Advance on Vienna failed” and devoted its coloured page to the speed of falling raindrops during a thunderstorm. The cover of the Viennese edition of the “Völkischer Beobachter” [People’s Observer, the National Socialist party’s public medium] on 7 April read “Under the banner of successful defence”. The Soviets had already advanced into

Ottakring [district of Vienna] and to Südbahnhof [Vienna’s main railway station]. By the time the NS medium was delivered, the editors had long fled.

Until the very end, the brown masters refused to accept that their power had been broken. As if in a blood rage, they denied the truth. On all roads leaving Vienna, SS patrols lay in wait for deserters. In the prisons, hundreds of prisoners died in machine gun fire. In the KZ camp Ebensee, the SS intended to bury alive thousands of Jews and political prisoners in the factory’s tunnel on 4 May, one week after the provisional government headed by Renner had assumed office.

The final act. The trauma of war through which the people in Burgenland, in Vienna and in large parts of Lower Austria went through in those spring days of 1945 was incomparable. 19,000 Wehrmacht soldiers and 18,000 Red Army soldiers lost their lives in the three weeks between the taking of Budapest and the fall of Vienna, according to Soviet calculations. Since Napoleon had approached through the Danube valley in 1809, Vienna had not experienced war again. To be sure, in 1848 the imperial troops had used grape shot to end the revolution in bloody fighting in the streets;

in 1934 there had been two days of civil war. But in this April of 1945, a world war that had already devoured 50 million people was entering its final act in and around Vienna.

While the opening paragraphs of the article are typical of reportage – using details to convey a sense of authenticity and immediacy – and while they detail the final weeks of the war, the general tone and pace of the narrative are abstract, conveying an overview and often using numbers to impress upon the reader the magnitude, horror, and absurdity of those days. No names are given for any of the perpetrators, victims or bystanders in those crimes; rather, they are functionalised or collectivised as “soldiers”, “the SS”, “SS patrols”, “thousands of Jews and political prisoners”, culminating in the “50 million people” already “devoured” by the war. The article also uses the term “letzter Akt” [final act], alluding to dramaturgical terminology, in order to name and delineate the period of what are known as “Endphaseverbrechen” [final phase crimes] in historiography.

This mode of narrating contrasts with the majority of *Profil* articles published in 2015, revealing not only a significantly more comprehensive and detailed engagement with commemorative subjects but also a different mode of narrative. The following

passage is taken from the article “Täter, Opfer und ein paar Gerechte” [Perpetrators, victims and a few just] in the special issue “Zero Hour” in 2015.

One week before the residents of Vienna-Floridsdorf [then a workers’ district] had witnessed a horrific scene. At the “Spitz”, a busy traffic crossing in Floridsdorf, Major Karl Biedermann, Captain Alfred Huth and Lieutenant Rudolf Raschke were hanged from the street lampposts on 9 April. They had played an important part in the betrayed “Operation Valkyrie” – the plan for peacefully handing over Vienna to the Red Army. As Alfred Huth was dragged up the ladder, he shouted: “Long live Austria.” The SS men became nervous, Huth slipped from their grasp and fell back-first onto a picket fence. An SS officer put his boot on his neck and stabbed him with his dagger in the face multiple times.

One of the participants in the execution was the SS veteran Otto Skorzeny, who in 1943 had rescued Benito Mussolini from prison at Gran Sasso. After the war, Skorzeny escaped into Franco’s fascist Spain and lived there until his death in 1973 as a well-respected tradesman. The Verstaatlichte Industrie Österreich [a publicly owned industrial conglomerate] also liked to use his

contacts. Neo-Nazis to this day travel to Skorzeny’s grave in Vienna’s Döbling cemetery.

When the SS fled north from the approaching Red Army through Floridsdorf on 12 April, the bodies of the three officers still hung from the posts. During their retreat, the SS men had discovered nine Jews aged between 21 and 82 in a basement on Förstergasse, who had been hiding here. A resident of the building had betrayed them. They died a few hours before Vienna was liberated. [...]

The worst fate, of course, was that of the approximately 50.000 Hungarian Jews who had been tasked with building the strategically utterly useless “Südostwall” [South East Wall] at the eastern border since November 1944. Hundreds of them died already in the first weeks of the earth works. The conditions in the camps in Hungary, Burgenland and Styria were catastrophic. Worst was the situation in the Lower Austrian village Felixdorf, where the camp commander Wilhelm Vroch simply left the forced labourers to die of hunger and cold. The local pharmacist heroically smuggled medicine and pain relief into the camp – the mass death he was unable to prevent. Of the 2.200 Jews in Felixdorf only 80 survived.

Commander Vroch was sentenced to 18 years of prison in 1948 but released early in 1953.

Between Purbach and Donnerskirchen, a sadistic overseer named Nikolaus Schorn supervised the work. Jews who had fallen ill he had placed naked in the snow “to reduce their fever”, until they died. Bela Grosz, one of the few survivors, however, attests to the good conduct of the two villages’ residents: “They were very well-meaning towards us and tried to help us.” In Schattendorf village in Burgenland, too, food was often given to the suffering figures.

People were behaving very differently in the nearby village Rechnitz. There, on the orders of the local Nazi group leader, on 25 March, 250 Jews no longer able to work were shot by SS men and local party members. In the quarry of St. Margarethen, where today cultural festivals are held for Easter, the SS plunged boulders on the Jews held there. Dozens died.

Since the end of March, the cannons of the Red Army could already be heard, the Hungarian Jews were put on marches of each 2.000 persons from southern Burgenland and Styria towards Mauthausen [concentration camp]. The utterly malnourished

human beings were guarded by SS and Volkssturm men. The route led by Graz, Bruck, Leoben Eisenerz, Hieflau, Weyer, Großraming, Ternberg, Steyr and Enns to Mauthausen. On some days, 40 kilometres had to be covered. Those who could not keep up were shot. In the steep area of Präbichl, masses perished. “We fed on grass and stinging nettles, the snails were a special delicacy,” recounts the survivor Josef Kahan.

Unlike the exemplary segment from 2005, this passage is at pains to provide names, situational details and verbatim eye witness accounts, while also moving along a chronology of the final days of the war in and around Vienna (covering the same regions: Vienna, Burgenland and Lower Austria). On the one hand, this results in a minute recounting of some events, but the article also follows some individuals’ historical trajectory (e.g. “the SS veteran Otto Skorzeny”) and links the individual incidents temporally or spatially (e.g. “When the SS fled north from the approaching Red Army through Floridsdorf on 12 April, the bodies of the three officers still hung from the posts”). This allows the article to highlight continuities and the ease with which even prominent Nazis could do business or hold office in post-war Austria. While these are

notably different strategies to convey the horror of those days, the article largely resorts to numbers with respect to those murdered by the Nazi death machinery. While other articles are devoted to the biographies of such victims as well as of the perpetrators, it is striking that the “horror of numbers” is still used here, along-side the stylistic device of brevity (e.g. “Dozens died.”), to convey the abruptness of these deaths. Nearly all reportages in our corpus employ similar strategies and forms, but the shift indicated above seems consistent and thus characteristic of the genre’s development between 2005 and 2015.

8. Conclusion

The longitudinal perspective on two levels of discourse (official representation and media) and in terms of two genres (speech and reportage) indicates notable changes in commemorative discourses in Austria. Chancellor Schüssel’s speech on 27 April, as an example of official commemorative discourse in 2005, constructs “the horror” of the war in generalised terms, dehistoricising and depoliticizing World War II. The speech makes no differences between actors, causes and events. Numbers, collectivised groups and abstract nouns are used to depict

the horror as depersonalised and essentialised events. Austria and Austrians are presented as a nation of victims, innocent as the metaphorical new-born baby, unaware of past wrongdoing by members of that collective self. Throughout that year's media discourse, as exemplified by *Profil*, there is little thematic focus in reportage on World War II and little interweaving of distinct topics within single articles. Overall, the narrativisation of historical events relies on generalised and collectivised representations of perpetrators and victims as well as on statistics to convey the magnitude rather than the specifics of war crimes and individual fates. This results in an explicit yet distanced account of Austrians' involvement in the war.

In contrast, official commemorative discourse as represented by President Fischer's speech on 27 April 2015 personalises historical events to some degree and explicitly engages with the issue of Austria's responsibility and its past failure to acknowledge that responsibility. This can also be recognised, for instance, in the speeches given by Chancellor Werner Faymann and Vice-Chancellor Reinhold Mitterlehner on 15 May 2015 on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the signing of the Austrian State Treaty. Here, however, the highest-

ranking representatives of the government and their respective parties (Social-Democrats and People's Party, respectively) articulate the diverging narratives on Austria's liberation mentioned by Fischer just weeks before. Fischer's speech frames this meta-discursive engagement with choice questions and then provides alternative answers outside their respective options. The dominant metaphors here are that of building and of builders, thus allowing for agency and responsibility. Throughout 2015, media coverage as represented by *Profil* was thematically focused on war crimes, in particular final phase crimes, as well as on the biographies of perpetrators and victims, the political continuities in post-war Austria and the negligent memory politics of previous decades. In the 2015 *Profil* article that covers the same space and timeframe as the article from 2005 (i.e. the weeks immediately before and after the end of the war), the interwoven narratives are individualised, naming perpetrators and victims, including verbatim quotations from survivors and eye witnesses. They also trace the life history of several perpetrators prior to and after this narrow timeframe, thus indicating political continuities and Austria's long neglect in dealing with its National Socialist past. However, the "horror of numbers" is still

evidently used in recounting the mass murder of Jews.

Apart from the presence of the German President at the occasion, little to no transnational commemoration is visible in the texts of either genre in 2015. These are still clearly *national* discourses of commemoration, focused on the specifics of Austria's difficult past and, on the meta-level, of previous engagements with it. Only in its appeals to the present does President Fischer's speech universalise the lessons to be learned from history. The "rhetorics of learning" (Forchtner 2016) have indeed shifted from a rhetoric of judging or failing to a rhetoric of penitence. This enables positive self-representation as a now-aware, penitent subject in opposition to its past, providing a narrative of reform but also finding a foundation in the heroes proclaiming the Second Republic.

References

- Alexander, J. C. (2004). Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance between Ritual and Strategy. *Sociological Theory*, 22.4, pp. 527-573.
- Anderson, B. (1994). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Revised edition. London: Verso.

- Assmann, A. (2010). The Holocaust – a Global Memory? Extensions and Limits of a New Memory Community. In A. Assmann & S. Conrad (Eds.), *Memory in a Global Age: Discourses, Practices and Trajectories* (pp. 97-117). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bax, S. (2011). *Discourse and Genre: Using Language in Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Benke, G. & Wodak, R. (2003). The Discursive Construction of Individual Memories: How Austrian “Wehrmacht” Soldiers Remember WWII. In J. R. Martin & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Re/reading the Past: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Time and Value* (pp. 115-138). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Billig, M. (1997). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Blackledge, A. (2009). *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- de Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London & New York: Longman.
- de Cillia, R. & Wodak, R. (Eds.) (2009a). *Gedenken im „Gedankenjahr“: Zur diskursiven Konstruktion österreichischer Identitäten im Jubiläumsjahr 2005*. Wien: Studienverlag.
- de Cillia, R. & Wodak, R. (2009b). Restitution: Yes, but... In R. Wodak & G. Auer Borea d’Olmo (Eds.), *Justice and Memory: Confronting Traumatic Pasts. An International Comparison* (pp. 195-121). Wien: Passagen.
- de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (1999). The Discursive Construction of National Identities. *Discourse and Society*, 10.1, pp. 149-173.
- Diner, D. et al. (1988). *Zivilisationsbruch: Denken nach Auschwitz*. Hamburg: Fischer.
- Durkheim, E. (1965). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. NY: Free Press.
- Ensink, T. & Sauer, C. (Eds.) (2003). *The Art of Commemoration*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Ensink, T. (2009). Resolving Antagonistic Tensions: Some Discourse Analytic Reflections on Verbal Commemorative Practices. In R. Wodak & G. Auer Borea d’Olmo (Eds.), *Justice and Memory: Confronting Traumatic Pasts. An International Comparison* (pp. 169-194). Wien: Passagen.
- Forchtner, B. (2016). *Lessons from the Past? Memory, Narrativity and Subjectivity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Fuchs, D. (2013). What Kind of Community and how much Community Does the European Union Require? In R. McMahon (Ed.), *Post-identity? Culture and European Integration* (pp. 87-104). London/New York: Routledge.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Halbwachs, M. (1967). *Das kollektive Gedächtnis*. Stuttgart: Enke.
- Haller, M. et al. (Eds.) (1996). *Identität und Nationalstolz der Österreicher: Gesellschaftliche Ursachen und Funktionen – Herausbildung und Transformation seit 1945 – Internationaler Vergleich*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Heer, H. et al. (Eds.) (2008). *The Discursive Construction of History: Remembering the Wehrmacht’s War of Annihilation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huter, M. (1994). Die Magie der runden Zahlen: Kulturelles Verhalten und Formen der Zeiterfahrung. In W. Schmidt-Dengler (Ed.), *Der literarische Umgang der Österreicher mit Jahres- und Gedenktagen* (pp. 7-16). Vienna: ÖBV.
- Ichijo, A. (2013). *Nationalism and Multiple Modernities: Europe and Beyond*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Karner, C. & Mertens, B. (Eds.) (2013). *The Use and Abuse of Memory. Interpreting World War II in Contemporary European Politics*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Kellner, D. (2003). *Media Spectacle*. London: Routledge.
- Kopeinig, M. & Kotanko, C. (2000). *Eine europäische Affäre: Der Weisen-Bericht und die Sanktionen gegen Österreich*. Vienna: Czernin.
- Kovács, A. & Wodak, R. (Eds.) (2003). *NATO, Neutrality and National Identity: The Case of Austria and Hungary*. Wien: Böhlau.
- Krzyzanowski, M. (2010). *The Discursive Construction of European Identities: A Multi-Level Approach to Discourse and Identity in the Transforming European Union*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.

- Lebow, R. N. et al. (Eds.) (2006). *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Loader, B. D. & Mercea, D. (2011). Networking Society? Social Media Innovations and Participatory Politics. *Information, Communication and Society*, 14.6, pp. 757-769.
- Mitten, R. (1992). *The Politics of Antisemitic Prejudice: The Waldheim Phenomenon in Austria*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Musolff, A. (2006). Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21.1, pp. 28-38.
- Ottmers, C. (1996). *Rhetorik*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Pakier, M. & Stråth, B. (Eds.) (2010). *A European Memory? Contested Histories and Politics of Remembrance*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Perelman, C. (1980). *Das Reich der Rhetorik*. München: Beck.
- Rathkolb, O. (2011). *Die paradoxe Republik*. Innsbruck/Wien: Haymon-Verlag.
- Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2016). The Discourse-historical Approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 23-61). London: Sage.
- Reisigl, M. (2007). *Nationale Rhetorik in Fest- und Gedenkreden: Eine diskursanalytische Studie zum „österreichischen Millennium“ in den Jahren 1946 und 1996*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg.
- Rheindorf, M. (forthcoming). Diskursanalyse in der Linguistik: Der Diskurshistorische Ansatz. In F. Wilk (Ed.), *Sprache und Identität. Tagungsband der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie*. Neunkirchen: Neunkirchener Verlag.
- Rheindorf, M. & Wodak, R. (2014). Der Wandel des österreichischen Deutsch: Eine textsortenbezogene Pilotstudie (1970-2010). *Deutsche Sprache: Zeitschrift für Theorie, Praxis und Dokumentation*, 2.2014, pp. 139-167.
- Ricento, T. (2003). The Discursive Construction of Americanism. *Discourse & Society*, 14.5, pp. 611-637.
- Risse, T. (2010). *A Community of Europeans? Transnational Identities and Public Spheres*. Ithaca/New York: Cornell University Press.
- Straßner, E. (2000). *Journalistische Texte*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Tálos, E. (2013). *Das austrofaschistische Herrschaftssystem: Österreich 1933 - 1938*. Wien: LIT.
- Uhl, H. (2006). From Victim Myth to Co-responsibility Thesis: Nazi rule, World War II, and the Holocaust in Austrian Memory. In R. N. Lebow et al. (Eds.), *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe* (pp. 40-72). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Uhl, H. (2008). Medienereignis „Holocaust“: Nationale und transnationale Dimensionen eines globalen Gedächtnisortes. In F. Lenger & A. Nünning (Eds.), *Medienereignisse der Moderne* (pp. 172-191). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Uhl, H. (2011). *Transformationen des österreichischen Gedächtnisses: Nationalsozialismus, Krieg und Holocaust in der Erinnerungskultur der Zweiten Republik*. Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- Wodak, R. & de Cillia, R. (2007). Commemorating the Past: The Discursive Construction of Official Narratives about the “Rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic”. *Discourse & Communication*, 1.3, pp. 337-63.
- Wodak, R. & Pelinka, A. (2002). From Waldheim to Haider. In R. Wodak & A. Pelinka (Eds.), *The Haider Phenomenon*, pp. vii-xxvii. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Wodak, R. (2006). The Making of History/History in the Making. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 5.1, pp. 125-154.
- Wodak, R. (2011a). Suppression of the Nazi Past, Coded Languages, and Discourses of Silence: Applying the Discourse-Historical Approach to Post-War Anti-Semitism in Austria. In W. Steinmetz (Ed.), *Political Languages in the Age of Extremes* (pp. 351-379). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2011b). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Wodak, R. et al. [1999] (2009). *The Discursive Construction of National Identities*. 2nd revised edition. Edinburgh: EUP.
- Wodak, R. et al. (1990). „*Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter!*“ *Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.
- Wodak, R. et al. (1994). *Die Sprachen der Vergangenheiten: Öffentliches Gedenken in österreichischen und deutschen Medien*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.