

Original citation:

Mick, Christoph (2018) *"What did they die for?": War remembrance in Austria in the transition from empire to nation state*. In: Miller, Paul and Morelon, Claire, (eds.) *Embers of Empire : Continuity and Rupture in the Habsburg Successor States after 1918*. Austrian and Habsburg Studies, 22. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books. ISBN 9781789200225

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/104850>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

This chapter appears in a larger collection published by Berghahn Books
<http://www.berghahnbooks.com/title/MillerEmbers> Mick, Christoph (2018) "What did they die for?": War remembrance in Austria in the transition from empire to nation state. In: Miller, Paul and Morelon, Claire, (eds.) *Embers of Empire : Continuity and Rupture in the Habsburg Successor States after 1918*. Austrian and Habsburg Studies, 22. New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

“What did they die for?”

War Remembrance in Austria in the Transition from Empire to Nation State

Introduction

Public war remembrance has multiple functions: to honor the dead, comfort the bereaved, conciliate the veterans, and legitimize the political order. In order to fulfill these tasks, war has to be invested with meaning. This is easier for states that win or, at least, survive a war. After the German army attacked France and Belgium in 1914, their soldiers did not need convincing that they had to fight. The British government, meanwhile, told its soldiers that they were fighting Germany to uphold liberal values and the rule of law as enshrined in the Treaty of London (1839), which guaranteed Belgian neutrality and to which Germany (then Prussia) was a signatory. But of course, the main reason Britain entered the war was to maintain the balance of power in Europe and prevent the Belgian sea ports from falling into German hands. Britain, France, Belgium and the other victorious powers could thus draw meaning from the world war in a way that was not possible for Bulgarian or German soldiers. And yet despite defeat, their countries had at least survived the epic conflict. The same could not be said for the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which collapsed in 1918. What did its soldiers die for?

It proved difficult for the eponymous successor states of Austria-Hungary to give meaning to the Great War and integrate it into their national narratives. While Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Croats, Slovenians, and Bosnians could all draw sustenance from their own successful state-building, Austrian Germans and Hungarians had been the dominant nations in an empire that no longer existed. The new postwar borders, moreover, meant that 3.3 million Hungarians and more than three million Austrian Germans now found themselves as minorities in states dominated by other nations. And Austria herself was a small republic consisting of just a few German-speaking provinces with a total population of some six million. Only Vienna, the former imperial capital, still bore witness to Austria's vanished status as a great power.

This chapter analyzes Austrian attempts to give meaning to the First World War. It will not

examine how the bereaved sought to come to terms with their loss, but rather discuss the meaning offered them by their government, political parties and elites. Public war remembrance plays an important role in political conflicts. The design of memorials and the form and content of national rituals are negotiated between government and society. They thus stand a better chance of finding wide acceptance if they result from compromise and are open to multiple interpretations, rather than when governments and interest groups try to impose their views onto the memorials and memorialization process. Such partisanship risks alienating those parts of the population that do not accept the “official” version of the war. In so doing, they can undermine one of the main purposes of war remembrance: furthering national unity. Governments and interest groups count on their control of the public space and narrative to shift, eventually, opinion in their favor. Yet this is not always the case and national unity is not furthered but – as in inter-war Austria – rather weakened.¹

I have set out to make this argument by analyzing Austrian attempts to create a national memorial that would give meaning to the world war. My focus is on the *Heldendenkmal* (Heroes’ Memorial) on *Heldenplatz* (Heroes’ Square) in Vienna. Although the initial ideas for such a memorial were floated in the 1920s, when Austria was still a democratic republic, the memorial was only completed a decade later under Austro-fascism. As we will see, this had a profound impact on the memorial’s design and meaning. First, however, I will examine an earlier memorial project that promoted democratic and pacifist values and was closely connected with Vienna’s then socialist city government: the war memorial on the *Zentralfriedhof* (Central Cemetery).

The War Memorial on the *Zentralfriedhof* in Vienna

After the world war, successive Austrian governments faced a monumental task: Almost every Austrian had lost a son, friend, husband, or close relative. How could the bereaved be comforted in

the wake of the empire's collapse? They went to war – as so many other soldiers of the Great War – believing that they had to fight to defend their families and homes. Retrospectively they had rather defended a now deposed dynasty and dismantled empire. Had the soldiers therefore not died in vain? Was their death not futile? Religion offered some comfort, but it was difficult to find national meaning for their “ultimate sacrifice.” Liberals could at least welcome one consequence of the defeat: Austria had become a democratic republic. Yet the soldiers had not fought for republican/democratic values or, even, for an Austrian or German nation-state. For most Austrians, the solution to their dilemma was thus to become part of Germany. Yet the victorious powers expressly forbade *Anschluss* (in this context: union) and denied Austrians the right of self-determination. Instead Austria became an independent state largely against the will of her people.²

For Austrian socialists, the war provided a different message: it had been a capitalist crime chiefly committed by the old elites. Socialists thus invoked the dead as a warning against militarism and on behalf of revolutionary action. Accordingly, only a socialist revolution would prevent a new imperialist war. Nevertheless, these were still not the ideals for which the k.u.k. soldiers had fought.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, most Austrian war memorials arose from local initiatives and were made by and for local communities and military units. For example, every day at noon since 3 May 1931, an organist plays the *Heldenorgel* (heroes' organ) in the Kufstein fortress (Tyrol) for ten minutes.³ Yet despite being the biggest open-air organ in the world, the concert only commemorates the Austrian and German war dead. Such local memorials and monuments to specific peoples or military units could not compensate for the lack of a national war memorial in the capital.

On the other hand, the memorials created during the war had imperial rather than national meanings. Thus the postwar Austrian government was forced either to redefine these monuments

or to build new ones that would privilege republican values. This was easier said than done. Austria, after all, was still trying to find her *raison d'être* and the government was undecided as to how to use the war to integrate the population and reconcile social and political divisions. Moreover, political parties and varying veterans' organizations dominated war remembrance and used it to promote their particular interests. Most agreed that a national war memorial was needed, but it proved exceedingly difficult to settle on a representation of the war that would be acceptable to the majority of conflicting interest groups.

It is in this atmosphere that the Vienna city council and the organization of Viennese war invalids commissioned the monument for the city's *Zentralfriedhof* in 1924. Never intended to be a national war memorial, the socialist magistrate tasked the sculptor, Anton Hanak, to design a structure which would combine mourning for the fallen with a clear anti-war message. The outcome was a monument depicting a mother sinking to her knees and raising her arms in pain and desperation. Above her juts a stone overhang—symbol of war's heavy burden and threat. The monument was erected at the entrance to the cemetery's war graves section containing the remains of some 17,000 soldiers who died in Vienna's military hospitals. On the rear of the monument, was the inscription "NIE WIEDER KRIEG" (Never Again War).⁴

The socialist newspapers praised the monument. The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* welcomed the fact that it conveyed a universal rather than more narrowly national message—"a monument of nameless humanity (*Menschheit*) mourning her lost sons."⁵ Proponents even saw the chalkstone material used for the sculpture as a deliberate statement against traditional heroic monuments typically made from more expensive granite or "noble" marble or bronze. Hanak had originally planned to group male bronze figures representing sacrifice, superhuman struggle, truth and loyalty (*Treue*) around the "mother of sorrows" (*Schmerzensmutter*).⁶ This did not come to fruition and the mother figure stood alone. Without the bronze figures the monument's anti-war message was

even stronger than the artist originally intended.

Although the *Zentralfriedhof* monument could not satisfy all national groups, socialist newspapers and republican organizations went to great lengths to popularize its pacifist appeal. The war, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* reminded readers, had made widows and invalids out of far too many women and men. The newspaper also blamed the military conflict for the high unemployment and general impoverishment of the Austrian populace. In this way, socialists hoped to unite the nation through suffering rather than triumph, and thus to mobilize Austria against war: “A shout resounds from the depths of this miserable hell suffered by the masses, a call to all subsequent generations: Never again war!” The *Arbeiter-Zeitung* argued that only democracy could prevent war, and that proletarian pacifism had to incorporate a patriotism that was capable of defending itself (“*wehrhafter Patriotismus*”). But it was up to the whole nation to resist the return of the Habsburg dynasty and to prevent capitalists and the ruling classes from again sending Austrians to war.⁷

On 31 October 1925, socialist Vienna and various republican organizations honored what the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* referred to as the “murdered soldiers” whose death had been “meaningless and useless.” The demonstrations brought pacifist discourse and monument together. Members of the *Republikanischer Schutzbund* (the Social Democratic Party’s paramilitary) marched to the cemetery in disciplined formations. The socialists agitated against capitalist society and any restoration of the Habsburg dynasty, using war remembrance to reinforce democracy, socialism, and pacifism.⁸ Speeches by city officials during the monument’s unveiling delivered a clear anti-war message. Moreover, the social-democratic mayor Karl Seitz reemphasized the non-national significance of the memorial, which was dedicated to *all* soldiers and war victims (*Opfer des Krieges*). He thus compared the monument to the ‘tombs of the unknown soldier’ in other countries:

When we celebrate [the nameless soldier], we are certainly not doing so in order to pay homage to the arts of war and violence; we are not honoring him as the tool but rather as the victim of war, as one who had to die. The monument's inscription—"Never again war!"—is the cry of all cultured humanity, a cry of culture and civilization against the barbarity of war...⁹

The government newspaper *Wiener Zeitung* likewise extolled the fact that, unlike other war memorials, this one neither glorified war nor called for revenge. Rather it was an expression of "unspeakable pain" (*eines unsäglichen Schmerzes*) and "harrowing calamity" (*eines grauenvollen Unglückes*), the main purpose of which was to comfort the bereaved. The monument would thus serve as a warning to future generations and promote reconciliation.

Nevertheless, the *Wiener Zeitung* was none too happy about the anti-war inscription. Indeed, it expressed concern that some citizens might be offended by the message, "which shouts out at us—all too loudly!—from this monument." Moreover, if political infighting should stop when remembering the dead, then the monument's "fierce and fervent pagan spirit" (*heidnischer Geist heftig und brennend*) was unhelpful.¹⁰ The conservative Christian Social journal *Reichspost* also expressed displeasure with the inscription, as well as with the monument's lack of religious symbols. In one of the many letters-to-the-editor published by the newspaper, a reader not only took umbrage at the inscription's political connotation, but also with the sculpture itself: rather than seeing a mother mourning her heroic sons, he imagined "a hyena, a Fury." The reader also found the monument to be deeply materialistic and devoid of any sign of Christian hope.¹¹

Despite its pacifist message, the war memorial was not the sole prerogative of socialists and democrats—in 1925/1926, it also became a rallying point for the political right. One day after the socialists gathered in front of it on All Saints' Day (November 1, 1925), conservative veterans organizations and student corporations gathered around what they called the "heroes' monument"

(*Heldendenkmal*) rather than the “mother of sorrows.” The chairman of the right-wing *Frontkämpferversammlung* (Frontline Fighters’ Organization) of German-Austria Oberst von Zeiß abstained from openly criticizing the memorial’s anti-war message. Yet he loudly declared that while veterans did not “frivolously” wish for war, they would always be ready to do their duty should the people (*Volkstum*) be threatened (though not necessarily with the same enthusiasm as in 1914). He further promised that those present were inspired by the fallen to work together for a better future, even if the fatherland had not shown adequate gratitude to its soldiers.¹²

Similar dueling ceremonies took place the following year. After the right-wing Frontline Fighters’ Organization met near the memorial on November 1 to honour the dead of the First World War, the leftist *Schutzbund* held its own gathering on *Totensonntag* (“Dead Sunday,” 21 November 1926).¹³ *Frontkämpfer* chairman Colonel Zeiß no longer spared the monument with his criticism. He stirred his audience when he declared that the memorial failed to live up to the Austrian people’s expectations—the *Frontkämpfer* would thus not rest until a new one had been built on the same site.¹⁴ From this November 1 forward, the *Frontkämpferverband*, as it was also called, appears to have held its annual memorial ceremony beside the graves of former leaders, rather than at the monument itself. The army, meanwhile, commemorated the fallen in Vienna’s St. Charles’s Church (*Karlskirche*). Only the *Republikanische Schutzbund* continued to meet at the Viennese war memorial, though these gatherings received less press coverage than in previous years.

The political right maintained that the inscription “Never again war” was an unacceptable politicization of war remembrance. However, they were not above evoking the fallen soldiers to promote their own political aims. The *Heldendenkmal* in central Vienna would be the very epitome of this politicization.

The *Heldendenkmal*

By 1930, Austrian cities including Vienna, Eisenstadt, Klagenfurt, Salzburg, and Innsbruck all had impressive World War I memorials. Yet these were no substitute for a national memorial. Ideas for what was already being called a *Heldendenkmal* went back to the first Austrian postwar democratic governments, and in 1925 several front fighter associations put forward concrete proposals. Yet as with similar attempts in Germany, these early Austrian commemorative efforts came to naught.¹⁵ Even in 1930, it was unclear where the memorial would be located and what it would look like. One idea was to erect a twenty-five meter iron cross on the Kahlenberg, at the edge of Vienna's nineteenth district. The remains of an unknown soldier would then be buried there. Other proposed sites included the classical Theseus temple in the Volksgarten; Austria's tallest mountain—the Grossglockner, the tomb should be blasted in the rock immediately beneath the peak; and the island of Wörth in the Danube.¹⁶

In 1932, the government finally settled on a site that was already a war memorial in its own right—the outer castle gate (*Äußeres Burgtor*) on Vienna's *Heldenplatz*. Designed by the Neoclassicist architect Peter (Pietro) Nobile and built by soldiers of the Imperial Austrian Army, the *Äußeres Burgtor* was unveiled in 1823 to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the victory over Napoleon's army at the Battle of Nations in Leipzig (1813). Later, equestrian statues of Prince Eugène de Savoy (1663–1736) and the Archduke Karl, Duke of Teschen (1771–1847)—arguably Austria's greatest military leaders—were erected on *Heldenplatz*. In 1916, laurel leaves were attached to the gate to honor the fallen soldiers of the Austro-Hungarian Army. The gate was thus already intimately connected with war remembrance.¹⁷

The Association for the Erection of an Austrian Heroes' Memorial (*Vereinigung zur Errichtung eines Österreichischen Heldendenkmals*, or simply *Heldendenkmalskomitee*) was established in 1932. Dominated by high-ranking officers of the imperial army and representatives

of right-wing veterans' organizations, the Association was chaired by the veteran Major General Carl Jaschke. Colonel General (Count) Viktor Dankl von Krašnik—the oldest living member of the imperial army in Austria—served as its patron.¹⁸

In the midst of the planning for the Heroes' Monument, the political landscape in Austria changed dramatically. On March 4, 1933, Federal Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss suspended parliament and transformed the democratic republic into an authoritarian Austro-fascist “*Ständestaat*” (corporative state). Dollfuss soon created the Patriotic Front (*Vaterländische Front*) by merging the *Heimwehr* (the paramilitary organization of the political right) with the Christian-Social Party and other conservative organizations. The government, which could now rule by decree, gradually suspended civil rights and dissolved the Social Democrats' paramilitary organization, the *Republikanische Schutzbund*. It also closed down the main workers' newspaper, the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*. Yet the repression did not merely target pro-republican organizations—it went after enemies of the new regime on both the far left and right (i.e., the communists and national-socialists) as well. In February 1934, resistance by the *Schutzbund* in Linz led to a brief civil war that ended victoriously for the government, its paramilitary organizations, and the federal army. The civil war cost the lives of 356 people. 88 of them were members of the *Schutzbund* or its allies, 111 fought on the side of the state (police, gendarmerie, army, volunteers), 112 victims were non-combatants and 45 could not be allocated to any group. Nine *Schutzbund* members had been executed, 10 – 15 had committed suicide. Following the civil war, scores of *Schutzbund* members were arrested and the government dissolved the Social-Democratic Party and its affiliated trade unions.¹⁹

The *Heldendenkmal* now became a joint project of right-wing veterans' organizations and the emerging Austro-fascist state. Yet despite this ideological uniformity, the planning process proved challenging due to the need to maintain the historical unity and consistency of the *Heldenplatz* site

itself. In this respect, the committee stipulated that the memorial design fulfill the following criteria: (1) a monument to a “nameless soldier” of the Great War and the cornerstone in a network of local war memorials; (2) a monument to the “glorious imperial army” and its history over the past three centuries; and (3) a site for the obsequies of important personalities. In short, the *Ständestaat* and federal army (*Bundesheer*) would link themselves to the Austrian empire through war remembrance and the glorification of the imperial army.

They would ideally do so, moreover, with voluntary funding by the Austrian people rather than as a solely top-down government project. The Association for the Erection of an Austrian Heroes’ Memorial held its first fundraising event in the ceremonial hall of the Habsburg Imperial Palace (the *Hofburg*) on January 17, 1934. It was hardly a populist occasion. Former Austrian counts and countesses, princes and princesses, archdukes and archduchesses met with retired generals and high-ranking representatives of the new government, including Federal Chancellor Dollfuss and Ministers Kurt Schuschnigg, Karl Buresch, Robert Kerber, and their wives. A state secretary in the Army Ministry, Prince Alois von Schönburg-Hartenstein, welcomed the guests with a speech emphasizing the objectives of the *Heldendenkmal*: to honor the dead heroes, their living comrades, and the war invalids. Schönburg-Hartenstein went on to praise the dutiful soldiers who had sacrificed their lives for the fatherland;²⁰ and Cardinal Theodor Innitzer, the provincial governors and the federal government were named patrons (*Ehrenschilder*) of the *Heldendenkmalskomitee* and of the memorial itself.²¹

While the organizers considered the event a success, fundraising for the memorial proved more difficult. Veterans’ organization members were reluctant to top up their membership fees to support the project, and the contributions from fundraising events and general collections did not meet the organizers’ expectations. The fact that additional state funding was granted in the midst of the global economic crisis is not only indicative of this dilemma, but also of the government’s

eagerness to legitimize the new political order. In the end, more than forty percent (300,000 schillings) of the memorial's total cost of 700,000 was covered by public money. The remainder came mostly from collections and voluntary contributions, with veterans' organizations contributing approximately 100,000 schillings.²²

The design competition itself fared better in terms of public support: 173 artists and groups submitted some 1000 different project proposals. These projects had to comply with such conditions as confining the memorial to the internal halls of the *Burgtor* (which would thus have to be transformed) and maintaining the general external appearance of Heroes' Square and the castle gate. In light of these restrictions on artistic imagination, the *Reichspost* complained that it might have been better to create something new altogether.²³ But the organizers favored traditional designs over abstract or "unaesthetic" forms that were less likely to appeal to most Austrians. Thus the *Neue Freie Presse* judged a design by the prominent architects Max Fellerer and Eugen Wörle as inappropriate, since it included sculptures by the Austrian modernist Fritz Wotruba. The journal described Fellerer and Wörle as talented men who were incapable of satisfying the "sense of beauty" (*Schönheitssinn*) the memorial demanded: "The future heroes' monument must have in its decor figures which will really be liked by the 'ordinary man' and 'ordinary woman,' graceful but full of power so that they will become popular."²⁴ In the end, a jury of artists, committee members, and state representatives narrowed the field to nine projects, three of which won awards.

In opening an exhibition of the contest designs, retired Colonel General Dankl emphasized that the Austrian capital was the appropriate place for the national war memorial. Federal Chancellor Dollfuss, for his part, stressed that the monument should be a "symbol of the unity of all war comrades...[and] preserve the spirit of the past and love for our free, independent homeland in our youth." The monument would also symbolize "our freedom...[and] unity, irrespective of world view, language and of profession."²⁵

The St. Pölten architect Rudolf Wondracek won the competition. Rather than placing the Hall of Honor (*Ehrenhalle*) for the imperial army in one of the *Burgtor*'s wings as in the Fellerer/Wörle design (which would then have decorated it with ceiling reliefs depicting the Empire's military history) or in a large crypt under the castle gate as in another proposal (an idea the *Reichspost* deemed too expensive²⁶), Wondracek put it on top of the gate itself. The Hall thus had no roof—or in Wondracek's words, it “had the most wonderful roof in the world: the sky.” Dedicated to the army, the Hall was filled with sculptures of imperial symbols such as the imperial eagle and relief portraits of Austrian generals from Wallenstein to Franz Conrad von Hötzendorf (the Chief of the General Staff from December 1912 through March 1917), as well as of representatives of Austria-Hungary's eight main nations and of soldiers from the previous three centuries.

The Austrian national character of the project was expressed through the deliberate use of native materials. The sculptures and reliefs were carved from local stone, and the unknown soldier was shaped from red Austrian marble. The latter was located in a wing of the *Burgtor* which served the monument's second purpose: war remembrance. Designed by the sculptor and former frontline soldier Wilhelm Frass, the 2.70 meter sculpture of the dead warrior lies upon a sarcophagus inside the wing's crypt and chapel. Indeed, he can still be seen there today, in the uniform of an Austrian infantry soldier right down to the steel helmet. His left hand rests upon his heart, symbolizing the blood he spilled for his fatherland. In his right, he's holding a gun. An eternal flame burns behind the altar and the walls on either side of it bear inscriptions commemorating Archduke Franz Ferdinand, “murdered in Sarajevo”; and Emperor Karl, who “died in exile” (*Verbannung*).²⁷

Since the sculpture had not been completed when the *Heldendenkmal* was unveiled on 9 September 1934, a cast copy was substituted (indeed, the entire building, including the sculpture, was not finalized until 26 October 1935).²⁸ In the meantime, on 25 July 1934, less than seven weeks before the unveiling, Austrian National-Socialists murdered Dollfuss. The dead chancellor

quickly became the patron saint of the *Ständestaat*, with a devoted following linked at once to the cult of the fallen soldiers and the glorification of the imperial army.²⁹ On 8 August 1934 his memorial service on the *Heldenplatz* drew some 200,000 faithful and prompted a state-wide industry of Dollfuß chapels, altar pictures, and renamed streets during the *Ständestaat*'s few remaining years before Nazi Germany occupied Austria in March 1938.³⁰

Despite the heavy mood following Dollfuß' murder, there was broad acclaim in the press for the *Ehrenhalle* and its – having the sky as its ceiling – closeness to nature. Virtually every newspaper dutifully cited Wondracek's sentiment that, with the exception of the St. Stephen's Cathedral (*Stephansdom*), nowhere in Vienna did one come closer to God.³¹ When I began researching the Austrian Unknown Soldier, I was unsure whether the actual physical remains of an anonymous soldier had been buried in the crypt. It was discussed whether to bring the body of an unidentified soldier from the Italian front to the memorial. The Austrian Black Cross (war graves commission) supported the initiative. But the generals of the former army, the memorial committee, and finally the government opposed it on the nationalist grounds that burying an unknown soldier would be an imitation of the entente countries.³² To this day, there are no physical remains of a soldier in the crypt.

On September 8/9, the government staged two mass meetings on the *Heldenplatz*. Since the unveiling had been purposely timed with the national meeting of war veterans (*Kameradschaftstreffen*), some 50,000 gathered in Vienna on the eighth. The city was abuzz with delegations from across the country, and the old imperial uniforms appeared everywhere. The “coordinated” (*gleichgeschaltet*) Austrian press published in full or extensively quoted from the many official speeches that sought to give meaning to the mass death of Austrian soldiers, in part by popularizing the Austro-fascist and clerical-conservative interpretation of the Great War. On the first day, the main speakers were the chairman of the *Heldendenkmalskomitee*, Carl Jaschke; the

president of the Patriotic front and former leader of the *Heimwehr*, Vice Chancellor Ernst Rüdiger Starhemberg; Austrian president Wilhelm Miklas and Chancellor Kurt Schuschnigg. At the end of his speech, Schuschnigg raised his right hand and, according to the press, was “enthusiastically” cheered by the crowd. The federal anthem played and Starhemberg and Schuschnigg marched together to the *Äußeres Burgtor* to lay a wreath at a plaque commemorating the recently deceased Chancellor Dollfuss.

The first-day celebrations culminated at 5 pm, with a rally by the Patriotic Front and its military arm (*Wehrfront*). Imperial army generals, former archdukes, barons and their wives all took up their places of honor in the rally. Above the scene floated an image of the assassinated chancellor Dollfuss, while a black flag emblazoned with his white death mask hung from a building on the square.³³ The evening ended with fireworks meant to illustrate the last three hundred years of Austrian history.³⁴ Throughout the ceremony, oppositional voices were silenced.

The next day’s unveiling ceremony was also staged such that it was almost impossible to disrupt the regime’s display of self-adulation. The arrangement of the audience left little space for ordinary civilian participation, and the area in front of the gate was occupied by the army, the *Wehrbund* (formerly *Heimwehr*), and various uniformed veterans’ formations. The main speakers, moreover, were a virtual who’s who of the authoritarian *Ständestaat*: the Archbishop of Vienna, Cardinal Theodor Innitzer; the former defense minister, retired Colonel General Alois Schönburg-Hartenstein; retired Colonel General Viktor Dankl; Vienna’s last Christian Social Mayor, Richard Schmitz; Chancellor Schuschnigg, and Austrian President Miklas. Cardinal Innitzer gave the state ceremony a religious component by celebrating a *Feldmesse* (field Mass) on a platform above the gate.

On both days the speeches focused on seven themes, the first four of which were universal to modern war commemoration: (1) the duty to remember and honor the sacrifice of the fallen

soldiers; (2) the importance of educating the younger generation; (3) the need to comfort the bereaved; (4) and a call for national unity invoking the unity that supposedly existed during the war, as well as that of the front-line soldiers themselves. The final themes were tailored to Austria: (5) the legitimization of the current political system (the *Ständestaat*) by placing it on a continuum of Austrian history; (6) the meaning of the sacrifice specifically for Austria; (7) and what might be termed the ceremony's *leitmotif*—the propagation of the “Austrian idea” (*österreichische Idee*)—standing for the healing of national conflicts and overcoming of class divisions

Many of the speeches and newspaper articles criticized the treatment of veterans and the general lack of respect accorded the fallen soldiers in the immediate aftermath of the war. According to this argument, the returning soldiers were mocked and humiliated in the democratic republic—forced to watch powerlessly as Austria's dignity and honor were trampled in the mud. And now the *Ständestaat* was giving the fallen the kind of dignified memorial they deserved.³⁵ Cardinal Innitzer heard the dead soldiers say: “Do not forget us!”³⁶ And Austria answered: “They, the unknown soldiers,” will never be forgotten.³⁷ The “deep and noble debt of gratitude owed the victims and warriors of the world war” was at last being discharged, exclaimed Captain Reichel, the *Wehrfront*'s Chief of Staff. In short, with the erection of the *Heldendenkmal* Austria—that is, the *Ständestaat*—had finally fulfilled her duty towards “her heroic sons” (*Heldensöhne*). In the crypt, books were laid out bearing the names of every fallen Austrian. Each day a page was turned to reveal new names and a mass was read for the dead soldiers.³⁸

The two-day celebrations aimed to unite the war generation with Austria's youth.³⁹ The soldiers had done their duty, risking and often sacrificing their lives for the nation. Now it was up to the new generation to emulate them. The dead were thus an exhortation to the living to create Austria anew and to validate the soldiers' sacrifices.⁴⁰ In their readiness to defend Austria, moreover, the youth should learn not only from the military virtues of their forebears in the First

World War, but from Dollfuss himself, who supposedly also had sacrificed his life for Austria.⁴¹ In his speech, Vice-Chancellor Starhemberg referred to “the heroic death of our Federal Chancellor and leader Dr. Dollfuss, who has joined the martyrs and heroes of our past.”⁴² He then absolved the front-line soldiers from guilt in the defeat, drawing on the Austrian version of the popular German “stab-in-the-back legend” (*Dolchstoßlegende*) in which “treason in the Hinterland” rather than military defeat made Austria’s demise unacceptable.⁴³ Cardinal Innitzer, for his part, agreed with the politicians though did not specify Dollfuss: the soldiers had died so that the next generation could live, and the next generation was obliged to work for a “strong Austria and a new nation (*Volk*).”⁴⁴

With the exception of the former Social-Democratic paper *Das kleine Blatt*, Cardinal Innitzer was also alone in emphasizing the importance of the monument for the bereaved. The newspaper, which had been brought into line by the new regime, reminded readers of how the soldiers had gone off to war leaving their families and friends with a terrible anxiety (*eine furchtbare Ungewißheit*) behind them. The thoughts of the bereaved were in distant countries where the fallen were buried.

And yet the pain suffered has been lightened by our gratitude. Of course, war as such is senseless—a crime, a wicked attack on flesh and blood. But the fate of the individual in war is not meaningless. Every person who lies out there gave his life in the fulfilment of the duty demanded of him. And in so doing he transcended himself to become a shining example for all those for whom service to an ideal constitutes the final fulfilment of life.⁴⁵

The unity at the front, moreover, was to be reproduced through shared remembrance, which for the government represented a means to overcoming political and class divisions. As Schönburg-Hartenstein had said at an earlier event in 1934, the memorial should constitute a reminder “of the

great unity (*Geschlossenheit*) of all nations (*Völker*) of our great erstwhile fatherland,” and of the “enthusiasm with which we went to war [together] twenty years ago.” In this way, continued Schönburg-Hartenstein, the memorial should also teach contemporary youth of the importance of such unity (*Einigkeit*) in the new, smaller fatherland.⁴⁶ According to most of the 9 September press, the monument admirably fulfilled this task as the fallen soldier became “a symbol of the unity and communion of all good Austrians.”⁴⁷ One speaker patriotically exclaimed: “The Austrian has a fatherland.”⁴⁸

Austrian workers, however, had not yet been reconciled to the new system. This task was taken up by the *Christliche Arbeiterzeitung*, the Christian-Social newspaper for the working classes. On 15 September 1934, the paper stated that the present generation had to prove itself worthy of the heroes of Austria’s great past. It was imperative to guide workers back towards the history of Austria and of the Austrian people (*Volk*)—after all, this was their heritage as well. In short, the journal advocated using history to reconcile the working classes with the state: “Austria herself needs a workforce that is conscious of Austrian history and connected with this history, as out of this flows (*erfließt*) the bond between state and labor.”⁴⁹

The fallen soldiers would thus set examples for subsequent generations of Austrians—by demonstrating the power of unity; standing in the glorious traditions of the old imperial army; and providing the link between the former empire and the authoritarian *Ständestaat*. The democratic republic, meanwhile, was deemed an aberration. “The old love of country (*Vaterland*) has once again come alive,” exclaimed Federal Minister Fey.⁵⁰ The president of the *Wehrfront*, Vice-Chancellor Starhemberg, placed his organization in the tradition of the “glorious old Austrian-Hungarian Army,” just as the *Ständestaat* put itself in the tradition of the Empire as a whole.⁵¹ The speakers thus not only linked Dollfuss, the *Ständestaat*’s founder, to the Great War fallen (“a front-line soldier from our midst”), but to the imperial family itself: “Three great men died a martyr’s

death for Austria: Archduke Franz Ferdinand, Emperor Karl, and Chancellor Dr. Dollfuss. They died because they wished to make Austria free and happy. Their legacy lives on and is holy.”⁵²

It was not unusual for the cult of the fallen after World War I to be construed religiously. The soldiers’ deaths were equated with that of Christ. And just as Christ’s martyrdom had redeemed mankind, the fallen soldiers had redeemed the nation. The lead article in the *Reichspost* on 9 September expressed it this way: “New life arises out of [the soldiers’] death. For sacrifice is stronger than success, more sublime than victory, more imperishable than glory. It is holy... Their sacrifice has the power to inspire the present, no matter how difficult life may be, with the willingness to win the future for Austria.”⁵³

Of course, Austria had no realistic possibility of regaining her old empire. Indeed, the small state was more likely to be swallowed up by its powerful German neighbor than to reincorporate the imperial crownlands. Thus a less revisionist-sounding mission statement for the new nation was needed. But what mission could convincingly integrate Austria’s powerful imperial past with the diminished and vulnerable nation-state of the present? The solution was to glorify neither the old nor the new Austria, but rather the “eternal Austria, the idea of Austria, which stands for the idea of the reconciliation between nations, of peace between classes.” This became the sacred calling for which the soldiers of the multinational army had fought and died. Crucial too was the fact that this idea was not invented by the *Ständestaat*, but took shape during the war itself.⁵⁴

In this sense then, the “mission” of the new Austrian state was consistent with that of the old Austrian Empire, without being dependent upon its recreation. Just as the Habsburg dynasty had brought Christianity, culture, and peace to its peoples and protected them against “the storm of barbarism,” Austrians would go on defending “European culture.” Indeed, they had done just that during the world war.⁵⁵ The new Austria was thus held up as the gateway to Europe, a task which had been “entrusted to our ancestors—honest (*schlichten*), quiet and reliable gatekeepers.”

Austria's "mission," in sum, was that which it had always been: to serve as Europe's "spiritual and moral bulwark" (*Bollwerk des Geistes und der Gesittung*).⁵⁶ Starhemberg went so far as to argue that Austria was destined to write European history, even world history. The world would only be "healed" from the Great War when Austria's historical importance was restored and recognized.⁵⁷

Cardinal Innitzer set a slightly more pacific tone in affirming his support for the *Ständestaat* and expressing his sense of an Austrian mission. Austrian soldiers had gone to war in 1914, he argued, to fight for peace: "our heroes set forth for the sake of peace, so as to protect family, homeland, nation (*Volk*) and fatherland." The legacy of the fallen soldiers was the call for peace, and the living must build a "holy, new Austria." As the "guarantor of Europe's peace," Austria would enable "a strong, Christian West (*Abendland*)" to rise again.⁵⁸

Thus did the *Heldendenkmal* go further than providing a national monument for Austria's world war dead: it honored the "victors of an eternal idea." This theme was embellished through the notion that Austria was "not dead, but resurrected." And since only "the Christian ethos [could] save European civilization," Austria would "once again be the model for a Europe torn asunder."⁵⁹

In constructing Austria as the flag bearer for western/Christian civilization, *Ständestaat* leaders were also making a sly dig at Germany. There, they argued, the Nazi Party had come to power "in times of national confusion," whereas Austria had faithfully protected "the most precious treasures (*edelste Schätze*) of the German spirit (*deutsches Wesen*)."⁶⁰ Austria, proclaimed President Miklas, was the "redeeming idea for all Europe, for the happiness and peace of the world, and not least for the honor of the German name."⁶¹ In other words, Austrian soldiers had died so that German and European civilization could live and, ultimately, world peace could be restored. Similarly, Schuschnigg ended his speech on 9 September by reciting the slogan of the Dolfuss government, which itself came from the title of an 1848 book by the Austrian politician Franz Schuselk: "Austria above all else, if only she wants it." The Chancellor then followed this

with his own slogan: “Austria above all else. Comrades, we want it!” (*Österreich über alles! Kameraden, wir wollen!*). His speech reminded the audience of Austria’s “thousand-year-old historical mission,” before ending with the refrain: “Austria will remain forever.”⁶²

The *Ständestaat* did face the question of how much it should emphasize its “Austrian-ness,” versus the German essence of Austria. Dollfuss had founded the Patriotic Front in 1933 to unite all right-wing and Christian organizations. He professed its adherence to Austria, though did not speak of Austria as a nation. Dollfuss’s successor Schuschnigg also spoke of Austria’s “German nature” and avoided the term “Austrian nation.” Austro-fascism thus promoted an independent Austrian state of the German nation. After Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933, Austro-fascists presented their country as the better Germany and the Austrian people as a second, *better* German nation.⁶³ War remembrance was one of the main vehicles to propagate these ideas, which formed the very basis of the *Ständestaat*’s ideology.

Following the speeches on 9 September, dignitaries led by the Federal President and other government leaders laid wreaths in the *Ehrenhalle*. Archduke Eugen contributed an enormous laurel wreath on behalf of the former Empress Zita, the wife of the last Austrian Emperor Karl. Wreaths were also laid by the German Army minister, a Hungarian delegation, and a Chinese military delegation. The guests then moved to the crypt with the Tomb of the Dying Soldier (*Grab des Sterbenden Soldaten*) to pay their final respects on behalf of a reborn Austria.

Epilogue

The war memorial in the *Zentralfriedhof* divided the Austrian public. Initially, right-wing veterans’ organizations tried to claim the space and monument, though they later preferred to hold their meetings and memorial rituals at sites with less pacifist associations. Social-democratic and republican organizations, however, continued to remember the war dead at this monument. After

the Austro-fascists came to power, the controversial inscription at the center of these political divisions—"Never Again War"—was replaced with the more anodyne words "God, grant us peace! To the Fallen of the World War [from] the City of Vienna" (*Herr, gib uns den Frieden! Den Gefallenen des Weltkrieges die Stadt Wien*). The new government additionally placed a cross atop the monument, thus giving it a Christian meaning not present in the original design. Today the *Zentralfriedhof* memorial still resonates powerfully, even if it is often overlooked by tourists more interested in the graves of Austrian authors, artists, composers, actors and politicians. Bereft of its original, provocative conceptualization, it has become a marginal monument.

Ironically the *Heldendenkmal* in the center of the capital has come to share the fate of Vienna's official war memorial in the *Zentralfriedhof*. Its marginalization, however, is due to its origins and function during Austro-fascism. The unveiling of the memorial was an opportunity the *Ständestaat* simply could not resist. It thus stamped the ideology of Austro-fascism onto the discourse surrounding the war memorial. And this was certainly not a message shared by all Austrians: on 9 September 1934, both the socialist workers and the national-socialists were absent from the dedication ceremonies on the *Heldenplatz*.

Dollfuss's state funeral in July 1934 and the unveiling of the *Heldendenkmal* that September have since been overshadowed by another mass meeting that took place on the *Heldenplatz* just four years later: On 15 March 1938, Adolf Hitler proclaimed the return of his homeland (*meine Heimat*) to Germany to a cheering crowd of some 300,000. Today, the *Heldenplatz* evokes the memory of the *Anschluß*, Nazi Germany's annexation of Austria (belittlingly renamed the *Ostmark*). Ironically considering the *Ständestaat*'s opposition to National Socialism, the Nazis found much to recycle in Austro-fascist ideology, including the oft-invoked German nature of Austria and Austria's role as a bulwark against invading eastern hordes.⁶⁴ Yet while the Nazis also destroyed many *Ständestaat* monuments and all those that honored Dollfuss, they did not alter the

Heldendenkmal. Even its hall of honor and the crypt with the dead warrior—where Hitler and other Nazi leaders laid wreaths—were left untouched. The SA (*Sturmabteilung*, or NS paramilitary) was given its own monument just below the central passage of the castle gate, which in former times had been reserved for the emperor.

The SA monument was removed in 1945, but one symbol of the national-socialist years remained until quite recently. In 1934, Wilhelm Frass, who created the sculpture of the dead warrior, belonged to the then illegal National-Socialist Party. After the *Anschluss*, he proudly recounted how he had deliberately subverted the intentions of the *Ständestaat* by slipping a metal capsule with a national-socialist message underneath the marble sculpture when it finally replaced the temporary statue in 1935. In 2012, Austrian defense minister Norbert Darabos decided to investigate whether there was any truth to Frass's story, and ordered the sculpture searched. Sure enough, the following message was discovered:

After all the terrible events, after all the humiliation, may God put an end to the unspeakably distressing feud between brothers and lead our united glorious people under the banner of the sun wheel [i.e., swastika] to the Most High. Then, my comrades, you will not have fallen in vain.⁶⁵

Thus since 1945, Austrian chancellors, presidents, foreign ambassadors, and state guests have bowed their heads before a monument bearing a concealed pro-Nazi message.

This was not, however, the complete story. To everyone's surprise, a second capsule was found bearing a message from Frass' co-worker, the sculptor Alfons Riedel. His missive was also addressed to the German nation, though it had a decidedly more pacifist tone: "I hope that future generations of our immortal nation will not again be faced with the need to erect monuments for those who fell in violent conflicts between nations."⁶⁶ There are many layers of meaning to the *Heldendenkmal*, though it never became a popular site of memory in Austria. According to the

historian Peter Stachel, most Austrians have never heard of it. Fewer still, it follows, have ever paid their respects at the crypt with the unknown warrior.⁶⁷

¹ T.G. Ashplant, Graham Dawson, and Michael Roper, “The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration: Contexts, Structures and Dynamics,” in Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper, eds., *Commemorating War: The Politics of Memory* (London: Routledge, 2000), 3–85. Jay Winter and Emmanuel Sivan, “Setting the Framework,” in Winter and Sivan, eds., *War and Remembrance in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999), 6–39. J.M. Mayo, “War Memorials as Political Memory,” *Geographical Review* 78 (1988): 62–75.

² According to the provisions of the Treaty of Saint-Germaine (10 September 1919), German-Austria had to change its name to Austria, and the new state had to accept that “the independence of Austria is inalienable.” This could only be changed with the consent of the League of Nations.

³ “Die Heldenorgel in Kufstein,” *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 103 (5 May 1931): 3.

⁴ Josef Seiter, “Politische Denkmäler im Wien der Ersten Republik (1918–1934),” in Stefan Riesenfellner (ed.), *Steinernes Bewußtsein: die öffentliche Repräsentation staatlicher und nationaler Identität Österreichs in seinen Denkmälern*, ed. Stefan Riesenfellner (Wien: Böhlau, 1998), 427–29.

⁵ “Wehrhafter Friedenswille,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 300 (1 November 1925): 1.

⁶ “Das Kriegerdenkmal der Gemeinde Wien im Zentralfriedhof,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 297 (29 October 1925): 8.

⁷ “Wehrhafter Friedenswille,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*: 1. In German: “Aus dieser Hölle der Massennot tönt es allen nachkommenden Geschlechtern entgegen: Nie wieder Krieg!”

⁸ “Die Totenfeier des Republikanischen Schutzbundes,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 300 (1 November 1925): 7.

⁹ “Das Kriegerdenkmal der Gemeinde Wien,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 300 (1 November 1925): 7. In German: “Wenn wir diesen [den namenlosen Soldaten] feiern, dann gewiß nicht im Sinne einer Huldigung für das Handwerk des Krieges und für die Gewalt, wir huldigen ihm nicht als dem Werkzeug, sondern als dem Opfer des Krieges, das sterben mußte. Das Wort am Denkmal, das sagt: ‘Nie wieder Krieg!’, das ist der Schrei der gesamten Kulturmenschheit, ein Schrei der Kultur und Zivilisation über die Barbarei des Krieges ...” See also: “Enthüllung des Kriegerdenkmals auf dem Zentralfriedhofe,” *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 250 (1 November 1925): 4.

¹⁰ “Das Kriegerdenkmal auf dem Zentralfriedhofe,” *Wiener Zeitung*, no. 248 (30 October 1925): 2.

¹¹ “Das neue Kriegerdenkmal,” *Reichspost*, no. 302 (3 November 1925): 5.

¹² “Die Totengedenkfeier des Bundesheeres,” *Reichspost*, no. 301 (2 November 1925): 4.

¹³ “Der Republikanische Schutzbund ehrt die Kriegsgefallenen,” *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, no. 302 (2 November 1926): 12. *Totensonntag* is the Sunday before Advent on which the dead are commemorated (thus it always falls between 20 and 26 November).

¹⁴ “Die Tage der Toten,” *Reichspost*, no. 302 (2 November 1926): 6.

¹⁵ On Germany, see: Benjamin Ziemann, *Contested Commemorations: Republican War Veterans and Weimar Political Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013).

¹⁶ C. Jaschke, “Die Grundlagen zum Werden des österreichischen Heldendenkmales,” in: *Österreichisches Heldendenkmal. Gedenkschrift anlässlich der Weihe des österreichischen Heldendenkmales am 9. September 1934*, edited by the Vereinigung zur Errichtung eines österreichischen Heldendenkmales (Wien: Steyermühl, 1934). On the Großglockner project “Ein Grab für den unbekanntem Soldaten Österreichs,” *Vorarlberger Tagblatt*, no. 254 (5 November 1924): 1. “Das Denkmal des unbekanntem Soldaten,” *Vorarlberger Tagblatt*, no. 53 (5 March 1926): 1.

¹⁷ *Lorbeeren für unsere Helden 1914–1916. Denkschrift zur Enthüllung der Kränze am äußeren*

Burgtor in Wien (Wien, 1916).

¹⁸ “Oesterreich gedenkt seiner Helden,” *Reichspost*, 46 (17 February 1934): 9.

¹⁹ Kurt Bauer, “Die Opfer des Februar 1934: Auszug aus dem Projektbericht ‘Die Opfer des Februar 1934. Sozialstrukturelle und kollektivbiografische Untersuchungen’ (Stand: Februar 2015),” (http://www.kurt-bauer-geschichte.at/PDF_Forschung_Unterseiten/Kurt-Bauer_Opfer-Februar-34.pdf, accessed on 13 November 2015). The project was based in the Ludwig-Boltzmann-Institut für Historische Sozialwissenschaft. On the Austrian civil war see also Emmerich Tálos, *Das austrofaschistische Herrschaftssystem: Österreich 1933–1938* (Berlin: Lit.-Verlag, 2013). Manfred Scheuch, *Der Weg zum Heldenplatz. Eine Geschichte der österreichischen Diktatur 1933–1938* (Wien: Kremayr und Scheriau, 2005). Roland Jezussek, *Der “Austrofaschismus”—ein Modell autoritärer Staatsform: Ideologie, Entstehung und Scheitern des österreichischen Ständestaates* (Saarbrücken: VDM, 2009).

²⁰ “Dem unbekanntem Soldaten Österreichs!,” *Reichspost*, 15 (17 January 1934): 7

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² Urkunde zur Schlusssteinlegung im Österreichischen Heldendenkmal in Wien, 26. Oktober 1933; Österreichisches Staatsarchiv – Archiv der Republik, Landesverteidigung, Bundesministerium für Landesverteidigung 1. Republik, Vereinigung zur Errichtung eines Heldendenkmales in Wien I (previously 07R118/1, 302–06.)

²³ “Das äußere Burgtor als Heldendenkmal,” *Reichspost*, 49 (20 February 1934): 10.

²⁴ “Das österreichische Heldendenkmal,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 24940 (18 February 1934): 14.

²⁵ “Das Heldendenkmal ein Sinnbild unserer Freiheit,” *Reichspost*, 48 (19 February 1934): 5.

²⁶ “Das äußere Burgtor als Heldendenkmal,” *Reichspost*, 49 (20 February 1934): 10.

²⁷ “Erster Blick auf das Heldendenkmal,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2.

²⁸ “Das österreichische Heldendenkmal,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25140 (8 September 1934): 11.

-
- ²⁹ Táros, *Das austrofaschistische Herrschaftssystem*, 116.
- ³⁰ David Clay Large, *Between Two Fires: Europe's Path in the 1930s* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1990), 96. More on the Dollfuß cult Lucile Dreidemy, *Der Dollfuß-Mythos: Eine Biographie des Posthumen* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2014), 61-154.
- ³¹ “Das äußere Burgtor als Heldendenkmal,” *Reichspost*, 49 (20 February 1934): 10.
- ³² Wilhelm Wenk, “Heldendenkmäler und Heldenehrung,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 8.
- ³³ “Heldenfeier im Heeresmuseum,” *Reichspost*, 245 (3 September 1934): 7.
- ³⁴ “Oesterreich über alles: Wir wollen!” *Reichspost*, 245 (3 September 1934): 4. “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6–7. “Wien im Zeichen der Heldenfeier,” *Das kleine Blatt*, 233 (9 September 1934): 2.
- ³⁵ From Starhemberg’s speech. “Wir sind kampfesfroher denn je!” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 4. “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.
- ³⁶ “Den für Österreich Gefallenen,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 252 (10 September 1934): 1–3.
- ³⁷ “Dem unbekanntem Soldaten,” *Das kleine Blatt*, 233 (9 September 1934): 2.
- ³⁸ “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6. “Die vaterländische Kundgebung auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2f. “Die vaterländische Kundgebung auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2f.
- ³⁹ “Heldenfeier im Heeresmuseum,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 7.
- ⁴⁰ Jaschke, “Die Grundlagen zum Werden des österreichischen Heldendenkmales,” 43–48.
- ⁴¹ “Dem Unbekanntem Soldaten Österreichs,” *Reichspost*, 15(17 January 1934): 7.
- ⁴² “Wir sind kampfesfroher denn je,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 4.
- ⁴³ “Der unglückliche Ausgang des Krieges 1918, den nicht der Frontsoldat verschuldet hat, sondern

den der Verrat im Hinterland herbeigeführt hat, kann für uns nicht eine endgültige Lösung für Österreich bedeuten.” (Starhemberg), “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

⁴⁴ “Unsere Helden zogen um des Friedens willen aus, um Familie, Heimat, Volk und Vaterland zu schützen.” (Cardinal Innitzer) “Den für Österreich Gefallenen,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 252 (10 September 1934): 1–3.

⁴⁵ “Dem unbekanntem Soldaten,” *Das kleine Blatt*, 233 (9 September 1934): 2.

⁴⁶ “Dem Unbekannten Soldaten Österreichs,” *Reichspost*, 15 (17 January 1934): 7.

⁴⁷ “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6. The newspaper is quoting the speech of the chairman of the *Heldendenkmalskomitee*, Major General (Army Reserve) Jaschke.

⁴⁸ “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

“Die vaterländische Kundgebung auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2.

⁴⁹ “Österreich selbst braucht eine Arbeiterschaft, die sich der österreichischen Geschichte bewußt ist und die dieser Geschichte verbunden ist, weil daraus die Verbundenheit zwischen Staat und Arbeiterschaft erfließt.” “Das österreichische Heldendenkmal,” *Österreichische Arbeiter-Zeitung*, 37 (15 September 1934): 5.

⁵⁰ “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

⁵¹ “Wir sind kampfesfroher denn je,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 4.

⁵² “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

“Die vaterländische Kundgebung auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2f.

⁵³ “Aus dem Tode das neue Leben,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 1.

⁵⁴ Markus Erwin Haider, *Im Streit um die österreichische Nation: Nationale Leitwörter in*

Österreich 1866–1938 (Wien: Böhlau, 1998), 172–80.

⁵⁵ “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

“Die vaterländische Kundgebung auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 2.

⁵⁶ “Und setzet ihr nicht das Leben ein...,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 251 (9 September 1934): 1.

⁵⁷ “‘Wir sind kampfesfroher denn je’,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 4. “Das Soldatentreffen auf dem Heldenplatz,” *Neue Freie Presse*, 25141 (9 September 1934): 6.

⁵⁸ “Den für Österreich Gefallenen,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 252 (10 September 1934): 1–2.

⁵⁹ “Aus dem Tode das neue Leben,” *Reichspost*, 251 (9 September 1934): 1.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ “Den für Österreich Gefallenen,” *Wiener Zeitung*, 252 (10 September 1934): 1–3.

⁶² Franz Schuselka, *Oesterreich über alles, wenn es nur will!* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1848); “Den für Österreich Gefallenen,” *Wiener Zeitung* (10 September 1934): 1–3.

⁶³ Friedrich Grassegger, “Nationalsozialistische Denkmäler in Österreich,” in *Steinernes Bewußtsein*, ed. Riesenfellner: 547–73.

⁶⁴ Peter Diem, *Die Symbole Österreichs. Zeit und Geschichte in Zeichen* (Wien: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1995), 203–06.

⁶⁵ “‘Gefallener Krieger’: Nazi-Metallkapsel in Burgtor-Krypta gefunden,” *Der Standard* (19 Juli 2012): <http://derstandard.at/1342139530529/Gefallener-Krieger-Nazi-Metallkapsel-in-Burgtor-Krypta-gefunden> (last accessed 17 September 2015).

⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁷ Peter Stachel, “Der Heldenplatz. Zur Semiotik eines österreichischen Gedächtnis-Ortes,” in Riesenfellner (ed.), *Steinernes Bewußtsein*, 619–56. Abridged version: “Der Heldenplatz als österreichischer Gedächtnisort,” *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften*:

<http://www.oeaw.ac.at/ikt/mitarbeiterinnen/publikationen-der-mitarbeiter/peter-stachel-werkverzeichnis-seit-1999/peter-stachel-werkverzeichnis-vor-1999/der-heldenplatz-als-oesterreichischer-gedaechtnisort/> (last accessed 17 September 2015).