

**European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR)  
Standing Group on EU Politics  
Third Pan-European Conference**

Istanbul, 21-23 September 2006

**EU Enlargement and Transforming Paradigms of Political Identity in Individual  
Member States: the Case of Austria**

Dr. Esra LaGro

Jean Monnet Chair for EU Enlargement and Governance,  
Dept. of International Relations  
Istanbul Dogus University

&

CIRP – International Research and Policy Platform

E-mail: [elagro@dogus.edu.tr](mailto:elagro@dogus.edu.tr) / [lagroper@usa.net](mailto:lagroper@usa.net)

## **EU Enlargement and Transforming Paradigms of Political Identity in Individual Member States: the Case of Austria**

Dr. Esra LaGro

### **ABSTRACT**

The EU Enlargement process provides not only a window of opportunity but also several challenges. The transformation of paradigms of political culture in individual EU member states constitutes one of these challenges and reflects on the policy choices on different levels. This paper aims to focus on the political challenges stemming from the Enlargement process and the changing paradigms of political culture faced by an individual EU member state. In this context, the position of Austria provides valuable insights. Thus an analysis of how the individual political identity crisis of an EU member state can possibly reflect on the EU level politics and policy making will be presented.

## **EU Enlargement and Transforming Paradigms of Political Identity in Individual Member States: the Case of Austria**

### **Introduction**

The EU Enlargement process provides not only a window of opportunity but also several challenges both for the EU itself and for the individual member states. The paradigms of political existence are changing with each enlargement wave, and the recent enlargement of the EU to the east encompassing ten new member states is not an exception to the rule, and it only accelerated the process. This in return reflects on the EU individual member states in different ways. The transformation of paradigms of political identity in EU member states reflects on the policy choices at different levels including the approach towards new enlargements, and their foreign policy as well as Council Presidency priorities. In this context, the case of Austria provides valuable insights since the Enlargement process added to the identity transformation of Austria, and it reflects on her foreign policy choices as well as her stance towards the EU. In order to provide an insight to the case of Austria, first, the identity formation process of Austria will be discussed with reference to main components of political identity and culture in Austria. This will be realized by taking into account two different periods; before and after the Cold War environment together with the policy outcomes based on the main components of identity formation. Then, the EU membership of Austria and her position vis-à-vis the EU Enlargement process will be discussed within the framework of two EU Presidency periods providing further evidence of the effects of identity transformation of an individual member state and its policy outcomes.

### **Identity and Political Culture in Austria**

The identity and political culture of Austria have essentially a much more complex structure than one would expect from a relatively small state. The complex sets of issues involved in the political processes not only shape the political culture of Austria but also they shape Austrian foreign policy agenda and its outcomes. Therefore, it is necessary to

examine the main issues which on the overall constitute the pillars of Austrian identity and political culture. In this context, the evolution of Austrian identity after the Second World War; the evolving concept of neutrality and its significance for domestic and international politics; the concept of Kulturnation and its relevance to Austrian identity formation as well as her foreign policy; and the importance of concept of Mitteleuropa for Austria in the post-Cold War geopolitical order will be discussed. An insight to these issues and concepts will clearly provide a considerable understanding of Austria as to its present and future policy outcomes because the outcome of the interaction among these concepts defines domestic and international political bargaining grounds of Austria.

*The Austrian identity in the Aftermath of World War II and Austrian Neutrality*

The turning point of reconstruction of Austrian identity is argued to be the period following World War II. In this perspective, Spohn defines four controversial debates concerning Austrian identity formation process. First, Anschluss to Nazi Germany being mainly interpreted as victimization of Austria, thus coming to terms with the past turned out to be weaker in Austria. Second, the historical evolution of Austrian identity emerged in parallel and eventually separate from German identity. Third, the Austrian nation was based on ethnic-cultural / political-civic foundations. Fourth, the neutrality principle primarily provided Austria with the role as a mediator between the East and the West (Spohn, 2003: 1) Out of these four debates, the Austrian identity formation process is mostly in tune with the effort to move towards a differentiated identity vis-à-vis German identity. The efforts include a wide spectrum from distancing the national identity from that of German to positioning of Austria in European and world politics through the concept of neutrality, and the identity crisis following the collapse of Soviet Union and the Eastern Enlargement due to shifts in changing geopolitical paradigms. Thus the identity formation process of Austria has been a gradual process through construction and reconstruction of Austrian identity in line with both domestic and international events, the most controversial issue arguably being the “relation between Austrian and German layers of Austrian collective identity” (Spohn, 2003: 5).

During the First Republic, the non-consolidated Austrian nationalism was reflecting the identities at regional or local levels next to the Catholic way of life (Spohn, 2003:17). Throughout this period, Austrian and Pan-German orientations were shifting. Later during the annexation to the Third Reich and the aftermath of war only the Austrian elite came to realize and welcome the formation of an individual Austrian identity. Thus one important aspect of Austrian identity formation process in the period following the Second World War was to come into terms with the Nazi past. This was reflected as victimization of Austria, and it took a long time for Austria to face the problems in this context while the Nazi currents remained integral part of the society for a long time and (Spohn, 2003:5). Later these currents eventually transformed into Austrian nationalism under the auspices of FPÖ (Freedom Party of Austria) in 1990s. With the establishment of the Second Republic, the independent, democratic and neutral Austrian state came into existence with sustainable foundations for a separate Austrian identity. The evolution of the identity formation also marked the establishment of a neutral nation close to western democracies and cultural traditions with a mediating role between the East and the West.

The identity formation process of Austria continued with a consistent pace until the end of Cold War. The post Cold War international scene forced Austria to redefine her identity once again both domestically and internationally in order to be able to face the challenges of the new world order. In this context, the concept of neutrality, which is the important pillar of Austrian identity, also had to be redefined.

### *The Concept of Neutrality in Austria*

The concept of neutrality as interpreted throughout the Austrian political history and culture, rather its evolution, carry significant messages for analysing the current political stand of Austria in both domestic and international affairs, next to the other components of Austrian national identity. How, then, has the concept of neutrality been defined and eventually redefined by Austria? In this framework, Anton Pelinka puts forth several different meanings of Austrian neutrality. According to him, neutrality for Austria can be interpreted within a wide spectrum from an instrument of strengthening Austrian identity to a possibility to mediate credibly between East and the West (Pelinka, 2001:4). All

these definitions reveal the complexity and the challenges to Austrian identity and the ruling political elite. In domestic politics, neutrality was almost a political taboo and not much contested by the political parties until the prospect of EU membership came to the agenda of Austria following the other fellow neutral states of EFTA in due course of the EU membership process. It also points out to the fact that domestic problems arising out of neutrality issue manifested themselves at the international level, especially vis-à-vis the EU membership of Austria. The issue of neutrality has evolved to be more widely defined when the EU membership process began. This also indicates itself concerning the Austrian approach towards NATO and the EU Common Foreign and Security Policy. Thus neutrality had to be redefined at that point. The conceptual and political framework of neutrality in Austria which was carefully embedded in the system throughout the history of Second Republic needed to be reversed and narrowed down in order to be in tune with the challenges to both international and domestic politics, especially during the accession of Austria to the EU. Neutrality still remains open-ended. In the initial years of the Second Republic it was a precondition for freedom also a pragmatic response to the needs of the time but later it became an integral part of Austrian national identity (Pelinka, 2001:1). The neutrality concept of today is defined rather narrowly in order to be in tune with the requirements of post- Cold War era. It is clear that in the current world order the concept of neutrality is far from being useful for Austria despite its being interwoven into the Austrian national identity. The public opinion still holds it close to the core of the system. Paradoxically, the Austrian public opinion evolved with the belief in the merits of neutrality along many years and now the politicians face the difficult task of explaining why and how neutrality issue is redundant for Austria. Therefore, the future of Austrian neutrality is open (Pelinka, 2001:2).

#### *Austrian Identity between Kulturnation and Mitteleuropa*

Among all the arguments regarding the Austrian identity formation, Anton Pelinka's (1990) identification of the process of Austrian identity formation is believed to be the most viable one both in general and for the purposes of the present paper. Pelinka identifies the identity formation process within the context of German unification; EU membership of Austria; and the concept of Mitteleuropa re-emerging vis-à-vis the

Habsburg legacy of Austria in the aftermath of Cold War. But before dwelling on these, it is important to have an insight to the interrelated concepts of *Kulturnation* and *Staatsnation* in Austria as well as the concept of *Mitteleuropa*.

### *Austria as Kulturnation and Staatsnation*

An important pillar of the evolving Austrian identity is the concept of *Kulturnation*. The belief in the German *Kulturnation* in Austria during the First Republic later evolved into the concepts of *Staatsnation* next to the *Kulturnation* as embraced by Austria throughout the identity formation process during the Second Republic. It continues to be transformed and the self-perception of Austria as a small state with big culture is known to be shaping part of Austrian identity formation since 1945 (Knapp, 2005:331). One manifestation of this can be seen in the speech of then Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. W. Schuessel in 1998 during the first Austrian EU Presidency as “Austria is a country of culture. For a medium sized country of 8 million, Austria can proudly count on relatively high numbers of writers, composers, painters, and scientists among its famous citizens” (Schuessel, 1998).

Austrian identity formation resembles that of the French example in the sense that first the state was established then Austrian identity was constructed. An important issue was reconciling the cultural and political dimensions of Austrian national identity. This, in return, meant in the Austrian case avoiding moral confrontation with the past. A consequence of this was to primarily define Austria as a *Staatsnation* rather than *Kulturnation* in the German sense. However, the issue of Austria as *Kulturnation* always remained in the background and later on merged after consolidation of state and identity formation in Austria at least as a right wing, conservative political component.

While the concept of Austria as a *Staatsnation* served a separate Austrian identity starting from the Second Republic, the concept of Austria as a *Kulturnation* served to shape the state of her existence in the post-Cold War era. *Kulturnation* concept enables not only an unquestionable Europeaness for Austria but also opens up the revival of its cultural and historical line with its Habsburg legacy. It is in a way continuation of the German

Kulturation concept but transformed as such that it is reinforced within the boundaries of regional territorial identity while Europeanness exists together with Catholicism and with a Central European and Danubian focus (Spohn, 2004:74). In addition to these perceptions of the concept of Kulturation, the foreign policy extension of it is an important aspect in order to have a better insight of Austrian foreign policy, especially for example vis-à-vis the EU and the Enlargement process. The political basis of the Austrian Kulturation together with its Mitteleuropa feature is clearly shaping the current foreign policy of Austria, and a closer look at the concept of Mitteleuropa provides a better view of state of affairs.

### *Mitteleuropa*

Mitteleuropa was an intellectual concept throughout the Cold War period, and only found voice in the works of leading intellectuals starting from 1950s then after some decades of silence in 1980s. But it lacked the political frame if not the intellectual one. Later the collapse of the Soviet Union and the EU Enlargement to the East provided the concept of Mitteleuropa with a political framework as well. Chianti-Stutte comments that “the definition of the belonging to Mitteleuropa works in the current political EU debate both as an indicator of the success for the EU application of an ex-communist country and as a source of distinction between Eastern European countries” (2003:327).

The principle of neutrality undoubtedly provided long term pay offs for Austria and it became redundant in the post Cold War period. However once the strategic country between East and the West, Austria was again quick to react to the challenges of new world order with its cumulative past experiences stemming from her Habsburg legacy. The Central and Eastern European countries were more prone to all types of ethnic conflicts, and there was a need to prepare these countries for alignment with Western Europe. Thus Austria once the mediator between East and West, now could resume even a better role by helping the Central and Eastern European countries. Thus the idea of Mitteleuropa could be turned into a reality, and it also points to the changing paradigms of existence for an individual EU member state

The concept of Mitteleuropa is part of Austrian history as well as part of its identity. Especially in the post-Cold War period, the newly emerging geopolitical order of Europe and the world created a certain flash back towards the conventional cultural and historical legacies of specific countries. In the context, The Central European Initiative (CEI) and the Danube Cooperation are two significant manifestations of this and Austria is a member of these groupings of cooperation. It is in this sense not a coincidence that Austria wishes to put her weight during Enlargement process towards her historical linkage countries.

With the full membership of the EU, all the institutional and policy making structures had to be transformed in Austria in a way which extended the powers of the executive while transforming partially the political and also corporatist understanding. In the domestic front, the political culture and traditional policy making approaches were questioned by the Austrian public if not by the politicians at first sight. The election results of 1999 were a clear indication of self-questioning.

Briefly, main components of Austrian political culture and their two level interactions and reflected policy outcomes are presented in Table 1 below in order to provide a clear overview of the issues involved. In this framework, two time periods, namely Cold war and Post-Cold war periods are taken to indicate the shifts in policy outcomes with reference to main components of Austrian identity and political culture. Clearly, in the aftermath of the Cold war period Austria has identity crisis as a result of the emerging challenges of the new geopolitical order. There was a need for a clear self-definition on part of Austria, and this has accelerated through her EU membership and also the EU Enlargement.

**TABLE 1: COMPONENTS OF AUSTRIAN POLITICAL CULTURE AND THEIR POLICY OUTCOMES**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Domestic Politics</b>	<b>International Politics</b>	<b>Policy Outcome in Cold War Period</b>	<b>Policy Outcome in Post-Cold War Period</b>
<b>Identity formation Process</b>	self-creation as a separate nation	keeping away from German influence in foreign policy, rejecting EEC membership	independent small state	identity challenge and redefinition
<b>Neutrality</b>	identity formation process, pillar of freedom from occupation	mediator between East and West	strategic country, aligning with other neutral states, EFTA	facilitator between East Europe and the EU in Enlargement process
<b>Kulturation</b>	identity formation process	self-presentation as small country with big culture	alignment with other neutral small states as independent state	self-definition as portrayed during 1998 EU Presidency
<b>Mittleuropa</b>	identity formation process with historical Habsburg legacy	return to Habsburg legacy and focus on Danube region	attempts to expand relations with member states of Soviet bloc	Central European Initiative (CEI), Danube Cooperation, EU Enlargement

(Table source: self-made)

## **The European Union and Austria**

An important theme of identity formation in Austria is the relation of Austria to Europe (Spohn, 2003:6). Austria's choice for not entering the EEC but EFTA had to do not only with the neutrality principle but also with the fear of domination by Germany within the European integration process. This attitude of Austria only changed when other neutral states of EFTA eventually applied for the EU membership. Austria applied to become a full member of the EU in 1989. Formal accession negotiations between the EU and Austria began in the beginning of 1993, and they were concluded in almost one year. Austria's being already an EFTA member and having the necessary framework was undoubtedly an important reason for such a relatively easy conclusion vis-à-vis adoption of the *acquis* (Falkner, 2001:4) On the other hand, a matter of concern on part of the EU Commission was the neutrality of Austria, which was also included in the Austrian membership application letter. This meant that there could be problems concerning Common Foreign and Security Policy during the negotiations but surprisingly Austria did not create a problem on the issue after all and Austria finally became a full member of the EU in 1995. In general, the adaptation of Austria went more smoothly than expected and accession was welcomed by the %66.6 per cent of the population.

The identity formation process, the identity crisis and the resulting shifts in political culture of Austria manifest themselves in various ways especially vis-à-vis the EU level depending on the issue at hand. Therefore it is useful to take a brief look at the well-known EU sanctions towards Austria, and the comparative agenda of the two Austrian presidencies.

### *Austrian EU Presidency of 1998*

Following its full membership in 1995, Austria held the EU presidency in 1998, as a small state and new comer to the European Union. A significant feature of the Austrian presidency period was its clear interrelatedness to both domestic and EU level politics. Austria's scheduled general elections in 1999 obliged the presidency to act in accordance with domestic political considerations. The Austrian presidency also coincided with the

Eastern Enlargement of the Union, a rather complex issue for Austria domestically as well as a window of opportunity internationally. The complexity of the Eastern Enlargement issue lied with the fact that it encompasses many dimensions, such as Austrian historical identity, strategic interests, domestic fears of immigration and incoming cheap labour force. The historical identity dimension is expressed by then Austrian foreign minister now Chancellor Wolfgang Schuessel as; “Our history and our self-definition has always been a supranational one, whether you put it in the context of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation or into the context of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Thinking and living in a larger European framework and in supranational structures is not an alien concern to us. There is, one would say in today’s language, a genetic predisposition, and the historic memory is still alive.”<sup>1</sup>

This is strikingly parallel with Spohn’s comment in relation to Austrian identity that: “The historical foundation of Austrian European orientations were closely related to the geopolitical location of the Great-Roman Empire within the European state and world order.....As the core Roman Catholic power, these Habsburg Austrian European orientations were moreover anti-Protestant and anti-Prussian in its west direction as well as anti-Ottoman and anti-Russian in its east direction” (2003:23)

An important consequence of the post-Cold War era and changing paradigms of existence was the return to Habsburg legacy on part of Austria through EU membership and the Eastern Enlargement. From political point of view Enlargement process was and is still a window of opportunity for Austria because the formerly peripheral member state of the EU found that its place was shifting towards the centre of Europe and the EU, while keeping its conventional role of mediating between East and the West in somewhat different way than before. From economic point of view Austria was committed to improving the economic position of the neighbouring East European states in order to decrease domestic tensions arising out of fear of incoming cheap labour. (Luther and Ogilvie, 1998)

Thus, the priorities of the Austrian EU presidency were officially outlined as follows:

“Enlargement is by far the best and most effective instrument to strengthen security in the regions. It keeps the nationalist demons at bay. It reinforces the civil society in these countries and stimulates economic and political reforms. It helps to stabilize societies and thus reduce the risk of organized crime and illegal migration. In the long term, the Union will either export stability towards the East, or it will import instability. No other country has a higher stake in this than Austria”<sup>2</sup>

Although the official government policy has been supporting the EU Enlargement process, more than half of the Austrians were not supporting it according to the Eurobarometer statistics, mainly due to economic consequences of the process vis-à-vis labour and the EU funds for regional development. This is not unexpected naturally as elsewhere the EU project remains to be an elite project in Austria as well.

Yet the Austrian Presidency managed to balance domestic and international dimensions of Enlargement successfully. The balancing was done through placing emphasis on long transition periods to protect the labour markets of member states in the domestic discourse. (Luther, 1999). The Austrian presidency promoted Eastern Enlargement in a creative manner. The presidency pushed for the beginning of negotiations on chapters that had completed the *acquis* screening process, instead of waiting for the full screening process to be finished before negotiations.

The general elections of 1999 brought about an unprecedented political crisis between the EU and Austria, which certainly added on the Euroscepticism existing among the Austrian population. When centre right ÖVP decided to form a coalition government with Haider’s FPÖ, the far right populist party, the EU reacted by threatening Austria with diplomatic sanctions of an unprecedented nature. However, ÖVP leader and Chancellor Schuessel did not give in and formed the government with the FPÖ. The reaction was commented upon from a variety of perspectives. It was argued that the EU was trying to position itself as a union based on a value system as well as being an economic integration process. Another argument was that the EU leaders were unhappy with the further reflections of a far-right party coming to power in a member state vis-à-

vis their domestic political concerns. And a number of arguments along the same lines were in the agenda throughout this crisis period.

In the domestic front, this event created a negative attitude among the Austrians because they took this reaction and the alleged sanctions as a negative movement towards their nation as a whole, not just to their lawfully elected destined government and Euroscepticism came to rise. Eventually, EU withdrew its criticism of Austria and the sanctions idea by the so-called report of the three wise man and the problem was solved.

#### *Austrian EU Presidency of 2006*

There was another significant crisis linked with Austria at EU level concerning the decision to start accession negotiations with Turkey in October 2005. The Austrian EU presidency followed the Brussels summit, where the decision to start accession negotiations with Turkey was taken following this crisis. Austria opposed the decision unless the talks with Croatia were also started and this issue occupied the EU agenda intensively. Eventually Austria gave its approval when the obstacle before Croatia was over, and Turkey could start the negotiation process.

The Brussels summit in itself foreshadowed the Austrian Presidency's Balkan priority. Austrian EU Presidency has supported Balkan countries, both in the Enlargement and European foreign policy front. The text prepared by the Austrian Foreign Ministry on 2006 Austrian EU Presidency reads that "18. In June 2005, the European Council reaffirmed that all the Balkan States have a "European Perspective" and thus the possibility to accede to the EU, provided they satisfy the conditions for membership. Austria has always supported this policy. We are convinced that the future of all the countries in western Balkans lies within the European Union"<sup>3</sup>

Concerning the Enlargement debate, the text underlines that the decision on whether or not accession negotiations would start with Macedonia might be taken under Austrian presidency. On Turkey and Croatia, it was stated that the first reports on the screening process would be presented during the Austrian presidency, and later it was announced

that Austria would also start negotiation of initially envisaged relatively easy chapters such as Science and Technology with Turkey. The Council of Ministers would then decide by unanimous vote whether or not individual negotiating chapters will be opened. Despite a small crisis during this period that step was taken. As for Romania and Bulgaria, the text underlines that the Commission might recommend that the entry be deferred for one year, should it decide that the countries do not fulfil the conditions for EU accession on 1 January, 2007.

Part three of the text on foreign policy again emphasizes the Balkans and Eastern Europe and reads that: “82. The Western Balkan countries will be a particular foreign policy priority for the Austrian Presidency. Some of the countries in the region are facing decisions of fundamental importance to their future in the coming year.”<sup>4</sup>

The stability of South-eastern Europe is one of the key Austrian foreign policy interests. Thus Austrian presidency fully supported Stabilization and Association agreements with ex-Yugoslav countries. In relation to the negotiations for a Stabilization and Accession Agreement with Serbia and Montenegro, Austria was stated to have a particular interest in the conclusion of the negotiations given that the stronger links between Serbia, Montenegro and the EU will have an impact of stability of the whole of South-eastern Europe. (Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2006). Austrian Presidency also supported the beginning of negotiations on a Stabilization and Association Agreement with Bosnia and Herzegovina. Further the Austrian presidency envisaged a stronger role for the EU in Kosovo. This was reflected in article 84 of the text, which stated that Austria would contribute to strengthening the role of EU in Kosovo. Concerning the EU Neighbourhood Policy, Austrian presidency emphasized the integration of Eastern European and Mediterranean countries in a common area of stability.

Finally, if both Austrian presidencies are compared a continuity can be observed. Both presidencies are in accordance with national foreign policy goals emphasizing a stable Eastern Europe and Balkans reflecting to a certain extent the Habsburg legacy of Austria. During these two presidency periods and even in the beginning of the EU accession of

Austria there was also another important shift in Austrian identity as an EU member state. This was the redefinition of the “other” in Austrian society which also reflected in her political culture. In the post-Cold War era Austrian national identity had to transform in order to accommodate the new realities of the emerging world order. While the existing identity was more consolidated than ever, there was also replacement of the existing minorities with immigrants as the “other” of the society. This shift not only clearly manifests itself in Austrian domestic political scene but also it is clearly evident in the stand of Austria in the EU Enlargement process through the efforts towards entry of neighbouring countries belonging to Mitteleuropa and Danube region, and the ongoing concern in the full membership of Turkey. In addition to this, the changing economic and political conditions created a further tension between “haves” and have nots” in the society thus leading to the rise of right wing populist movement while constituting a shift in the “other” of the society. The leading Austrian political scientist Anton Pelinka also pointed out in a BBC interview that EU affairs are very much shaped by the political elite in Austria as elsewhere in Europe, and most of the negative outlook is stemming from the fact that Austrian public opinion is shaped by the political elite and mass media due to the knowledge deficit in the EU and international affairs.<sup>5</sup> Thus the political elite are instrumental concerning this shift concerning “the other” in Austria. This is very much in parallel with Shiraev who points out the framework of analysis concerning the relationship between public opinion and foreign policy: “The government can use specific foreign-policy related issues and potentially successful actions to strengthen its political standing and future electoral prospects. ...Certainly both national and local elections provide some mechanism for determining the ways the foreign policy executives pay attention to or manipulate public opinion” (2000:301).

## **Conclusion**

International politics and bargaining is a multidimensional process based on a complex set of issues. It is clear that each country in international political system will seek optimum results. The outcomes are clearly not always a win-win case for all the parties concerned. In the case of Austria all the present bargaining grounds are very much compatible with the identity formation and transformation processes and the resulting

foreign policy priorities. There is the problem of information deficit on part of Austrian public regarding international issues and the EU. The Austrian public opinion is as elsewhere shaped by the political elite, media and the leading civil society institutions. For a beneficial future bargaining ground within the EU itself, the current analysis results indicate that Austria like many other EU member states should be able to turn her EU level politics from an elite project to a societal project, especially to mobilize the synergy expected out of the EU Enlargement Process.

As long as the EU project stays as an elite project the interactions of domestic politics and international politics will have outcomes which might negatively affect European integration process. The 2006 EU presidency convened the conference entitled “Sound of Europe”<sup>6</sup> for debating the future of Europe. As long as each EU member state follows the current domestic political concerns, and the EU remains to be an elite project away from the peoples of Europe, there will not be harmony and the outcome of these sounds is clear.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> “The Priorities of the Austrian Presidency of the European Union” Speech by the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Wolfgang Schuessel, at the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London on June 3rd, 1998

<sup>2</sup> “The Priorities of the Austrian Presidency of the European Union” Speech by the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Wolfgang Schuessel, at the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London on June 3rd, 1998.

<sup>3</sup> The Austrian EU Presidency 2006, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 November 2005.

<sup>4</sup> The Austrian EU Presidency 2006, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 23 November 2005.

<sup>5</sup> BBC News, Anton Pelinka Interview on October 3rd, 2005.

<sup>6</sup> “Sound of Europe” Conference on the future of Europe, 26-28.01.2006, organized by the Austrian EU Presidency, EU Commission, Economic and Social Committee, Salzburg.

[http://www.eu2006.at/en/The\\_Council\\_Presidency/Conference\\_The\\_Sound\\_of\\_Europe/index.html](http://www.eu2006.at/en/The_Council_Presidency/Conference_The_Sound_of_Europe/index.html)

## References

Chianti-Stutte, P. (2003) "The Ambiguous Heritage of Mitteleuropa: the Resurfacing of Mitteleuropa as a Counter Image to the EU in Austrian Populism" *Law and Critique* Vol.14, pp.325-353, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Falkner, G. (2001) "The Europeanization of Austria: Misfit, Adaptation and Controversies" *EIoP*, Vol.5 No.13 (<http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-013a.htm>)

Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2006) *The Austrian EU Presidency 2006*, Austria.

Knapp, M. (2005) *Osterreichische Kulturpolitik und das Bild der Kulturnation. Kontinuitaet und Diskontinuitaet in der Kulturpolitik des Bundes seit 1945*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Luther, K. R. (1999) *Political Elites in Divided Societies: Political Parties in Consociational Democracy*, London: Routledge

Luther, K. R. and Ogilvie, I. (eds) (1998) *Austria and the European Union Presidency: Background and Perspectives*, Keele: Keele European Research Centre

Nussbaumer, H. (2004) *Wo Endet Europa? Von Umgang der Europäischen Union mit der Türkei*. Vortrag vor der "Orientgesellschaft Hammer-Purgstall" 18 December 2004 in der Diplomatischen Akademie, Wien.

Pelinka, A. (2005) "Why Austria was a sticking point" *BBC News Interview*, 3 October 2005. (<http://newsvote.bbc.co.uk>, accessed 19.01.2006)

Pelinka, A. (2001) "Introduction" in Neutrality in Austria, *Contemporary Austrian Studies* Vol.9, Transaction Publishers, New Jersey.

Pelinka, A. (1990) *Zur Osterreichischen Identitaet. Zwischen deutscher Vereinigung und Mitteleuropa*, Überreuter, Wien.

Schuessel, W. (1998) “The Priorities of the Austrian Presidency of the European Union” Speech by the Austrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Wolfgang Schuessel, at the Royal Institute for International Affairs in London on June 3rd, 1998.

Shirayev, E. (2000) “Toward a Comparative Analysis of the Public Opinion-Foreign Policy Connection” in *Decision Making in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion and American and European Policy in the 21st Century*, B. L. Nacos, R.Y. Shapiro, P. Isernia (eds.) Rowman Littlefield.

Spohn, W. (2004) *Austria: The Comprehensive Country Report*, EURONAT Project Report, Robert Schuman Centre for Advanced Studies, EUI, Italy.

Spohn, W. (2003) “Europe and the Nation in Austrian National Identity” in *Representations of Europe and Nation in Current and Prospective Member-States: Media, Elites and Civil Society. The Collective State of Art and Historical Reports*, B. Strath and A. Triandafyllidou (eds.) June, The EU Commission.

Talos, E. and Kittel, B. (2001) *Gesetzgebung in Österreich*, WUV/Universitaetsverlag, cited Falkner 2001.