

Austria between “social protection” and “emancipation”: negotiating global *flows*,
marketization and nostalgia

Dr Christian Karner
Associate Professor of Sociology
University of Nottingham
Christian.Karner@nottingham.ac.uk
Tel: +441158467594

This is shortened and updated version of a chapter published, under the same title, in
Christian Karner and Bernhard Weicht (eds.) (2016) *The Commonalities of Global Crises:
Markets, Communities and Nostalgia*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Invoking Karl Polanyi, Austrian journalist Robert Misik has argued that contrary to widespread presumptions strong states have played key-roles in capitalist innovation; only states can mobilize the resources and handle the risks involved in technological shifts. Misik insists that Polanyi first formulated a “leftist liberalism” against the social and environmental consequences of “self-regulating markets”, which continues to be of relevance for protecting freedoms against concentrated economic might, in counter-acting inequalities, and in fighting for a “symbiotic” rather than “parasitic” relationship between politics and markets (Misik 2014). This reflects parts of contemporary Austria’s political field and contests. In a context that has ranked amongst the most resilient and affluent in the European Union, though current unemployment and growth figures paint a less rosy picture, perceptions of crises are near-ubiquitous. The relationship between politics and markets is central to many of them.

Cultural nostalgia also plays a role here and crystallizes at times subtly, as revealed by surveys (Reiterer 1988: 118f.; Bruckmüller 1996: 70) that have shown Austria’s “scenic beauty”, “historical treasures and achievements”, political stability, and national food to rank amongst the most cherished symbols of national pride. Such seemingly disparate national symbols share important common ground: a romanticising glance on past eras or a (former) state of natural beauty, glorified or felt to be threatened by social and environmental change. Building on previous work (Karner 2005, 2008, 2011) I here ask what the threat is taken to be. To do so, I apply Nancy Fraser’s (2012a, b) neo-Polanyian distinction between “marketization”, “social protection” and “emancipation” to illuminate competing ideological forces shaping Austria today. Close analysis of a wide range of empirical materials also pushes Fraser’s paradigm further: I ask what – in addition to a socially protectionist preoccupation with (national) boundaries and a diametrically opposed emancipatory commitment to extending rights to those beyond “the nation” – defines the discursive-political competitors illuminated below.

Nostalgia will be shown to partly distinguish social protection from emancipation. Defined as an “abrupt break between ‘before’ and ‘after’”, as “feelings of loss” of a past that “may never have been” (Schlipphacke 2014: 1-4), nostalgia emerges as a key-feature of social protectionism but is virtually absent from the emancipatory agendas discussed here. While nostalgia provides temporal dimensions crucial to social protection, emancipation works within a spatial framework of reference where comparisons are not made through backward-looking glances at the ingroup’s purported past but, instead, by sideward-looking comparisons with elsewhere through synchronic comparisons with injustices endured by “others elsewhere”. Contrasting frames of reference – one temporal, the other spatial – thus underpin social protectionist moves towards hardening external boundaries and emancipatory movements of widening, cosmopolitan inclusion respectively.

Following brief outlines of Austria’s post-World War II history and of the methods underpinning this discussion are three thematic sections, which examine local/ national manifestations of widening marketization and the competing politics of social protectionism and emancipation. Although empirically focussed on Austria, the conceptual development of the neo-Polanyian framework sketched here potentially offers new ways for thinking about socio-economic shifts and political tensions across and beyond the crisis-stricken European Union.

Historical and methodological context

Even cursory summaries of Austria’s 20th-century reflect a profound contrast between the turmoil of the first half (World War I, the disintegration of the Habsburg Empire, economic hardship and political polarization during the First Republic, descent into authoritarianism, the infamous *Anschluss* to Nazi Germany, World War II, the Holocaust), and the political and economic stability accomplished in the second. While Thomas Piketty’s *Capital* (2014)

demonstrates that this paralleled concurrently unfolding trends across the industrialized world, post-1945 Austria also contained particularities, including the specific form and success of Austria's neo-corporatist "social partnership" mediating between capital, labour and the state (e.g. Sully 1990), by Western European standards unusually high levels of political party membership (i.e. traditionally with the Social Democrats, SPÖ, or the centre-right People's Party, ÖVP), a for some time hampered civil society (Bruckmüller 1996: 42f.), and high levels of "social peace" reflected in remarkably low numbers of minutes of strike per worker as late as the 1980s (Fitzmaurice 1991: 122). Other Austrian features of the post-war era were the gradual discursive replacement of previously hegemonic pan-Germanic identifications with a newly dominant Austrian national self-understanding (e.g. Thaler 2001); and the country's neutrality, enshrined since 1955, which sat somewhat less than comfortably with Austria's "growing interdependence with Western economies throughout the Cold War" and its "enormous dependence upon global trade flows" (Harrod 2012: 166).

In other respects, Austria's post-war socio-economic transformations mirrored those observed elsewhere, including far-reaching shifts in agricultural production (Hanisch 1994: 95; Krausmann et al. 2003), the digital revolution and the shift from Keynesianism to neoliberalism (Karner 2008). The country's geographic location meant that changes in the wake of the revolutions of 1989-1991 were felt (or feared) particularly strongly in the Alpine Republic. The rise of neo-nationalism (Gingrich and Banks 2006) since the 1990s can be read, at least partly, as a defensive reaction to perceived dislocations. There have also been counter-discourses, the best-documented of which was the much-delayed *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* ("coming to terms with the past") finally triggered in the aftermath of the "Waldheim affair" in 1986 which led to a widespread, though not universally embraced critical scrutiny of Austria's previously dominant "myth of victimhood" during World War II and the Holocaust (e.g. Uhl 2006).

Building on my long-standing research on Austrian national identity negotiations (Karner 2005, 2007; 2010; 2011), I here draw on a large corpus of data collected over a period of more than a decade, which includes the country's wide-ranging media discourse: from the public broadcasting network (ORF); Austria's ideologically diverse press, national and regional, daily and weekly, broadsheet and tabloid; and readers' letters published in some of the country's most prominent and most widely read papers. Specifically, this discussion focuses on select and strongly contested issues and crises of recent years, paying specific attention to their Austrian "receptions" and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion thereby drawn and reproduced in media representations and publicly articulated discourses.

Austrian discussions – as comparable debates elsewhere – of current socio-economic shifts and crises are inevitably transnational in their coverage and foci. What follows is a thematic analysis of competing Austrian representations of, and positions on, political and economic issues that often take place elsewhere but are perceived to impact on the local and national contexts. The actors participating in these discussions, e.g. politicians, public intellectuals and journalists, "ordinary citizens", direct their gaze to a range of issues and crises, the "epicentres" of which often lie beyond national boundaries. This echoes Arjun Appadurai's discussion (1990) of the transnational "flows" of people, finance, technology, ideologies and media images of our conflictual, globalizing era. What we encounter below are competing receptions and responses to crises often emanating elsewhere and the transnational connections that define our era. The levels of the nation-state, the European Union and global markets are all addressed in the discourses analysed below.

My analysis centres on select extracts – comprising political-, journalistic-, and argumentative positions publicly articulated by less prominent, "ordinary social actors" – selected from the much larger corpus of data summarized above. The materials analysed all exemplify recurring argumentative positions on what may appear, at a first glance, a disparate

list of economic, social and ecological issues. Continuing Polanyi's and Fraser's trajectories, however, it is my contention that superficially unrelated concerns and topics are underpinned by a shared preoccupation with marketization and the competing political reactions it triggers. Yet, while the positions to be examined reflect wider discursive currents, what follows is not a quantitative measurement of their relative salience across Austria's population. Instead, I offer a qualitative, thematic reading of mutually contesting politics brought to bear on socio-economic hallmarks of the contemporary world.

Marketization/ commodification

Our era's structural shifts and globalizing pressures are well-documented in Austria. By the 1990s her above-mentioned social partnership was beginning to appear "obsolete" to some, given rates of international trade, capital mobility and technological change (Kindley 1997: 6-7; 3). Yet, it was also observed (Traxler 1997: 169-171) that Austrian (neo-)corporatism continued to play a role, albeit a changing one now focused on "gearing wages, skills, and working conditions to the requirements of international competitiveness". The economic changes since the 1980s have not only impacted on the institutions most immediately concerned with production and employment but are felt across wider social domains.

Recent transformations can indeed be described through Polanyian categories: increasingly unregulated markets; the "disembedding" of things, goods and relationships that were previously more firmly anchored in national institutions and local lifeworlds; and political counter-reactions. Frederic Jameson's (1991) suggestion that multi-national capitalism entails the "commodification" of previously non-commodified realms (e.g. nature and the unconscious) adds further specificity to changes witnessed since the 1970s.

Returning from the conceptual level to my particular empirical setting, prominent Austrian debates of recent years are precisely about disembedded markets and hyper-

commodification. One debate that has periodically occupied sections of the public for more than a decade focuses on water, widely seen as a public good, whose potential privatization/commodification is often perceived as a threat to national water-supplies. Other issues, though superficially unrelated, reveal similar anxieties about the widening reach of market forces.

The clearest recent example of this has been provided by widespread Austrian opposition to possible free trade agreements with the US and Canada, i.e. the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, or TTIP, and CETA respectively. Opposition has emerged across significant sections of the political spectrum, involving politicians, public figures, citizens' petitions and initiatives, and Austria's largest newspaper, the tabloid daily *Kronen Zeitung* (or *Krone*). Similar resistance against TTIP's predicted and feared environmental and social consequences has been evident across Europe. Nor is such opposition ideologically homogenous, disquiet about global, unrestricted market forces can at times be observed on both ends of the ideological continuum.

In Austria, opposition against TTIP merges with the national popularity of organic, local food production and a critique of transnational agribusiness. This manifests in the above-mentioned *Kronen Zeitung*'s long-standing stance against TTIP. Prominent in the paper's columns, headlines and readers' letters over many months, its position is epitomized in the following accounts:

[S]ecret negotiations about a trade agreement with the US are alarming ... With 40,116 farmers (more than 4,700 of them organic farmers) cultivating a total of 683,405 acres, Lower Austria is Austria's largest agricultural region ... Unrestricted markets would abandon [our farmers] to the billion-dollar industries of US agribusiness ... In US-style mass animal husbandry, quality or animal rights have no

place ... An average US farmer cultivates ... 14-times as large an area as an average European farmer. Our mountain farms are smaller still ... Lower Austria is our breadbasket but it would not stand a chance against America's huge, genetically modified grains. (Perry 2014; my translation)

It is welcome news that [agricultural] minister Rupprechter supports the *Krone's* campaign against TTIP, to protect our farmers against unscrupulous agribusiness ... only the powerful will benefit from transatlantic trade ... TTIP should also be rejected on environmental grounds ... The term "free trade" implies that the global export of all kinds of goods should be the aim of every economy. The EU also follows this dogma ... Where is this purported "progress" taking us? (*Kronen Zeitung* reader, 10 January 2015: 30f., my translation)

Such opposition is, as already mentioned, more widespread, ideologically heterogeneous (e.g. ORF 2015a) and certainly not confined to Austria's most widely-read paper. Noteworthy about many of the discourses involved is the topos of scales above, juxtaposing mighty external actors – through a recurring "David versus Goliath" trope – to local agricultural production. This is not just unequal economic competition but seen as a clash between different ethical regimes: global agricultural markets are associated with genetically modified produce, a lack of animal welfare and quality. Austrian farming, by contrast, is presented as green, organic, sustainable, committed to protecting local producers and animal rights. The wider cultural salience of such views manifested in the signing, in 1997, by 1,2 million Austrians of petition against genetically modified crops; and in 2006 organic farmers cultivated 13,5 percent of Austria's agriculturally used land, compared to a mere 3,4 percent across the rest of the European Union (Gruber and Bohacek 2006: 11; 46). Recently,

scepticism about trans-Atlantic free trade agreements led to Chancellor Kern's insistence on additional clauses being added to CETA, and the issue featured prominently in Austria's much-discussed 2016 presidential elections (ORF 2016a, b).

Changing thematic focus but staying within broader anxieties about marketization, on the left of the political spectrum one encounters recurring and unsurprising criticism of global financial markets and neoliberalism. The following quotations from the Viennese weekly *Falter* illustrate this:

Benevolent reform would require a reform of “the markets”, a regulation of the financial industry ... [Conversely,] austerity politics leads to a social abyss and is economic nonsense ... For 40 years we have witnessed politics disempowering itself. (Thurnher 2015a; *my translation*)

Creditors should support borrowers' economic development, enabling them to repay their debt ... Europe has disregarded this fundamental truth in Greece ... In the midst of economic crisis ... the Troika tied loans to ... extreme austerity ... This caused the demand in goods and services to collapse ... and a dramatic social deterioration. (Marterbauer 2015; *my translation*)

The contexts to these arguments were provided by recent regional elections resulting in further swings to the nationalist-populist right and an ever-more deepening Greek crisis implicating the entire Eurozone respectively. What these positions share is deep anxiety about the current hegemony of neoliberal austerity politics and their social consequences.

Some opposition to marketization continues a long “tradition” of anti-Americanism, stretching from 19th century romantic poetry to contemporary “critiques of a globalized

American ‘turbo-capitalism’” (Bischof 2014: 47-48), some of which with anti-Semitic undertones. While a history of ideas helps illuminate important ideological continuities, this is not the analytical direction taken here. Instead, concerns about free markets expressed on both the right and the left underscore the pertinence of a neo-Polanyian reading of the debates in question. Fraser’s distinction between *social protection* and *emancipation* can help trace and understand the competing counter-discourses shaping contemporary Austria.

Social protection and nostalgia

Fraser’s (2012a: 25) “triple movement” postulates that one way of counter-acting (neoliberal) marketization is through social protectionist movements and discourses, “some savory, others unsavory”, which pursue a re-embedding of economic relations in institutional arrangements that are undermined by markets but often hierarchical and exclusionary. Austrian examples reveal that social protectionism tends to operate with a nostalgic temporal dimension, invoking a positively connoted past in criticism of the present. In *some* social protectionisms, this takes the form of a nationalist historiography with its typical schema (Hutchinson 1987) of a former “golden age”, presumed “fall from grace”, and anticipated (nation-centred) rejuvenation. Protectionism is presented as the mechanism, through which a purportedly more just – clearly only for those included in the national “ingroup” – order can be re-established. Social protection, so the assumption goes, will revert the downward historical spiral nationalist discourse bemoans; things can, it is claimed, get better – for “us”, and “again”.

This argumentative schema is typical of Austria’s far-right Freedom Party (FPÖ), whose protectionist agenda is written into its self-stylization as a *soziale Heimatpartei* (“socially conscious homeland party”). Heinz-Christian Strache, the FPÖ’s head, has advocated a response to intra-European labour migration and rising unemployment that

would include closure – at least in certain industries – of Austria’s labour market to foreigners, potential repatriation and separate social insurance for foreign employees (*Kronen Zeitung*, 14 May 2015: 3). The nostalgic tone of the FPÖ’s social protectionism was also apparent in some of its recent provincial assembly election slogans, including its promises (in Styria and Upper Austria, all *my translations*) “To stop the asylum chaos”, “Preserve homeland and values”, to build “New flats instead of new mosques”, to “Fight for your safety”, “Make living affordable again”, or to “Give the homeland a future”. Perceptions of decline, the claim that resources or privileges have been “misallocated” to outsiders and need redirecting towards the allegedly overlooked ethnic majority, are at work here.

With the FPÖ likely to become Austria’s strongest party at the next national parliamentary elections, this discursive logic also manifested in a *Kronen Zeitung* interview (7 June 2015: 9) with Heinz-Christian Strache, in which the latter accused “cheap Eastern European workers” of pushing Austrians into unemployment, the Schengen agreement of increasing crime, and “more than 80 percent” of asylum-seekers of being mere economic migrants. Again, the nostalgic resonance of a purportedly better past – assumed to have predated the rise in unemployment, crime and current migratory flows – and the promise of a nation-centred future are the interpretative foundations, on which such arguments are constructed. In another interview Strache reaffirmed his social protectionism, declaring that the principle “love thy neighbour ... for me means, in the first instance, our Austrians” (ORF 2013).

A link between nostalgia and nationally-framed protectionism was also evident in an initiative for an EU-exit, whose national petition was signed by 261,159 people, four percent of the electorate, in late June 2015 (ORF 2015b), and which claimed that through a purported “liberation” [sic!] from the European Union Austria would “regain freedom and sovereignty”, depart from the EU’s “democratic deficit” and from support for other Eurozone countries,

avoid “ruinous” free-trade agreements, “rebuild a national economy in citizens’ interest” and reduce current unemployment levels, and return to Austria’s “healthy” agriculture (<http://www.volksbegehren-eu-austritt.at>, my translations). Invoking an allegedly preferable pre-EU-accession era, all of this promised a return to a nostalgically reified *status quo ante*.

Austria’s 2016 presidential elections left no doubt that perceptions of present decline contrasted to a positively evaluated past possess considerably wider social currency. This often manifests in the trope of an “island of the blessed”, or *Insel der Seligen* (Liessmann 2005), applied in nostalgic recollections of Austria between the 1960s and 1980s. Importantly, this is not an Austrian particularity, as Thomas Piketty (2014: 96) observation that “Continental Europe ... entertain[s] considerable nostalgia for ... the thirty years from the late 1940s to the late 1970s during which economic growth was unusually rapid” shows.

Not all nostalgia or social protectionism becomes nationalist. The question arises as to how other social protectionisms guard the ideological demarcation from nationalist politics. Therein also lies a major challenge facing social democracy today. The commitment to providing social protection in the face of marketization constitutes political terrain now also claimed by the populist-/ far-right. As shown by Aichholzer et al. (2014: 113), FPÖ voters have “distinct views on ... immigration, European integration and dissatisfaction with the political system”, and the party has structurally “undermin[ed] the Social Democrats’ support base”. While the FPÖ’s singular commitment to nationals is clear, it should be remembered that although the SPÖ pushed for Austria’s EU accession in 1995, in the years prior some party members also expressed fears of the “home labour market being swamped by cheap labour” and a consequent deflation of Austrians’ wages (Bushell 2013: 231).

Social democrats’ dilemmas are illuminated by an application of Fraser’s neo-Polanyian model of the shift from a “double” to a “triple movement”. In its protectionist, class-based orientation, the traditional Left is now forced to compete with nationalist forces

for the working class. Meanwhile, subaltern identity politics and struggles for empowerment have created a wider political field – including green parties, lively civil societies etc. – in which social democracy can at best compete for, but certainly not monopolise, emancipatory forces. Engulfed in political competition on two fronts, the SPÖ has recently made some widely criticized choices (Klenk 2015; Bauer and Linsinger 2015), including the formation of a regional coalition with the FPÖ in Austria’s eastern-most province of Burgenland.

Elsewhere, one occasionally encounters a left-leaning nostalgia outside party politics and far removed from any entanglements with “unsavoury” (Fraser 2012a), nationalist social protectionism. In his reflections on the SPÖ’s current dilemmas, *Falter* editor Armin Thurnher (2014) has suggested that those include the party’s previous glory period, under Bruno Kreisky in the 1970s, which now acts as an unreproducible and thus demoralizing model. Economic journalist Ulrike Herrmann (2015), meanwhile, has argued for a transnational social protectionism: criticizing Germany’s export surplus achieved by lowering labour-/ production costs domestically, Herrmann called on Austria to lead an alliance with other Eurozone countries disadvantaged by German neoliberal policies; to prevent Europe’s further impoverishment, Herrmann argued, German workers’ wages need to be substantially increased.

Social protectionism, nostalgia and nationalism constitute separate, distinctive but partly overlapping phenomena that assume different forms in different ideological constellations. The question arises which alternative, inclusive, non-nostalgic responses to today’s crises and flows are also evident in Austria.

Emancipation

Social protectionists thus often articulate opposition to marketization through nostalgic registers, contrasting a particular (versions of the) past to a present found uncertain and

unjust. By contrast, emancipatory voices for groups and individuals excluded *either* in the realm of the market *or* within the social structures upheld by protectionists (Fraser 2012a: 25) work through a synchronically focused axiological frame. What we encounter here are not “subaltern counterpublics” (Fraser 1992) or “parallel discursive arenas” created and utilized by the (historically) oppressed only, but *emancipatory counter-publics* shared by structurally very differently positioned actors and organisations – e.g. Austrian/European citizens showing solidarity with asylum-seekers.

Emancipatory frameworks work through comparisons aware of inequalities *presently* suffered by *others*. In assessing such frameworks, the question as to *which power relations a given emancipatory discourse subjects to criticism* is paramount. Some of the following examples speak on behalf of the most adversely affected by social protectionist politics upholding exclusionary structures. According to a recent OECD-report, Austria accepted – in proportion to population size – the second largest number of asylum claims (after Sweden) between May 2015 and April 2016 (ORF 2016c). The structural and discursive exclusion of asylum-seekers in and beyond Austria is now well researched (e.g. Franz 2003) and has entered a new phase since the peak of the refugee crisis in 2015. Slightly more dated scholarship showed that EU directives on “minimum reception standards” had been implemented unevenly across Austria’s nine provinces (Rosenberger and König 2011: 537), and a “re-emergence of colonial thought” in the far-right’s anti-asylum-seekers discourse (Hipfl and Gronold 2011). In the context of ongoing intra-European wrangling over the possible distribution of asylum-seekers within the EU and Austria experiencing serious infrastructural challenges in handling the increase in arrivals and asylum-claims (ORF 2015c), the FPÖ’s recent electoral successes have been explained with reference to its tough anti-asylum stance (and growing unemployment) (ORF 2015d). There are, however, notable counter-discourses, including, as I have shown elsewhere, local media and street magazines

in Austria's main cities, and civil society organisations with a record of providing asylum-seekers with a voice, rare employment opportunities and support structures, recording racist attacks, establishing connections between refugees and local Austrians, or sharing asylum-seekers' life stories (Karner 2007). Emancipatory counter-discourses also surfaced, in the context of recent deaths in the Mediterranean, in quality press criticism of a lack of empathy shown by European politicians pre-occupied with continental/ national fortification at the expense of human rights (Gächter 2015; Thurnher 2015b). Emancipatory alternatives also emerge in local initiatives, considerable obstacles notwithstanding (Pölsler 2015; Schaffer 2014) to house asylum-seekers in private accommodation (<http://www.fluechtlinge-willkommen.at/>).

Arguably, emancipatory calls with potentially more structural effects have been articulated by various actors and institutions – including the social partners, regional politicians, parts of the coalition, and businesses – to ease asylum-seekers' and refugees' access to the Austrian labour market (ORF 2016d, e, f, g). While far from universally endorsed, such suggestions are partly emancipatory insofar as they counter-act protectionist exclusions and recognize non-nationals' needs. Yet, they are also framed in a discourse of the market, for it is integration in the labour market, however unfavourable the terms may be in some suggestions (ORF 2016f), that is presented as an antidote to the present refugee crisis. Recognizing that some proposals could actually deepen inequalities by creating under-paid jobs for refugees, there have also been more far-sighted emancipatory voices critical of exclusions effected by both social protectionism and unregulated marketization (see *Profil* 12/09/16: 13; *Kronen Zeitung* 20/8/16: 3).

Other criticism speaks on behalf of others currently, and elsewhere, most immediately affected by hyper-marketization and neoliberal politics. Reflecting on Greece's continuing crisis, a *Falter* article summarized as follows:

The crisis has emptied shops ... economic destruction is everywhere ... [This] is not about dry politics, it's about a country, her people and their suffering ... Greece can hardly bear further cuts, the country is already bleeding dry. (Narodoslawky 2015, *my translation*)

A surprisingly similar argument appeared in a *Kronen Zeitung* article before Syriza's January 2015 triumph at the Greek elections, formulating what may be read as a transnationally emancipatory, critical engagement with current power relations in the EU:

The German government declares that a Syriza victory and end of austerity would make Greece's exit from the Euro-zone "unavoidable" ... The Austrian government is more diplomatic ... This is sensible ... [M]any Greeks are suffering very severely under austerity (mass redundancies in the public sector, massive wage- and pension cuts), thus justifying some of Tsipras' demands. And many economists agree that a new "hair cut" of Greek debt will be required. (Hauenstein 2015: 2-3, *my translation*)

Six months on, in a poll taken after the referendum reflecting Greeks' resounding rejection of more austerity, 91 percent of *Krone* readers declared (*Krone* poll 2015) that Greece should receive no more bailouts. The emancipatory thrust of the just-quoted article(s) is part of public debate in Austria today, but – clearly – it cannot be assumed to represent majority opinion.

Concluding reflections

Socio-economic crises are ubiquitous and increasingly seen to be unmanageable within existing parameters of thought and action. This paper has examined manifestations of Nancy

Fraser's "triple movement" – involving *marketization*, *social protection*, and *emancipation* – in early 21st century Austria, which inescapably implicates wider European dimensions and transnational flows. This discussion needs to be read in its European context, where both national (e.g. Schachner-Blazizek and Hauser 2015) and transnational voices (e.g. Heise 2014; Piketty 2014) convincingly criticize the ineffectiveness of neoliberal, austerity politics in the Eurozone, its exacerbation of social inequalities, and a concurrent re-nationalization of political discourse, but are yet to persuade key-decision makers that current trajectories provide reasons for deep concern.

As emphasized, my intention has not been to measure the relative prominence across Austria of the competing responses to the forces of marketization. This remains the object of important future work. Such more quantitative measurements will have to do more than read social protection and emancipation off election results. Ideological opponents sometimes share some common ground, as shown in the disparate make-up of the resistance to TTIP. An understanding of the structural shifts of our era and the competing politics of nostalgia and (global) solidarity needs a more nuanced tracing of what is claimed and offered in any position. This challenge is more complex than a projection of arguments onto the classical left-right spectrum would suggest. Fraser's neo-Polanyian model, enriched by the distinction between temporal (i.e. ideological nostalgia) and geographical-cosmopolitan interpretative orientations takes a step towards acknowledging the internal complexity, mutual contestability, but also the occasional overlaps and partial entanglements of the competing politics shaping the early 21st century, in Austria as elsewhere.

References

Aichholzer, Julian et al. (2014) "How has radical right support transformed established political conflicts? The case of Austria", *West European Politics* 37 (1), 113-137.

- Appadurai, Arjun (1990) “Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy”, in M. Featherstone (ed.) *Global Culture*, London: Sage.
- Bauer, Gernot and Linsinger, Eva (2015) “Ohnmachthaber”, *Profil* 8. June, 15-21.
- Bischof, Günter (2004) “Victims? Perpetrators? “Punching bags” of European historical memory? The Austrians and their World War II legacies”, *German Studies Review* 27 (1), 17-32.
- (2014) *Relationships/ Beziehungsgeschichten: Austria and the United States in the Twentieth Century*, Vienna: Studienverlag.
- Bruckmüller, Ernst (1996) *Nation Österreich*, Vienna: Böhlau.
- Bushell, Anthony (2013) *Polemical Austria*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Fitzmaurice, John (1991) *Austrian Politics and Society Today*, London: Macmillan.
- Franz, Barbara (2003) “Bosnian refugee women in (re)settlement”, *Feminist Review* 73, 86-103.
- Fraser, Nancy (1992) “Rethinking the public sphere”, in C. Calhoun (ed.) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- (2012a) “Marketization, social protection, emancipation: Toward a Neo-Polanyian conception of capitalist crisis”, <http://sophiapol.hypotheses.org/files/2012/02/Texte-Nancy-Fraser-anglais.doc> (accessed 22 July 2013).
- (2012b) “Can society be commodities all the way down?”, Working Papers Series, Fondation Maison des sciences de l’homme, http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/72/50/60/PDF/FMSH-WP-2012-18_Fraser2.pdf (accessed 22 July 2013).
- Gächter, Sven (2015) “SOS Unmensch”, *Profil* 27 April, 13.
- Gingrich, André and Banks, Marcus (eds.) (2006) *Neo-Nationalism in Europe and Beyond*, New York: Berghahn.

- Gruber, Alexandra and Bohacek, Helmut (2006) *Lebensmittel heute*, Graz: Kammer für Arbeiter und Angestellte für Steiermark.
- Hanisch, Ernst (1994) *Der lange Schatten des Staates*, Vienna: Ueberreuter.
- Harrod, Andrew (2012) “Hidden hands and cross-purposes: Austria and the irreconcilable conflict between neutrality and market laws”, *Austrian History Yearbook* 43, 165-188.
- Hauenstein, Christian (2015) “Athen: Linke fordern Schuldenerlass”, *Kronen Zeitung*, 2 January, 2-3.
- Heise, Arne (2014) “Zwangsjacke Euro: Die Fehlkonstruktion des Europäischen Economic Governance Systems”, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* 40 (1), 17-31.
- Herrmann, Ulrike (2015) “Österreicher, stoppt die Deutschen, oder ihr verarmt!”, *Falter* 24, 16-18.
- Hipfl, Brigitte and Gronold, Daniela (2011) “Asylum seekers as Austria’s other: the re-emergence of Austria’s colonial past in a state-of-exception”, *Social Identities* 17 (1), 27-40.
- <http://www.fluechtlinge-willkommen.at/>, (accessed 10/06/2015).
- <http://www.volksbegehren-eu-austritt.at>, “Warum EU-Austritt? So kann es nicht weitergehen!”, (accessed 11/05/2015).
- Jameson, Fredric (1991) *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso.
- Karner, Christian (2005) “National doxa, crises and ideological contestation in contemporary Austria”, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11 (2), 221-263.
- (2007) “Austrian counter-hegemony: critiquing ethnic exclusion and globalization”, *Ethnicities* 7 (1), 82-115.
- (2008) “The market and the nation: Austrian (dis)agreements”, *Social Identities* 14 (2), 161-187.

—— (2010) “The uses of the past and European integration”, *Identities* 17 (4), 387-410.

—— (2011) *Negotiating National Identities*, Farnham: Ashgate.

Kindley, Randall (1997) “Small European states and the challenge of globalization”, in
Randall Kindley and David Good (eds.) *The Challenge of Globalization and
Institution Building*, Boulder: Westview.

Klenk, Florian (2015) “Ein Plädoyer für die Ausgrenzung”, *Falter* 24, 6-7.

Krausmann, Fridolin et al. (2003) “Land-use change and socio-economic metabolism in
Austria – part I: driving forces of land-use change: 1950-1995”, *Land Use Policy* 20,
1-20.

Krone poll (2015)

[http://mobil.krone.at/phone/kmm_1/app_CORE/sendung_id_28/voting_id_5183/
voting.phtml](http://mobil.krone.at/phone/kmm_1/app_CORE/sendung_id_28/voting_id_5183/voting.phtml), (accessed 06/07/2015).

Kronen Zeitung, various dates and page numbers as given in text.

Liessmann, Konrad P. (2005) *Die Insel der Seligen*, Innsbruck: Studienverlag.

Marterbauer, Markus (2015) “Rettet die Griechen vor der Destroika”, *Falter* 10, 6-7.

Misik, Robert (2014) “Der gute Staat”, *Falter* 51: 14-15.

Narodoslawky, Benedikt (2015) “Ein Land blutet aus”, *Falter* 18, 20-21.

ORF 2013, “Strache im Gespräch: Wo steht die FPÖ konkret? ”

<http://orf.at/stories/2197973/2197974>, (accessed 12/09/2013).

ORF 2015a, “Proteste in 45 Ländern weltweit”,

<http://orf.at/stories/2274072/2274073>, (accessed 18/05/2015).

ORF 2015b, “261,159 unterschrieben EU-Austritt-Volksbegehren”,

<http://www.orf.at/stories/2287503/>, (accessed 02/07/2015).

ORF 2015c, “Weiter Streit um Flüchtlingsunterbringung”, <http://orf.at/stories/2281528>,

(accessed 03/06/2015).

- ORF 2015d, “FPÖ braucht Verhandlungserfolg”, <http://orf.at/stories/2281438/2281423>,
(accessed 03/06/2015).
- ORF 2016a, “Wechselseitige Vorwürfe”, <http://orf.at/stories/2358484/2358486/> (accessed
17/09/16)
- ORF 2016b, “CETA-Kritiker bleiben trotz Zusatztextes skeptisch”,
<http://www.orf.at/stories/2361154/> (accessed 06/10/16)
- ORF 2016c, “1,65 Mio. Asylanträge 2015”, <http://orf.at/stories/2360771/2358741/> (accessed
19/09/16).
- ORF 2016d, “Flüchtlinge: Sozialpartner für leichteren Zugang zu Arbeit”,
<http://orf.at/stories/2360091/> (accessed 29/09/16).
- ORF 2016e, “Uneinigkeit bei Arbeitsausbau für Asylwerber”,
<http://steiermark.orf.at/news/stories/2800743/> (accessed 04/01/16).
- ORF 2016f, “Verpflichtende Jobs für wenig Geld”, <http://orf.at/stories/2360771/2360772/>
(accessed 04/10/16).
- ORF 2016g, “Unternehmen für bessere Integration von Flüchtlingen”,
<http://www.orf.at/stories/2360056/> (accessed 29/09/16).
- Perry, Mark (2014) “‘Krone’ kämpft um Sicherung der Existenz unserer Bauern”, *Kronen
Zeitung*, 28 December: 5.
- Piketty, Thomas (2014) *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Pölsler, Gerlinde (2015) “Ein Dorf steht auf”, *Falter* 1-3, 44-45.
- Polanyi, Karl (2001 [1944]) *The Great Transformation*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Profil*, dates and page numbers as given in text.
- Reiterer, Albert (ed.) (1988) *Nation und Nationalbewußtsein in Österreich*, Vienna: VWGÖ.
- Rosenberger, Sieglinde and König, Alexandra (2011) “Welcoming the unwelcome: the

- politics of minimum reception standards for asylum seekers in Austria”, *Journal of Refugee Studies* 25 (4), 537-554.
- Schachner-Blazizek, Peter and Hauser, Werner (2015) *EU-Topia*, Vienna: NWV.
- Schaffer, Tiz (2014) “Mi casa es tu casa?”, *Falter* 48, 52-53.
- Schlipphacke, Heidi (2014) “The temporalities of Habsburg nostalgia”, *Journal of Austrian Studies* 47 (2), 1-16.
- Sully, Melanie (1990) *A Contemporary History of Austria*, London: Routledge.
- Thaler, Peter (2001) *The Ambivalence of Identity*, West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.
- Thurnher, Armin (2014) “Vor dem SPÖ-Parteitag: der Fluch des Pragmatismus”, *Falter* 48, 5.
- (2015a) “Nach den Wahlen, vor den Wahlen: Angst, Ohnmacht, Reformpartnerschaft”, *Falter* 23, 5.
- (2015b) “Unsere Menschenwürde? Gerade im Mittelmeer ertrunken”, *Falter* 17, 5.
- Traxler, Franz (1997) “European transformation and institution building in East and West”, in Randall Kindley and David Good (eds.) *The Challenge of Globalization and Institution Building*, Boulder: Westview.
- Uhl, Heidemarie (2006) “From victim myth to co-responsibility thesis”, in Richard N. Lebow et al. (eds.) *The Politics of Memory in Postwar Europe*, Durham: Duke University Press.