



National Museums in Austria

Emma Bentz & Marlies Raffler

Summary

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries saw much of the nation-making and museum creation discussed in this paper, Austria underwent a whole spectrum of constitutions: monarchy, republic, autocracy and part of a totalitarian state and then again, since the ten years spanning 1945-1955, a republic. This dramatic history is also reflected in the changing borders of Austria – from a geographically extensive mosaic of the Habsburg Monarchy (as a *Vielvölkerstaat*, a multinational realm) to today's Austria that is made up by nine federal states with approximately 8,4 million inhabitants in total. Thus, an important question concerns what the term 'national' may refer to in the specific case of Austria.

Turning to developments in the museum sphere, the period of the *Austrian Empire* (1804-1867) and the *Austro-Hungarian Empire* (1867-1918) – especially in the *Vormärz* - was marked by royal initiatives regarding existing collections. A process of centralizing and ordering collections, that hitherto had been dispersed, began and thus it was only now that these began to be regarded as entities. In the imperial city of Vienna, splendid buildings were constructed to host these collections during the second half of the century, e.g. the "twin museums" *Kunsthistorisches Museum* (KM, Museum of Art History) and *Naturhistorisches Museum* (NM, Museum of Natural History), emerging from the imperial collections. However, the two museums were never described as 'national', since the *Vielvölkerstaat* had to represent all peoples. The same can be said about the *Austrian Museum für Volkskunde* (The Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Art), inaugurated in 1894.

Outside Vienna, a number of regional/provincial museums were founded; the Joanneum in Graz/Styria (1811) being perhaps the most prominent example. The Joanneum serves as a case study, highlighting topics such as the development of a national and regional identity and private initiatives in the museum sphere. The question of the relation between region and nation, what is centre and what is periphery is important in this context. According to Raffler, these museums were Janus-faced, being both cosmopolitan and regional as the museums presented both history of humanity and nationally specific knowledge (Raffler 2007: 344f).

With the disintegration of the Habsburgian monarchy, museums became state-owned. Often characterized as a time of crisis, a new self-image and identity had to be invented. The term 'Austria' was however, regarded with scepticism since it hitherto primarily had been associated with the dynasty of the Habsburgs. Rituals and festivities rooted in the empire had to be replaced and attempts were made to promote music as the factor that made the geographically highly-shrunken Austria into a world nation (Matzl 1995). The period also included art restoration claims, posed by former members of the multinational realm..

During NS-rule, megalomaniac projects included new museums, here exemplified with plans for (but never completed) Fuehrer-museums in Linz and Vienna. Austria's role during this period of fascism has been much disputed, affecting later plans and discussions for museum projects dealing with this period: Austria as a victim vs. Austria as willing partner? Further post-war

discussions on identity include the status assigned with the signing of the state treaty in 1955 that has been endlessly celebrated; and the constructing of a tale of new beginnings forming a unifying national symbol and stepping stone for new national myths.

In this paper, the question of the existence of an Austrian national museum, focusing on twentieth century history, is addressed by highlighting recent discussions surrounding the plans for a *Haus der Geschichte* (House of History). Until today, it is – interestingly enough – the *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum* (The Museum of Military History) that presents the most complete history of Austria, although ending with the end of WWII. Since the late 1990s, various proposals for a new museum have been made and the project has been intensely debated among politicians and historians. Still today, no consensus exists regarding exactly what to exhibit and why; neither is the question of where (in Vienna) such a museum should be located settled. The debates are interesting since they reveal the still-existing tensions regarding how to tackle and present central topics such as the *Ständestaat* (authoritarian rule 1934-38), the Austrian civil war, the *Anschluß* and Austria's role during the NS-reign. Many historians fear a political instrumentalization and a too-smooth version of the violent past that constitutes one aspect of Austrian twentieth century history. Finally, Marlies Raffer has put forward an interesting thought: could it be that an Austrian national museum is equal to the sum of existing *Landesmuseen* (i.e. museums located in the federal states of Austria), together making up a kind of 'disloziertes Nationalmuseum' (dislocated Nationalmuseum) today?

Summary table, Austria

Name	Inaugurated	Initiated	Actors	Ownership	Type	Values	Temporal reach	Style Location
Universal-museum Joanneum	1811	1808	Arch-duke Johann, <i>Steirischen Stände</i>	Ltd. Landes-museum Joanneum GmbH (2003)	Natural Sciences and Humanities	Universal values, education, encyclopaedic, Styria	All encompassing.	Different buildings, new under construction, centre of Graz.
Museum of Military History <i>Heeres-geschicht-liches Museum</i>	1856/ 1891	1848	Imperial Kaiser Franz Joseph I	State: Ministry of Defence	Military History	Imperial Austria, Austria in the world	17 th c. to 1945.	Purposely designed, historicist style. South of town centre, Vienna.
Museum of Natural History <i>Natur-historisches Museum</i>	1889	(1750), 1857	Imperial (Franz I and Franz Joseph I)	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>	Natural History, Pre-history	Universal, encyclopaedic	All encompassing.	Purposely designed, neo-renaissance style. Prominent location die Ringstraß (Kaiser-forum), Vienna.
Museum of Art History <i>Kunst-historisches Museum</i>	1891	1864	Imperial (Kaiser Franz Joseph I)	<i>Bundes-museum mit Vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>	Art, Cultural History	Europe, Greek-Roman, Middle East Egypt	Prehistory-late 18 th c.	Purposely designed neo-renaissance style. Prominent location die Ringstraße, (Kaiser-forum), Vienna.

* = Outsourced, but still state-owned, museums with responsibility for management and finances.

Introduction

In regard to museum- and nation making discussed in this paper during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Austria has undergone almost the whole spectra of constitutions available: monarchy and empire (1804-1867, 1867-1918), republic (1918-1933), autocracy and austro-fascism (1934-1938), totalitarian state under NS-rule (1938-1945) and then, since the end of World War II, the second republic (1945-1955 - today). This dramatic history is also reflected in the changing borders of Austria – from the geographically extensive mosaic of the *Vielvölkerstaat* to today's Austria made up by nine federal states with approximately 8,4 million inhabitants in total. Thus, what has been considered Austrian territory, and thereby part of Austrian politics and culture, has shifted over the centuries, but the general trend has been the gradual loss of territories. In this paper, primary focus is on museums that lie within the borders of today's Austrian republic. The founding of museums in countries that previously were related to the Habsburgian monarchy in different ways, such as Hungary, the Czech Republic and Balkan states, to mention a few, are discussed and treated in detail in separate papers.

Overview

Needless to say, the different constitutions have also affected the museum sphere in both direct and subtler ways. In an attempt to discuss nation-making and the museum system, the following subdivision has been made here highlighting some characteristics for the different periods:

- *Habsburgian Monarchy: Austrian Empire (1804-1867) and Austro-Hungarian Empire (1867-1918)*. Imperial collections on display framed by elaborate and opulent architecture, e.g. *Kunsthistorisches Museum* and *Naturhistorisches Museum*, situated in Vienna as imperial capital. Projects to reflect the grandeur of the empire: the (not completed) *Kaiserforum*, *Ringstraße-project*. Founding of a number of provincial museums. *Vielvölkerstaat*.
- *First Republic (1918-1933) and Ständestaat (1934-1938)*: Disintegration of the Habsburgian monarchy after defeat in WWI and loss of territories. Crisis (financial, political, identity, legitimacy). Political turbulence, fallout in 1934 resulting in the *Ständestaat*. With the end of Habsburgian rule, museums become state-owned.
- *Nazi cultural policy (1938-1945): 'Anschluß' and 'Gleichschaltung'*. A number of megalomaniac NS-projects including the construction of 'cultural institutes', for instance a *Fuehrermuseum* devoted to 19th century art in Linz. Museums under NS-control. Austria's role during this period of fascism much disputed, affecting later plans and discussions for museum projects dealing with this period: Austria as a victim vs. Austria as willing partner?
- *Second republic (1945/1955-today)*, complete sovereignty in 1955; the signing of the state treaty as central founding myth for the republic. Creation of a national narrative based on Austria and Austrians as victims rather than active perpetrators and participants during the NS-reign. Long-lived myth gradually contested since the 1960-70s. Changing view on NS-reign: from initial '*Opfermythos*' ('Myth of Austria as a victim') to collective responsibility. Still an issue today, exemplified by the discussions and controversies surrounding the plans for a '*Haus der Geschichte/Republik*', ('House of History') a museum intended to display Austria's post-1918 history. European/international ambitions,

‘benchmarking’: *MuseumsQuartier*. Museum reforms: process of outsourcing prestigious institutes. First hesitant discussions on inclusions of new groups (history of migrants) in a museum context.

Four museums have been selected for closer studies and further important institutes are discussed in the text. The case studies concern the Universalmuseum Joanneum in Graz, the “twin” museums *Kunsthistorisches Museum* and *Naturhistorisches Museum* in Vienna as well as the *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum*, also situated in the capital. All have been, and are still, prominent and influential institutions, often associated with the term ‘national museum’ – but in very different ways. The Joanneum in Graz/Styria is also an important example of a private initiative and questions concerning regional identity. The two art- and science museums can be regarded as the two most prominent museums during the Empire. Finally, the *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum* in Vienna is, still today, the only museum in the country with a permanent exhibition that covers Austrian history from the Thirty Years War until the end of World War II.

Early national and provincial museums in the Habsburgian Monarchy

Initial note: This chapter is partly identical to chapters in Marlies Raffer's book Museum. Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes-und Nationalmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie (Raffer 2007).

According to Marlies Raffer, the origin of the national and regional/provincial museums established during the Habsburgian monarchy lies primarily in the so called *Länderbeschreibungen*, i.e. documents describing the characteristics of each region and its inhabitants. These documents were basically intended as information sources to future regents, so that they could gain detailed knowledge and understanding over the land they were designated to rule. But the descriptions also came to influence museum founders such as Archduke Johann (see separate case study: Joanneum/Graz) in an exemplary way. The questions ‘What do we know about our own country’ and ‘What constitutes our country’ were materialized and documented not only in writing and depicting but also in the collection of objects (*Realia*). The ordering of objects (historical and natural sciences) proved important also to regional studies as a form of ‘tangible’ *Landeskunde*.

During the nineteenth century, a number of provincial museums – *Landesmuseen* – were founded. The Joanneum in Graz/Styria has been mentioned above, but also in e.g. Innsbruck/Tyrol (1823) and in Linz/Oberösterreich (1833) and in Klagenfurt/Kärnten (1844) museums were established. Encyclopaedic principles of collecting still prevailed in these museums but also new aims were formulated in accordance with this tradition. The museums were national/patriotic/*Vaterländisch* and practical/public education-scientific. Educational ambitions were signalled by the presence of libraries and teaching.

An increased awareness of a ‘national heritage’ had been strengthened by the wars of freedom and Napoleon’s art robberies. But what connotations does the attribute ‘national’ have in an Austrian context? Does national mean ‘a large, multilingual province’, or does ‘national’ mean ‘vaterländisch’, ‘patriotic’, ‘chauvinistic’ or perhaps national in the sense of language/ethnic? There existed no ‘Austrian nation’ but a *Vielvölkerreich*, which – different from western European national states – was held together by a dynasty and held down by an absolutist concept of government. Vienna was also not situated in the heart of this empire. The imperial collections in Vienna were never described as national since the Empire had to represent all peoples of the

complicated *Vielvölkerstaat*. Yet the imperial collections in Vienna surely would have been suitable as ‘national’. They are expressions of a constant process of centralisation, of bringing together dispersed collections under one roof. The result is that they, by the end of the nineteenth century, are, for the first time, regarded as constituting unities. This is further emphasised by the fact that the collections are now displayed in magnificent museum buildings, created specifically with the purpose of hosting and exhibiting the valuable objects, to be marvelled at by amazed visitors – both back then and also today (see below).

Raffler summarized these ‘national’ and regional museums as having a “certain Janus character, at the same time cosmopolitan and parochial. On the one hand they presented the history of humanity as a whole [...] while on the other hand depicting nationally specific knowledge.” (Raffler 2007: 348).

Second half of nineteenth century: Imperial collections in new buildings and examples of private foundations

Apart from being the political centre of the monarchy until 1918, the Hofburg in Vienna also hosted some of the most important imperial collections. A wish to exhibit these and thereby make them public accessible was repeatedly expressed. For this purpose, new buildings were needed and, during the second half of the nineteenth century, some of the most well-known Austrian collections were brought together under one roof. Several of these museums are situated along the *Ringstraße*, the c. 5 kilometre long street embracing most of the old town centre of Vienna. In 1857, Emperor Franz Joseph I expressed his will that the town wall of the expanding city should be removed and replaced by a boulevard. This prestigious project started with an architecture contest in 1858 and shortly thereafter construction work began. The new boulevard was inaugurated in 1865 (although it took until 1913 before the last building could be completed). Among the many prominent buildings erected in various forms of historicist architecture, often subsumed under the term ‘*Ringstraßenstil*’, is the parliament, the university and the town hall. Both noble families and members of the bourgeoisie erected private palaces. The first museum to be constructed in the *Ringstraße* was the MAK (*Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst/Gegenwartskunst*, Museum of Applied Arts), at the time of its founding named ‘*K. K. Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie*’. The first collections were on display in a part of the Hofburg from 1864 until 1877, when a pompous neo-renaissance building, built for the museum in the Stubenring 3, could be inaugurated.

One important reason for the founding of the museum in 1864 was the perceived inferiority of Austrian design when compared with other European countries. After having visited the World Fairs in Paris (1855) and London (1862), art historian Rudolf von Eitelberger was painfully aware of the poor state of design in the Empire. He made the lack of any formal institutions devoted to the subject responsible for the current situation and sought to fight this by creating both an exemplary collection and a site for the further education of designers and craftsmen (in 1868, a School of Design connected to the museum could be founded) (Rampley 2010). Eitelberger wished to promote global and universal values, contrasting to the older *Landesmuseen*, where focus was on the local and the provincial (Rampley 2010:255). In this context, it is interesting that younger museums of applied art within the Habsburgian state pursued and emphasised national aspects of the design rather than the universal promoted by

Eitelberger (Rampley 2010:256). Today, the museum has sought to define and profile itself anew by also making it a site for contemporary art. With the rebuilding in 1986, the trademark 'MAK' was established and a 'mission' formulated by the director, who describes today's museum as '*a central interface for global communication*' (http://www.mak.at/mission/f_statement.htm [March 10, 2011]).

In a different part of the Ring, the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* stands vis-à-vis *the Naturhistorisches Museum*, two neo-renaissance buildings (drawn by Carl Hasenauer and Gottfried Semper) separated by the Maria-Theresien-Platz. These important museums are discussed together in a separate case study (see p. 20).

Among the many museums founded (or considerably enlarged/merged) during the second half of the nineteenth century, only a few institutes in Vienna came into being as the result of private initiatives and did not constitute imperial foundations. Since both the *Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde* (The Austrian Museum of Folk Life and Folk Art) and the *Technisches Museum* (Museum of Science and Technology) constitute such foundations, they deserve brief mentioning here.

The *Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde*, situated in the *Gartenpalais Schönborn* and one block away from the *Ringstraße*, was founded in 1894. The initiative came from two men working in the department of prehistory and ethnography in the Museum of Natural History. Contrasting to the national sentiments expressed in similar foundations all over Europe at the time, the two founders Michael Haberlandt and Wilhelm Hein had the ambition that the museum should be a 'monument of the *Vielvölkerstaat*' and represent all peoples 'from the Carpathians to the Adriatic'. Members of the museum society came from the bourgeoisie, but also the aristocracy was well represented and during the Empire, a member of the House of Habsburg acted as custodian/protector of the museum. Ironically, it was only in 1917 that the museum could present itself as '*k.k. Kaiser-Karl-Museum für österreichische Volkskunde*' (Johler 2008: 230). One year later, with the end of the Empire in 1918, the ideals of the *Vielvölkerstaat* promoted by the museum had to be replaced and new identities negotiated. Depending on the prevailing political situation, different approaches dominated during the century from a '*Haus des deutschen Volkstums im Donauosten*' during the NS-period to an emphasis on Austrian *Volkskultur* in the post-war era (and since the 1970s emphasis on the European perspective and context). The changing roles of the museum and its ideological links during the first half of the twentieth century have only recently started to become subject to more detailed studies (see Johler 2008).

In the case of *Technisches Museum*, the oldest collections originate from different imperial initiatives but the idea to found an Austrian museum for science and technology came from Wilhelm Franz Exner, professor of mechanics in Vienna (Fellner 2008). Inspired by a visit to the World's Fair in Paris in 1867, he repeatedly sought to realise his visions of a museum where all existing collections could be united under one roof. With the 60-year anniversary of Franz Joseph's rule, it was decided that a permanent museum, originating from Exner's idea, should be established in order to celebrate and commemorate this event (Ibid: 2f). In 1907, a 'preparatory committee' was founded and chaired by industrial Arthur Krupp and two years later the '*Verein Technisches Museum für Geschichte and Gewerbe*' replaced it. Construction work was completed in 1913 but due to the outbreak of World War I the inauguration was postponed. The museum finally opened in 1918. The museum remained in the hands of the society until 1922, when in wake of

the founding of the first republic; the state took over the ownership. The *Deutsches Museum* in Munich, founded in 1903, served as a model for the Austrian pendant. The national character of the museum was underlined by the explicit ambition only to include foreign exhibits when important for the history of production (Ibid: 3).

First Austrian Republic/Republic of Austria (1918-1933) and *Ständestaat* (1934-1938)

The rupture caused by the disintegration of the Habsburgian monarchy after World War I also had implications for the cultural sphere. Museums that hitherto had been in imperial hands now became state-owned. Collections expanded due to allocation of objects that previously had constituted royal property. At the same time, the '*Nachfolgestaaten*' such as e.g. Italy, made claims and demanded the return of certain (art) objects, from e.g. the *Kunsthistorisches Museum*. The change from monarchy to state-owned collections also meant that museums now became unrestrictedly accessible to the public and Raffler posed questions regarding the two twin museums – *Kunsthistorisches* and *Naturhistorisches* – and whether, by now, they constituted national museums for the new republic? (Raffler manuscript: 15).

Austria's new constitution as a republic was marked not only by financial and political crises but also by crises concerning identity and legitimacy. Also, in the cultural sphere a new identity had to be formed. On the one hand, it was no longer self-evident to decorate oneself with imperial glory and display universal collections but on the other hand, there was also no previous republican tradition to tie on to (Mattl 1995). The many rituals associated with monarchy and empire were no longer suitable and a new legitimacy was needed, something that could unite the shrunken country. One such political attempt was to focus on Austria's musical heritage and to establish and present the new republic '*Klein-Österreich*', as – although a small country - a great power within the field of culture, for instance by founding festivals (Salzburg) and promoting Vienna as a world city for classical music (Ibid: 620; 625ff). But it was also the time of mass-culture (cinema, radio, sport events) and a tension between 'high culture' and culture for the 'masses' remained, and the republic did not manage to create a new legitimacy that could unite all groups of society (Ibid).

During the first decades of the twentieth century, the capital was often referred to as 'Red Vienna', being a stronghold for social democrats. The first republic not only implied loss, crisis and disorientation, it was also a time when Vienna was a creative and intellectual centre – perhaps partly due to this situation. An almost endless list of famous icon-like individuals can be put together: starting e.g. with Sigmund Freud and Ludwig Wittgenstein etc. etc. Vienna was also the centre for political skirmishes, reaching a violent peak with the Austrian civil war in 1934 with chancellor and austrofascist Engelbert Dollfuß as a major actor violently fighting socialism.

***Anschluß* and Second World War (1938-1945): Museums as part of megalomaniac NS-plans**

With Austria's '*Anschluß*' to NS-Germany in 1938, the museum sphere was affected in several different ways. Like in Germany, persons approved by the regime replaced several museum directors and employees, or subordinated German counterparts in Berlin replaced the directors. As part of the *Arisierung*, museums like the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* received works of art that had been confiscated from Jewish collections and homes.

In Vienna, when the *Ständestaat* established the “*Kulturamt*” (‘culture department’) (1934), it became the central institution for cultural politics during the NS-administration (Matzl 1995:621). During the NS-reign, new museums or the rebuilding of already-existing museums were manifested in megalomaniac plans for cities like Vienna and Linz. Shortly after the *Anschluss*, Linz was selected as one out of five ‘*Führerstädte*’ (the other selected cities were Berlin, Hamburg, Munich and Nuremberg) and for a short while the city became a ‘[...] playground for the national socialists fantasies of power’ (Weihsman 1998:942). Apart from plans for major industrial expansion and the Danube harbour, Hitler designated Linz to be a new European art metropolis (Ibid: 946). In a new axis street south of the town centre, an opera, a library and a ‘*Führermuseum*’ were planned. The museum was thought of as an equivalent to the Uffizien in Florence and should exhibit art representing the “*Germanische Klassik*” (Ibid: 950). The so-called ‘*Sonderauftrag Linz*’ was established to acquire the therefore needed paintings. Hitler appointed art-historian Hans Posse, director of the Picture Gallery in Dresden, to be in charge of the planned museum for German and Austrian art from the nineteenth century. The museum was never realized but photo albums covering the paintings intended for display have been partly preserved; out of originally 32 albums, 19 are archived in the German Historical Museum in Berlin while the remaining 13 are missing (<http://www.dhm.de/datenbank/linzdb/> [February 2, 2011]). Shortly after Austria’s ‘*Anschluss*’ to NS-Germany, Adolf Hitler had issued the so called ‘Fuehrer’s prerogative’ in Mid-June of 1938 with the intention of securing first access to artwork seized from Austrian families by the Gestapo and other organisations. Many of the paintings listed in the preserved albums come from these confiscations, from the finest collections in Austria but also from Germany and other countries. Approximately 4000-6000 paintings were reserved for the *Fuehrermuseum* in Linz (<http://www.kunstrestitution.at/F.prerogative.html> [March 9, 2011]).

Apart from a spectacular art museum, Hitler’s plans for Linz also included museums of natural sciences and folklore respectively. The intention was that all construction work should be completed by 1950, after the imagined victory. Today, a bridge is the only architectural reminder of the large-scale plans of the Fuehrer.

In Vienna, it was Hitler’s wish to connect the town more clearly to the Danube and several detailed plans were made (Weihsman 1998:1021ff). Directly affecting the Habsburgian ‘twin museums’ was architect Hanns Dustmann’s proposal for a ‘Haus des Fuehrers’, intended for the exhibition of contemporary art (Gottfried 2001: 136). A square-shaped building with defence towers was to be constructed vis-à-vis the already existing museums. In the vicinity, the *Heldenplatz* should be converted into a ‘*Wiener Walhalla*’ or ‘*Kultbezirk*’ and as a place for ceremonies and marches (Weihsman 1998:1028).

During the final phase of the war, several museums were severely damaged; for instance, parts of the *Heeresgeschichtliche Museum* were bombed in November 1944.

New beginnings and old ghosts: Second Republic (1945-today)

As in Germany, the allied forces made a division into four occupation zones. The capital of Vienna was also four-divided/powered and surrounded by the Soviet-occupied zone. Ten years after the end of World War II, in May 1955, Austria gained full independence with the signing of the Austrian State Treaty. Needless to say, this was a much longed-for moment and soon incorporated as a central founding myth for the Second Republic, by many viewed as the

country's resurrection and new start. This was based on the narrative of Austria as a victim, first occupied by NS-Germany and later by a second '*Fremdberrschaft*' in the form of the Allied forces (Uhl 2005:487f). The famous photograph showing foreign minister (and former Chancellor) Leopold Figl standing on the balcony of the *Oberes Belvedere*, holding up the treaty in front of a cheering crowd forms a strong collective, visual memory of the event. This symbol of Austria's newfound freedom gains an additional symbolic dimension as one learns that the photograph in reality was a photomontage, since the fragile balcony would not have been able to carry the weight of all representatives (Felber 2006)! Another act constituting an important part of post-war Austria and its self-image is the declaration of neutrality for all time to come, signed later that same year, on the 26th of October 1955. Notably, it was this date and not the 15th of May that ten years later became the country's official national holiday/commemoration day.

Over the years, anniversaries commemorating the 15th of May, 1955 have been celebrated. On some of these occasions, the procedures during the famous day have been reproduced and dramatized in the presence of the Austrian government and foreign ministers from the countries involved in the preparation of the treaty in 1955 (Liebhart & Pribersky 2004). This happened for instance in 1990, when 35 years of republic was commemorated and celebrated. By repeating the procedures of this event, the strength of this national myth is reinforced and the memory of it kept alive in a collective awareness (cf. Liebhart & Pribersky 2004:396f). The most recent celebration took place in 2005 and was accompanied by '*Das neue Österreich. Die Ausstellung zum Staatsvertragsjubiläum 1955/2005*', a temporary exhibition presenting Austrian twentieth century history (Dürriegl & Frodl 2005). To give additional weight to the anniversary, once more the original setting was used as the exhibition was arranged in the *Oberen Belvedere*, where the negotiations had once taken place. In the catalogue accompanying the exhibit, the importance of not just highlighting the positive memories but also discussing more negative aspects of the young republic was stated in several prefaces. However, to many this was not enough and, for instance, historian Heidemarie Uhl criticized the exhibition for not taking any stand and for treating each view on the history of the second republic as equally valid (Uhl 2006). The three-fold anniversary year of 2005 – celebrating 50 years of state treaty but also 60 years of republic and 10 years of EU-membership – provoked much discussion and also counter-manifestations, clearly showing the still-present tensions in Austrian society in relation to its post-war history and the interpretation of this more recent history. An internet site (www.oesterreich-2005.at) was founded as a base for publication of critical contributions and views of the celebrations, presenting itself as a "Eine Aktionsplattform tritt gegen die konservative Jubelmaschine an". [March 14, 2011].

The exhibition in the Oberen Belvedere was not the only one commemorating the state treaty: the Technisches Museum Wien arranged "Österreich baut auf. Wieder-Aufbau & Marshall-Plan" und the exhibition "Österreich ist frei" opened in the Schallaburg/Niederösterreich (for discussion and comparison between these three exhibitions, see Felber 2006).

In post-war Austria, parallel to the vision of a new start materialised in the signing of the state treaty, there was an eagerness to put brackets around the NS-years. Generally speaking, Austrians saw no need to try to come to terms with a postulated Nazi legacy since there was a general consensus that the country had been Hitler's first victim with the *Anschluß* of 1938 (Uhl 2004). This focus on Austria as a victim of war was long prevailing in the national narrative and only

gradually questioned and deconstructed. Historians use words such as ‘Taboo’, ‘Guilt defence’ and ‘Suppression’ when speaking of post-war Austria’s relation to the eight years of Nazi rule. Until the 1970s, subjects related to the NS-reign focused primarily on which differences existed between Austrian society and the totalitarian NS-state, and as a consequence, National Socialism and the atrocities committed in its name solely belonged to German history and not to Austrian history – the Nazis had conducted a ‘*Fremdherrschaft*’/’*Gewaltherrschaft*’ over Austria. The process of questioning this comfortable self-image began slowly in the 1960-70s, and gained additional pace in the 80s with the Kurt Waldheim-controversy. The former UN-general secretary successfully ran for president in 1986 and remained holder of the post until 1992. His mandate period was lined with controversies relating to his past as an officer in the *Wehrmacht* and possible involvement in war crimes on Balkan states. Waldheim became a symbol for the Austrian population’s complicated and ambiguous relation to the NS-years, much quoted is his statement that he “...did nothing else during war-time than what hundred of thousands of Austrians also did, namely fulfilling my duties as a soldier” (Original quote: “Ich habe im Krieg nichts anderes getan als Hunderttausende andere Österreicher, nämlich meine Pflicht als Soldat erfüllt.“ (quoted from Uhl 2004:493)).

The 1980s was also the decade when initiatives towards a ‘*neue Erinnerungskultur*’ (‘new commemoration culture’) took place. Until then, monuments commemorating Austrian soldiers dominated rural parts of Austria whereas many other groups remained invisible in this landscape (Perz & Uhl 2005:546, 557ff). Exhibitions on Austria during the Second World War and the republics relation to the NS-regime were few during the first decades after the war, which was in accordance with the general *Verdrängung* (Suppression). The post-war history of the Mauthausen concentration camp well illustrates this. In 1970, when a museum could finally open on the site where more than 135.000 persons lost their lives (incl. satellite camps) between 1938-1945; it was, for a long time, close to the only permanent exhibition in Austria presenting the history of national socialism in Austria (Perz & Uhl 2005:570f). As expected, Austria was presented as a victim rather than as perpetrator and still today, the author Bertrand Perz states that: “Die Frage nach Mauthausen als realem und symbolischen Ort für eine österreichische „Tätergeschichte“ ist ebenfalls nach wie vor offen.” (Perz & Uhl 2005:573).

To a foreign observer, modern Austria appears highly (pre)occupied with self-reflection regarding its identity as a nation. To a certain extent this goes hand in hand with more general trends within European cultural and social studies, where the much-quoted works of Pierre Nora and Maurice Halbwachs often serve as a starting point for analysis of the construction (or destruction) of memory. Symbol-bearing places, myths and festivities are examined and related to questions of national identity.. In the case of Austria, this has resulted in the production of three voluminous books in the project ‘*Memoria Austriae I-III*’, covering different aspects of the Austrian mental landscape. The volumes contain articles on individuals, myths, epochs (vol. I), architectural objects, sites and regions (vol. II) and, in the final volume, the role of Austrian companies, businesses and products in the making of identity is discussed (Brix, Bruckmüller & Stekl 2004a; 2005a; 2005b, see also Plaschka, Stourzh & Niederkorn 1995; a volume focusing on the name “Österreich” and its connotations). The topics dealt with have been selected based on the results of questionnaires distributed to 1000 Austrians, aiming at answering questions regarding what is especially memorable with this specific country (Brix, Bruckmüller & Stekl

2004b). Another, slightly different example, are the two conference volumes originating from a research project conducted by the Austrian Academy of Sciences, focusing on loss, construction and storing of memory (Csáky& Stachel 2000; 2001). In this context, museums are discussed and the question of a national history museum in Austria is also highlighted - a subject we shall now turn to (Rauchensteiner 2000a).

The missing national museum?: Seemingly endless retakes and hurdles

As seen in the paper, Austria does not have a museum dealing solely with its own post-war history, like, for instance, neighbouring Germany. The most coherent, permanent exhibition on Austrian history can be found in the military museum (see separate case study). However, ever since the end of World War II there have been, and still are, calls for and discussions on the possibilities (or impossibilities) of such an undertaking. While more recent discussions tend to avoid the epithet 'National museum' and instead speak of plans for a '*Haus der Zeitgeschichte – Toleranz - österreichische Geschichte/Republik*' (to compare with similar institutions in Germany), Austria's first president (*Bundespräsident*) after the war, social democrat Karl Renner, made up plans for a national museum dedicated to the history of the Republic (*Museum der Ersten und Zweiten Republik Österreichs*) (Auer 1983). Renner initially proposed that also the federal states and communes should be encouraged to set up similar museums. Later, in 1947, it was decided that one would await the results and experiences made in Vienna before museum plans should be translated to other regions (Auer 1983:53). Renner was himself a figurehead within twentieth century politics in Austria and thus intrinsically connected with the periods he wished to devote to a museum. The social democrat served as state chancellor in 1918-1919 and partook as negotiator in the peace treaties in Saint-Germain and acted as a member of the *Nationalrat* from 1920-35 (serving as its president 1931-34). Immediately after the war, Renner was in charge of the first provisional government and was also elected federal president of Austria in 1945, beginning his services the year after.

In a first letter addressed to the chancellor regarding his plans for a museum in the Leopoldine wing in the Hofburg (which was to be renovated back to the state it had pre-1938), Renner suggests an exhibition in three halls, each devoted to a certain chapter of Austrian history. The first should contain the history of the First Republic; the second would be the '*Saal der Katastrophe*' (Anschluß, World War II) including a '*Helden- und Opferbuch*' and then the resurgence, the '*Wiedererhebung*' (Renner 1946 in Auer 1983: 79). The most important moments in history should be depicted in large paintings and paintings of presidents and chancellors (in size 1:1) should be displayed in portrait galleries. Finally, facial portraits of other prominent Austrians should be produced. A bust of Karl Renner himself constitutes inventory number 1! Renner's museum was intended for politicians on state visits and diplomats, but Austrian civilians and school children were also regarded as important visitors (Auer 1983: 60).

With Renner's death in 1950, the initiative lost its foremost advocate and the project slowly "ran dry", as Manfred Rauchensteiner has put it (Rauchensteiner 2000a: 72). Whereas the federal president Theodor Körner expressed his wish to let the project continue, Adolf Schärf (federal president 1957-1965) was more sceptical (Auer 1983:71; 75). The only slowly proceeding exhibitions became a source of conflict when Schärf wished to transfer responsibility from the president's desk to the Ministry of Education. For a long time, a deadlock prevailed and only in

1971 was it decided that the Ludwig Boltzmann should be in charge of the, by then dead, museum cause. Today, parts of the collection are exposed in the *Heeresgeschichtlichen Museum* in Vienna. Renner's vision of a museum of the republic has been realized on a much smaller scale, in his former home in Gloggnitz/Niederösterreich, where a society in 1978 founded a "Dr. Karl Renner Museum für Zeitgeschichte", devoted to the person Renner and contemporary history. (www.rennermuseum.at).[March 7, 2011].

Discussions on a new museum have however, continued. Since the 1990s, there have repeatedly been calls for a museum on twentieth century Austrian history. In 1998, the future of the neo-renaissance Palais Epstein in the Ringstraße was subject to debate. Leon Zelman, leader at the time of the Jewish Welcome Centre, advocated the establishment of a 'Haus der Toleranz' ('House of Tolerance') and that discussions could begin. Together with Anton Pelinka, professor of political science and much-engaged in questions concerning nationalism, Zelman focused on questions of racism and genocide with Jewish-Austrian experiences as a starting point. Finally, it was decided that, after the renovation, the former home of a prominent banker and his family, the Palais Epstein, should serve as an annex to the Austrian parliament. Today it is stated on the homepage of the Austrian parliament that the building would have been 'too small' for the proposed museum (<http://www.parlament.gv.at/GEBF/EPSTEIN/VERWENDUNGPLALAIS/Aktuell/> [March 10, 2011]).

The decision against a museum in the Epstein-palace has however, had a long postlude. In 1999, the Austrian *Nationalrat* decided to arrange a competition for a '*Haus der Toleranz/Geschichte*' and asked for proposals. The house was to be constructed on a different (by then – and still in 2011- not decided) location in Vienna. With many political complications, and instead of an '*Ideenwettbewerb auf breiter Basis*', two different proposals and feasibility studies were produced by two different ministries (Mattl 2002). Grazer historian Stefan Karner and director of the *Heeresgeschichtliche Museum* Manfred Rauchensteiner formulated the idea of a '*Haus der Geschichte*' with a focus on the second republic that was supported by the Ministry of Education, but the Ministry of Science preferred a '*Haus der Toleranz*' (proposal A. Pelinka among others). Since the procedure did not correspond to the initial ideas of an open contest, protests came from historians and further political turbulence followed. Finally, after the dissolution of the coalition SPÖ-ÖVP in 2001, further plans included a common proposal where both 'Houses' should merge into one. It is impossible to discuss all twists and turns of the debate in detail and only the broad views can be covered here. Many debates were carried out in the daily press such as *Der Standard* and *Falter* (*Wiener Stadtzeitung*) but also in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* (esp. *ÖZG* vol. 13, 2002/1).

After the exhibition in connection with the 50th anniversary of the signing of the state treaty in 2005 (see above), the seemingly never-ending debate took a new turn. On an initiative of the Minister of Education the project group joined the main figures behind this exhibition in favour of a '*Haus der Geschichte*'. Their task was to produce a road map for the realisation of a museum focusing on the history of republican Austria. After protests by prominent historians, a group of experts was added. In 2006, a road map was finally presented and, as expected, the waves of discussions went high once more (a summary of the road-map is available online: https://www.doew.at/thema/haus_der_geschichte/roadmap.pdf [February 12, 2011]). The

time-plan included in the road map foresaw a decision on where to locate the museum (incl. an architecture contest) and a construction start for the period 2008-2010 (Roadmap 2006:4). So, what is the current state of affairs? The political intention is, as stated in the *Regierungsprogramm* for 2008-2013, prepared by the coalition parties SPÖ and ÖVP, that the “planning and further work for the realization of the Haus der Geschichte should, as foreseen, rapidly be carried on” (Regierungsprogramm, s. 235). According the newspaper *Der Standard*, the chancellery holds a 2018 completion/finalization date of the work as probable, and it is surely no coincidence that this year is also the 100-anniversary of the Austrian republic (Der Standard, 12 November 2008).

Along the way, plans for a history museum have evoked strong opinions and feelings. The core problem seem to be that no one knows exactly why such a house is needed and what it should display, i.e. which history should be presented. Historians fear a political instrumentalization and the production of yet another carefully arranged success story of the Austrian republic.

Developments since the 1990s: processes of outsourcing

In the course of the 1990s, next to all institutions belonging to the cultural sphere (i.e. museums, theatres, operas) were subject to extensive reforms that resulted in new structures for their organisation and juridical status (Tschmuck 2008:11). A controversial process of outsourcing affected a number of Austria’s most well-known and well-visited institutes, such as *Kunsthistorisches Museum*, *Albertina* and *Obere Belvedere*. The first museum that underwent the change from being a primarily state-run institute to an independent institute with a management of its own was the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* (1999) and seven to ten others have followed. There are three kinds of Bundesmuseen that often, mistakenly, are subsumed under one heading: museums that hitherto had been state-owned and state-financed cultural institutions remained in state ownership and thus still belong to the republic of Austria but have received *Vollrechtsfähigkeit*. Those are: Albertina, Kunsthistorisches Museum (since 2011 also including Museum für Völkerkunde and Österreichischem Theatermuseum), Österreichische Galerie Belvedere, Österreichisches Museum für angewandte Kunst (MAK), Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig (MUMOK), Naturhistorisches Museum, Technisches Museum Wien (including Österreichischer Mediathek) and Österreichisches Nationalbibliothek. Museums still run by the state make up a second group: Volkskundemuseum, Ethnographisches Museum in Kittsee, Pathologisch-anatomische Museum och Heeresgeschichtliches Museum. Museums tied to the universities constitute one last group of Bundesmuseen (Konrad 2008:20f). The first institute to be outsourced was the Tiergarten Schönbrunn in 1991 (Tschmuck 2008:21).

The *Vollrechtsfähigkeit* for the first group of museums briefly means that each museum operates as an independent and self-financing actor – in accordance with a market oriented, neo-liberal way of thinking. The reforms were part of a general ‘Privatisierungswelle’ in Austria during the 1990s that, according to Peter Tschmuck, most probably was further supported by the Austrian EU-membership in 1995 (Tschmuck 2008:20ff). Museum visitors have noticed this change in a very concrete way as entrance fees have been considerably raised since the reform was implemented; something that may constitute a discouraging barrier to some groups of potential visitors.

In some cases, an increased tendency to invest in ‘safe’ exhibitions with non-controversial and internationally well-known artists can be noticed since the outsourcing. This is valid for the art museums and especially for the *Graphiksammlung Albertina*, where exhibitions on Munch, Klee, Picasso, Rembrandt, Rubens, Goya and Chagall (just to mention a few) have replaced each other since 2003 (Tschmuck 2008:232f). In the case of the *Albertina*, the author Tschmuck relates this to its new ambition as a “*Universalmuseum der bildenden Kunst*”, a self-appointed position not without complications. It already has resulted in exhibition overlaps with other art museums (Ibid: 232f). Another phenomenon is that museums, since their outsourcing, tend to arrange exhibitions outside of their traditional and stated area/field of collections. The increased amount of exhibitions has also had priority over other core areas of the museums (collecting, archives, research).

In another study on management in the museum sphere and cultural politics, the process of reforming and re-organizing the institutes included in the *Bundesmuseum*-reform serve as a case study (Konrad 2009). After a detailed analysis, Heimo Konrad concludes that not much has changed within a number of spheres (Konrad 2009). The organization of the individual museums has, to a large extent, preserved earlier structures. Larger renovations or new buildings are, like before, being financed directly by the state and there are no traces of more cooperation between the *Bundesmuseen*; just to mention a few points made by Konrad. The state has been discontent with this and other developments and, in 2007, a revised ‘*BMuseen-G Novelle*’ was formulated. Seemingly paradox to the initial aims of the reform, the state is once again strengthening its control over the museums.

The Austrian museum landscape in the twenty-first century

Since 2001, yet another museum complex can be added to the list of prestigious museum projects – realised or only planned - with spectacular architecture, which, as we have seen, has a long-standing tradition in Vienna. In the mid-1980s, the ever present lack of room for collections and exhibitions led to a proposal that the area of the former *Hofstallungen*, the baroque stables from 1725, that later long served as a fairground (*Messepalast*) should be converted into a museum. Initiatives came from the national government. Brainstorming followed by an architectural competition and resulted in a winning proposal for a museum/cultural centre in 1990. Construction work would begin eight years later, in 1998, after a number of compromises had been made, and an official inauguration followed in 2001.

The *MuseumsQuartier* presents itself with different museums, shops, event locations and cafés on an area measuring 60,000 square meters. That size matters is reflected in the marketing: The MQ “is one of the ten largest cultural complexes in the world“, it can display “Vienna's longest Baroque façade”, the MUMOK “is the largest museum for modern and contemporary art in Central Europe” while the Leopold Museum holds “the world's largest collection of works by Egon Schiele” (quotes from the homepage www.mqw.at). With its conglomerate of architectural styles, spanning from the baroque eighteenth century buildings to the modern and sober shell limestone façade of the Leopold museum, it constitutes a stage where an international audience can meet and consume essential parts of the proud Austrian national heritage, the MQ thus adding yet another dimension to the ‘classic’ imperial city of Vienna. There is a tension embedded here: a desire for internationalization/globalization on the one hand and for tradition

and national sentiments on the other. This tension was evident in the debates that followed on the winning architectural proposal in 1990, where the first plans for the MQ, among other things, was described as a “*Fremdkörper*” (‘alien’) and as “non-Austrian” (quoted in de Frantz 2002:14). Public opinion demanded changes and there was, in general, a call for “*eine stärkere Historisierung des Projektes?*” (Gottfried 2001:140). Revisions followed where, for instance, the idea to construct a library tower ‘*Bibliotheksturm*’ was abandoned.

Democratization and inclusion of new groups

The question of the representation of (im)migrants in Austrian museums has only slowly found its way into discussions and in November 2010, the first conference on the subject took place („Museum und Migration“ was held at the Volkskundemuseum in Vienna, 18-20 November, 2010 and arranged by Forschungszentrum für historische Minderheiten (FZHM), Institut für Wissenschaft und Kunst (IWK), Österreichisches Museum für Volkskunde (ÖMV) in cooperation with the Museumsbund Österreich. Abstracts are available under:

http://www.univie.ac.at/iwk/mus_mig.html [6 February, 2011]).

According to Christine Hintermann, a migration researcher at the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for European History and Public, the permanent exhibitions in the larger history museums in Austria to a large extent still remain “*migrationsfreie Zonen*” whereas temporary exhibitions devoted to subjects related to migration have increased in number

(http://www.univie.ac.at/iwk/mus_mig_abstracts.html [February 7, 2011]). Currently, there are no strong calls for the establishment of a migration museum in Austria. One explanation to the relative non-visibility of migrants in the country’s national narrative as reflected in, for instance, museums and textbooks, has, according to Hintermann, to do with the fact that post-war Austria preferred to centre on “reconciliation, consensus and homogeneity of the young nation state.” (Hintermann 2009:13). In such a tale there is little room for heterogeneity and Hintermann describes today’s Austria as “a reluctant immigration country” (Hintermann 2009).

Finally, the question of the existence of an Austrian national museum today shall be addressed once more. Marlies Raffler has put forward an interesting argument: could it be that an Austrian national museum is equal to the sum of existing *Landesmuseen* (the main museum of each federal state in Austria), together making up a kind of ‘*disloziertes Nationalmuseum*’ (‘dislocated National museum’)?

Case studies in chronological order

Universalmuseum Joanneum, Graz

Situated in Graz in the federal state Styria (*Steiermark*), the Joanneum – often mentioned in terms of a national museum - is an important example as it highlights several of the topics that are of interest to WP2. There is the individual Archduke Johann, brother of Franz II./I., as a driving force behind the foundation and further work, there is the Joanneum’s function as a source of inspiration and role-model to other museums of the time (e.g Franzensmuseum Brünn/Brno, Böhmisches Landesmuseum Prag/Praha) and further, there is the aspect of *Landesmuseen* and regional identity.

Starting with the '*Nationalmuseum*', it can be stated that there existed nothing like an 'Austrian nation' when the museum was initiated in 1808. Yet the deed of gifts and the statutes for the museum formulated three years later, in 1811, mention the institute as an "*Innerösterreichisches Nationalmuseum*". But what exactly did the term refer to? As little as an Austrian nation existed, neither was there a "Styrian Nation" nor an "Inner-Austrian Nation" (Raffler 2007:151f). Instead of being a prosperous nation, Styria was part of a troubled *Vielvölkerstaat* with Napoleon as a constant threat. The empire's defeat at Wagram led to the peace treaty of Schönbrunn in 1809, which meant great losses of land for emperor Franz I./II. Due to the many military attacks by Napoleonic armies and subsequent repression by the same, Styria was in a bad state at the time of the peace treaty and at the time when the museum was initiated. This has led to an interesting and seemingly paradox situation formulated by Marlies Raffler: Even though – or perhaps just because? – Styria belonged to one of the most underdeveloped regions of the Habsburg monarchy, the most progressive institute with the broadest impact is founded here; the Joanneum (Raffler, manus, s. 5).

The protagonist in the tale of the museum that later became the Joanneum that was inaugurated in 1811, is Habsburgian Archduke Johann (1782-1859), brother of Emperor Franz. He came to play an important role in the strengthening of Styrian identity and patriotism and is sometimes given the epithet 'Prince of Styria'. Today, a statue of him in the centre of Graz reminds the visitor of his past achievements. Interestingly enough, Johann did not come from Styria/Steiermark and the decision to found a museum in Graz was, in fact, a second hand choice. His first intention had been to donate his private collection (main focus on history and science) to the University of Innsbruck in Tyrol (Sommer 2000: 136). Personal political involvement in conspiracies organising an uprising against Napoleon – with whom Franz II./I. currently was reconciliated - led to a prohibition to visit Tyrol in 1813 and thus Johann turned to Styria. The collections were, at the time, rather 'neutral', or universal, in terms of what they represented and they could be displayed everywhere. With time, the collections expanded and also became more focused on Styria, but in a first phase they had to be, as Monika Sommer put it, "charged with Steiermark" (Ibid: 137). As mentioned earlier in this paper, Marlies Raffler sees the systematic *Landesaufnahme* a possible origin to the later provincial and national museums. The existence of such documents also influenced and inspired Johann, who formulated inquiries and calls for collection and also ordered texts regarding the "spiritual climate" in Styria.

The decision to display the collections in Graz was made in 1808. At first, the name "*Museum für Naturgeschichte, Chemie, Ökonomie und Technologie am Lyceum in Gratz*" was intended, since the idea was to put the collections in the already-existing Lyceum and not in a separate building, as a separate unit (Ibid: 137). Later, in 1847, when the museum had been established, an educational institution focusing on applied sciences and science became part of the institute, revealing Johann's educational ambitions rooted in a late-enlightenment tradition of bringing together teaching and collecting (Raffler 2007:187).

Regarding the organisation of the museum, it was Johann's wish that responsibility for the institute should go to the "*Steirischen Stände*" as being representatives for the collective; the *Land*. Johann himself remained head of the institute and three curators were appointed to monitor work and make sure that this was done according to Johann's will during his absences (Sommer 2000: 139). Also today, even if the Joanneum, since 2003, has been detached from the local

government administration, representatives from the *Landesstellen* are part of the organisation. The re-organization was made in order for the Joanneum to “remain competitive in the international museum business” but is still owned by the Land. Steiermark.

From the very beginning, the museum was open to the public. Visitors could marvel the impressive and manifold collections, but they were also encouraged to display self-made art or products coming from the region, strengthening the bond between museum and region. Step by step additional collections were acquired or donated to the museum and with time the regional anchoring increased. Monika Sommer writes: “*Die im Joanneum präsentierten Exposita zeichnen ein Bild der Leistungen der Steiermark und ermöglichen durch bewusstes Aussparen und –wählen die Konstruktion eines identifikatorischen Selbstbildes.*” (free translation: „The objects exhibited in the Joanneum paint a picture of Styrian achievements and through a deliberate/conscious omittance/exclusion and selection [of objects] it makes the construction of a identificatory self-image possible.”) (Sommer 2000: 140). This included ideas of progress and patriotism where central topics included the shift away from agriculture to industry and the French occupation (Ibid: 140). The museum’s active role in strengthening the regional identity continued also after Johann’s death, for instance, a cultural history museum and an art gallery were founded in 1887, some years later – in 1913 - the ethnological museum was added. Today the museum consists of a number of departments or ‘sub-museums’ where not all are located to Graz but are dispersed in the region. When the museum was re-named in 2009, it was argued that the name “Universalmuseum Joanneum” would reflect the many facets of life covered by the collections. A second argument was that the name was understood also outside the German-speaking parts of the world. It, of course, also gives different associations than the old name “*Landesmuseum Joanneum*” does, important in a time when museums are competing for visitors.

The Joanneum museum was assigned a representative role from early on and proudly shown to important visitors in Graz. But also persons with more specific interests in the institute *itself* visited Graz, such as Graf Kaspar Sternberg, founder of the Bohemian national museum in Prague or Franz Xaver Berger, later founder and director in Prague. Written information on the organisation of the Joanneum was collected in work proceeding the founding of museums in Brünn, Innsbruck, Lemberg and Laibach; also the statutes were adapted (Raffler 2007: 181). Johann himself was also actively involved in questions regarding the organisation of new museums in other parts of the *Vielvölkerstaat*. In this way, the Joanneum had an important function as a role model for both national museums and regional *Landesmuseen*. But even if, around 1820, there existed a ‘good example’, Emperor Franz instructed the *Akademie der Bildenden Künste* in Vienna to work on a design for the ‘ideal provincial museum’ (Ibid:182). These plans never came to be realised though and other *Landesmuseen* were founded independent of the existence of the Emperor’s plans, for instance in Innsbruck (Tyrol) 1823, Linz (Oberösterreich) 1833 and Salzburg in 1834 (Ibid: 127f).

During the last years, big investments have been made in order to cover the demand for representative premises for the ever-expanding Joanneum, looking more and more like a “*Gesamtkunstwerk*”. 2010 saw the construction start of the *Joanneumsviertel* that is associated with other spatial expansions like *MuseumsQuartier* in Vienna or *Museumsmeile* in Bonn. This year, Joanneum celebrates its 200-anniversary and thereby also “revitalize(s) its founding myths” (cf. Sommer 2000: 143). The homepage already proudly announces the festivities planned for the

celebration of “Austria’s oldest (public) museum” (see: <http://www.museum-joanneum.at/de/joanneum/ueber-das-joanneum/200-jahre-joanneum-1> [March 9, 2011]).

Kunsthistorisches Museum und Naturhistorisches Museum, Vienna

The *Kunsthistorisches Museum* stands vis-à-vis the *Naturhistorisches Museum*, two neo-renaissance buildings (drawn by Carl Hasenauer and Gottfried Semper) separated by the *Maria-Theresien-Platz*. The architecture forms an intrinsic part of the *Denkmal* (‘monument’) formed by the imperial collections (cf. Kriller 2000). The exterior and interior and the collections match each other in terms of splendour and grandeur. The choice of architectural style was deliberate, creating references to universalism, the spirit of humanism and patron of the arts with the purpose of, as Beatrix Kriller has put it, to immortalize the House of Habsburg via the “*Transportmittel*” (‘mode of transport’) art (Kriller 2000: 217). In the *Kunsthistorisches Museum*, one of many examples of unrestrained self-depiction is a monumental roof painting reproducing prominent collectors, belonging to the House of Habsburg, placed in the mezzanine. Here especially, Emperor Rudolf II (1552-1612) should be mentioned, who formulated the first ideas for a common Austrian *Schatz- und Kunstkammer* (Treasure- and art cabinet) as well as Emperor Leopold I (1640-1705), who made the first attempts to centralise the dispersed collections (Seipel 1992: 57ff). In 1776, during the reign of Empress Maria Theresa, a decision to move art collections to the *Obere Belvedere* was made and from 1781, collections here were publicly accessible (Ibid: 60f). On Franz Joseph I’s initiative, the collections were rearranged and an inventory conducted. Thereby an attempt to clarify which objects could be considered as imperial property or state property was also made. A suitable building was needed and after many proposals and modifications construction work began in 1871 and the museum could finally be inaugurated in 1891 (Gottfried 2001). According to Wilfried Seipel, the collections do not so much represent the national and he prefers to describe it as a “*Gesamtkunstwerk des europäischen Kulturerbes*” (Seipl 1992: 68). On the museum’s homepage, the institute – today consisting of the art museum, the museum for ethnography, the Austrian theatre museum, the *Schatzkammer*, *Neue Burg* (incl. armory), *Wagenburg*, *Schloß Ambras* and the Theseus Temple (in the Volksgarten) - is presented as “one of the world’s biggest and most important museums” (<http://www.khm.at/de/kunsthistorisches-museum> [March 7, 2011]).

The *Naturhistorisches Museum*, the art museum’s ‘twin’, displays the enormous, universal collections that started with Emperor Franz I Stephan von Lothringen’s acquisition of, at the time, the most famous collection of natural history objects in 1750. After his early death in 1765, his widow, Maria Theresa, donated the collections to the state and wished them to be publicly accessible. On the homepage of the museum it is proudly written “the first museum in the spirit of Enlightenment was founded!

(http://www.nhm-wien.ac.at/museum/geschichte__architektur/museum_der_aufklaerung [March 10, 2011]). The collections were first displayed in the Hofburg, and construction for a new museum began in 1871 and was completed in 1881 (Gottfried 2000: 87ff). In 1889, Emperor Franz Joseph I opened the exhibition. If imperial patrons of the art are immortalised and ever-present in the *Kunsthistorisches Museum*, sculptures of famous scientists and canvas paintings of exotic countries and exotic epochs grace this building. Apart from nature history objects, the

museum also has an archaeological exhibition. Venus from Willendorf is perhaps most prominent exhibit.

Heeresgeschichtliches Museum, Vienna

A museum often mentioned in association with the term ‘*Nationalmuseum*’ is the military museum in Vienna, the *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum*. Today it belongs to the group of *Bundesmuseen* (see above), but is different to other museums in this category; the Ministry of Defence has direct responsibility over the museum.

The founding of the museum has a very direct political background. In the wake of the 1848 revolution, first plans for an army museum were launched as part of a new citadel (a “*Konzentrierten Artillerie-Establissement?*”) that was to be constructed southeast of the town centre. Hitherto, modern weapons as well as a historical weapon collection had been stored in the centre of Vienna, in the *Zeughaus*. This location proved too vulnerable when it was attacked and stormed by revolutionaries in October 1848. In the following year, the new emperor, Franz Joseph I, signed a decision to transfer forces as well as military equipment to a new building complex southeast of the town centre. The winners of the architectural competition quickly produced plans for a citadel hosting ‘all military needs’. Apart from premises such as caserns and store of arms, the construction of a more representative building was also part of the plan (Zatschek 1960: 9). Originally, this building was intended to host the weapons of the infantry as well as the imperial collection of arms. During the long construction phase, many changes were made and gradually the scope of the museum was modified, increasingly focusing on the history and glory of imperial Austria. The museum was to be a place where “... *die gesamte bewaffnete Macht und alle Volksstämme der Österreichisch-Ungarischen Monarchie wiederfinden sollten.*” (Rauchensteiner 2000a: 78). Statues depicting the most prominent rulers and commanders; series of wall paintings with motifs taken from Austrian history and the allegory statue ‘Austria’ all emphasise the splendour and greatness of the Habsburgian Empire – as well as the nation. In order to portray Austrian history accurately, historians were involved in the composition of the different motifs (Rauchensteiner 200b: 4). When the museum was finally inaugurated in 1891 - note: when the museum had been inaugurated in 1856, in the presence of Emperor Franz Joseph, it had been far from complete) - it did not host the collections that had originally been intended for display. The vast collection of arms soon moved to the *Kunsthistorisches Museum* and the army museum, more and more, took the form of a history museum.

During the war years, the museum was instrumentalized by the NS-reign and displayed temporary propaganda exhibitions on campaigns, the direction of the museum then in Berlin. The building was heavily bombed in 1944-45 and was later also subject to looting (Rauchensteiner *et al* 2005). Shortly after the war when rebuilding began, objects from other museums were acquired and a new collection took shape. Also, a new name for the museum was considered as the name “*Heeresmuseum*” seemed unsuitable. There were proposals for the term “*Nationalmuseum*”, and Manfred Rauchensteiner states that there was hardly any other museum better suited to demarcate Austria from Germany and its history than the army museum (Rauchensteiner 2000a: 79). It was museum director Alfred Mell that, in 1946, had expressed the wish to integrate the museum in a - at the time not existing - “*Österreichisches Nationalmuseum*” in the *Neue Hofburg* (Rauchensteiner *et al* 2005:39f; 129). Discussions in the Ministry of Education

were not in favour of this idea, but noted that it this very “ambitious title” might a suitable term somewhat later (Original quote: „Diese Bezeichnung dürfte später, nachdem das Museum wieder in Erscheinung getreten ist, vielleicht am Platze sein. Dermalen erscheint diese sehr anspruchsvolle Bezeichnung noch verfrüht.“ (quoted in Rauchensteiner *et al* 2005:41).. However, the proposal “*Vaterländisches Museum*” did not evoke the same feelings! But finally the name “*Heeresgeschichtliches Museum*” was chosen.

The recent (2005) publication on the destruction and rebuilding of the museum is entitled “Phoenix aus der Asche” and tells the story of loss, dissolution and the gradual “resurrection” (Rauchensteiner 2005 et al). To the reader, it much resembles the conventional narrative: the tale of Austria’s post-war history as an success story with emphasis on new beginnings and restoration. Franz Kaindl, former director of the museum (1983-1992), describes it as a military museum, but, apart from that, also as “a history national museum of international dimension” (Kaindl 1992: 280. Today, the museum is presented as a “*Gesamtkunstwerk*” with its many different collections held under one roof (<http://www.hgm.or.at/107.html#c259> [14 March, 2011]).

The *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum* was never renamed as part of an “Österreichisches Nationalmuseum” but as we have seen, discussions on such a museum in the shape of a museum for contemporary history (mainly post-1945) are still ongoing. Among the active participants in this debate, director of the *Heeresgeschichtliches*; Manfred Rauchensteiner, advocated a “*Haus der Republik*”, to take over where the exhibition in the *Heeresgeschichtliches Museum* ends (post-1945).

Bibliography

- Auer, E. (1983) Ein „Museum der Ersten und Zweiten Republik Österreichs“. Dr. Karl Renners Plan und erster Versuch, *Wiener Geschichtsblätter*, Heft 2/1983: 53-80.
- Brix, E., Bruckmüller, E. & Stekl, H. (2004a) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band I. Menschen-Mythen-Zeiten*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- (2004b) Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Eine Einleitung, in Brix, E., Bruckmüller, E. & Stekl, H. (2004a) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band I. Menschen-Mythen-Zeiten*, München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 9-25.
- (2005a) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band II. Bauten-Orte-Regionen*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- (2005b) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band III. Unternehmen-Firmen-Produkte*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Bruckmüller, E & Urbanitisch, P. (eds). (1996) *996 - 1996 ostarrichi – Österreich. Menschen, Mythen, Meilensteine, Österreichischer Länderausstellung*, Horn: Verlag Berger.
- Csáky, M. & Stachel, P. (eds) (2000) *Speicher des Gedächtnisses: Bibliotheken, Museen, Archive. Teil 1: Absage an und Wiederherstellung von Vergangenheit; Kompensation von Geschichtsverlust*, Wien: Passagen-Verlag.
- (2001) *Speicher des Gedächtnisses: Bibliotheken, Museen, Archive. Teil 2: Die Erfindung des Ursprungs. Die Systematisierung der Zeit*, Wien: Passagen-Verlag.
- De Frantz, M. (2002) Conceptions of European urbanity: the role of cultural heritage in the political discourse about the Museumsquartier Vienna (Paper: ECPR Joint Sessions, Workshop on Metropolitan Governance, Turin, Italy 22 - 27 March 2002) (http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/events/jointsessions/paperarchive/turin/ws12/de_Frantz.pdf) [14 Feb. 2011].

- Dürriegl, G. & Frodl, G. (eds) (2005) *Das neue Österreich. Die Ausstellung zum Staatsvertragsjubiläum 1955/2005*, Wien: Österreichische Galerie Belvedere.
- Felber, U. (2006) Jubiläumsbilder. Drei Ausstellungen zum Staatvertragsgedenken 2005, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 17/1 2006: 65-90.
- Fellner, M. (2002) Zur Geschichte des Technischen Museums Wien (<http://www.technischesmuseum.at/Medien/Website%20Download/01%20das%20museum/Geschichte%20des%20Technischen%20Museums%20Wien.pdf>) [March 16, 2011].
- Gottfried, M. (2001) *Das Wiener Kaiserforum : Utopien zwischen Hofburg und MuseumsQuartier. Imperiale Träume und republikanische Wirklichkeiten von der Antike bis heute*, Wien: Böhlau.
- Hinterhölzl, G (ed.) (1999) *Museumsführer Österreich: über 1400 Museen, Sammlungen und Ausstellungen im Überblick*, Wien: Pichler.
- Hintermann, C. (2009) Migration and Memory in Austria: Representations of Migrations in a Reluctant Immigration Country. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration*, vol. 4, no 2/2009: 4-16.
- Johler, B. (2008) Das Österreichische Museum für Volkskunde in Zeiten politischer Umbrüche. Erste Einblicke in eine neue Wiener Museumsgeschichte. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde*, vol LXII/111: 229-263.
- Kaindl, F. (1992) Das Wiener Heeresgeschichtliche Museum, ein historisches Nationalmuseum von internationaler Dimension, in von Plessen, M-L., (ed.) *Die Nation und ihre Museen*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 271-280.
- Konrad, H. (2008) *Museumsmanagement und Kulturpolitik am Beispiel der ausgegliederten Bundesmuseen*, Wien: Facultas Universitätsverlag.
- Kriller, B. (2000) Das Kunsthistorische Museum: Architektur als Instrument der Erinnerung – Malerei als Zeitzeuge der Wissenschaft, in Csáky, M. & Stachel, P. (eds) *Speicher des Gedächtnisses: Bibliotheken, Museen, Archive. Teil 1: Absage an und Wiederherstellung von Vergangenheit; Kompensation von Geschichtsverlust*, Wien: Passagen-Verlag, 215-228.
- Liebhart, M. & Pribersky, A. (2004) Die Mythisierung des Neubeginns. Staatsvertrag und Neutralität Staatsvertrag, in Brix, E., Bruckmüller, E. & Stekl, H. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band I. Menschen-Mythen-Zeiten*, München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 392-417.
- Mattl, S. (1995) VI. 6 Kulturpolitik, in: Tálos, E., Dachs, H., Hanisch, E. & Staudinger, A. (eds) *Handbuch des politischen Systems Österreichs. Erste Republik 1918-1933*, Wien: MANZ Verlag, 618-631.
- Mattl, S. (2002) Was bisher geschah... *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*, vol. 13, 2002/1: 130-131.
- Perz, B. & Uhl, H. (2005) Gedächtnis-Orte im „Kampf um die Erinnerung“. Gedenkstätten für die Gefallenen des Zweiten Weltkrieges und für die Opfer der nationalsozialistischen Gewaltherrschaft, in Brix, E., Bruckmüller, E. & Stekl, H. (eds) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis Österreichs. Band II. Bauten-Orte-Regionen*, München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 545-579.
- Plaschka, R., Stourzh, G. & Niederkorn, J. P. (eds) (1995) *Was heißt Österreich? Inhalt und Umfang des Österreichbegriffs vom 10. Jahrhundert bis Heute*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, Band 136, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Raffler, M. (2007) *Museum – Spiegel der Nation? Zugänge zur Historischen Museologie am Beispiel der Genese von Landes- und Nationalmuseum in der Habsburgermonarchie*, Wien/Köln/Weimar: Böhlau Verlag.
- (manuscript) *Frühe National- und Landesmuseen in der Habsburgermonarchie* (manuscript for WP2/Austria).
- Rampl, M. (2010) Design Reform in the Habsburg Empire: Technology, Aesthetics and Ideology, *Journal of Design History*, vol. 23, no 3: 247-264.
- Rauchensteiner, M. (2000a) Nation ohne Museum – Museum ohne Nation, in Csáky, C. & Stachel, P. (eds) *Speicher des Gedächtnisses: Bibliotheken, Museen, Archive. Teil 1: Absage an und Wiederherstellung von Vergangenheit; Kompensation von Geschichtsverlust*, Wien: Passagen-Verlag, 67-83.
- (2000b) *Das Heeresgeschichtliche Museum in Wien*, Styria: Wien.
- (2005) *Phönix aus der Asche. Zerstörung und Wiederaufbau des Heeresgeschichtlichen Museums 1944 bis 1955*, Eigenverlag HGM: Wien.
- Regierungsprogramm 2008-2013. Gemeinsam für Österreich. Regierungsprogramm für die XXIV. Gesetzgebungsperiode. <http://www.bka.gv.at/DocView.axd?CobId=32965> [February 12, 2011].
- Seipel, W. (1992) Zur Geschichte des Kunsthistorischen Museums Wiens, in von Plessen, M-L., (ed.) *Die Nation und ihre Museen*, Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 55-68.
- Sommer, M. (2000) Das steiermärkische Landesmuseum Joanneum als Speicher des kulturellen Gedächtnisses, Csáky, C. & Stachel, P. (eds) *Speicher des Gedächtnisses: Bibliotheken, Museen, Archive. Teil 1: Absage an und Wiederherstellung von Vergangenheit; Kompensation von Geschichtsverlust*, Wien: Passagen-Verlag, 129-147.
- Der Standard* (2008) Regierung bestätigt Projekt-Auftrag, (November 18, 2008).
- Tschmuck, P. (2009) *Die ausgegliederte Muse. Budgetausgliederungen von Kulturinstitutionen seit 1992*, Innsbruck: Studienverlag.
- Uhl, H. (2004) Österreich. Vom Opfermythos zur Mitverantwortungsthese: Die Transformationen des österreichischen Gedächtnisses, in Flacke, M. (ed.) *Mythen der Nationen. 1945 – Arena der Erinnerungen. Band II*, Mainz am Rhein: von Zabern, 481-508.
- (2006) Welches Haus wollen wir? *Der Standard* (7./8. January 2006).
- Weihsmann, H. (1998) *Bauen unterm Hakenkreuz. Architektur des Untergangs*, Wien: Promedia
- Zatschek, H. (1960) Die Geschichte des Museums, in Direktion (ed) *Das Heeresgeschichtliche Museum in Wien*, Graz-Köln: Böhlau, 7-34.
- ÖZG (*Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*) (2002) Thema: Gedächtnis-Erinnerung-Identitäten, vol 13, 2002/1.

Annex table, Austria

Name	Inaugurated	Initiated	Actors	Ownership	Type	Values	Temporal reach	Style Location
Österreichisches Galerie Belvedere, Vienna	1781	1770	Imperial	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>)	Art (Medieval-Contemporary)	Universal, educational	Middle Ages-Today	Baroque, prominent.
Universal-museum Joanneum, Graz	1811	1808	Archduke Johann, <i>Steirischen Stände</i>	Ltd. Landes-museum Joanneum GmbH (2003)	Natural Sciences and Humanities	Universal values, education, encyclopedic, Styria	All encompassing	Different buildings, new under construction. Centre of Graz.
Albertina, Vienna	1822 (first public access)	1776, Grund-ungs-urkunde	Royal: Duke Albert von Sachsen-Teschen	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit (since 2000) *</i>)	Art (Graphic collection)	Austria and international	Middle Ages-contemporary	Palais Albertina, prominent.
Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst (MAK), Vienna	1864/ 1877	1863	Imperial (Franz Joseph I), also: Rudolf von Eitel-berger	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>)	Design and Architecture (also Contemporary)	National with global ambitions	Middle Ages-contemporary	Purposely designed building in historicist style (neo-renaissance).
Heeres-geschicht-liches Museum, Vienna	1856/ 1891	1848	Imperial Kaiser Franz Joseph I	State: Ministerium für Landwehr-verteidigung	Military History	Imperial Austria, Austria in the world	17 th c. - 1945	Purposely designed, historicist style. South of town centre.

Natur-historisches Museum, Vienna	1889	(1750), 1857	Imperial (Franz I and Franz Joseph I)	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>	Natural History, Pre-history	Universal, encyclopedic	All encompassing	Purposely designed, neo-renaissance style. Prominent location die Ringstraße (part of the Kaiser-forum).
Kunst-historisches Museum, Vienna	1891	1864	Imperial (Kaiser Franz Joseph I)	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit*</i>	Art, Cultural History	Europe, Greek-Roman, Middle East Egypt	Prehistory-Late 18 th c.	Purposely designed neo-renaissance style. Prominent location die Ringstraße, (part of the Kaiser-forum).
Öster-reichisches Museum für Volkskunde	1894	1894	Private society	State	Ethnology	Originally intended as a “Museum des Viel-völker-staates”	17 th c. - today	Museum hosted in a the baroque Garten-palais Schönborn, nearby the Ringstraße.
Technisches Museum, Vienna	1918	1879/1907	Private (W. A. Exner)	<i>Bundes-museum mit vollrechts-fähigkeit</i>	Applied sciences and technique	National/Austria, education	18 th c. - today	Historicising, close to Schönbrunn.

Museums-Quartier, Vienna	2001	1986/87	State	Republik Österreich: 75% Bund, 25% Gemeinde Wien	Mostly Art	National with global ambitions	19 th c. - contemporary	Conglomerate of buildings spanning from the 18 th /19 th c. - contemporary architecture. Prominent, building a block alongside the Ringstraße.
„Haus der Geschichte der Republik Österreich	Not yet realised	(1946)/1998	State	Intended to be a Bundes-museum	Austrian history, 1918-today	Austrian in an European + international context	---	---

NOTE: Several of the above listed museums have additional collections displayed in other parts of Vienna/Austria.

Just main collections/buildings are mentioned in the table.

*) = Outsourced, but still state-owned, museums with responsibility for management and finances.