

Jürgen Pirker

Memory Wars and Minority Rights: From Ethnic Conflict towards a Peace Region Alps-Adria?

Described as “the age of extremes” by historian Eric Hobsbawm, the 20th century was defined by heavily-contested borders and identities in Central Europe: politically, culturally, socially, and intellectually. With the end of World War I, communities found themselves in new nation-states, and the politics of assimilation and relations between minorities and their kin-states created tensions that continue to reverberate today. Using the Slovene minority in Austria as a case study, the article provides insight into two international projects that involve civil society actors in the field of memory politics and young people and their attitudes towards history and minorities. In drawing lessons from these initiatives dealing with troubled pasts to counteract current forms of exclusive identity politics, the article proposes that effective minority protection depends on a conducive social environment that allows for the reflection of opposing narratives stemming from ethnic conflict and acknowledges diversity as enrichment.

Keywords: memory politics, ethnic conflict, dialogue, Austria, Carinthia, plebiscite.

Spominske vojne in pravice manjšin: Od etničnega konflikta do Mirovne regije Alpe-Jadran?

20. stoletje, ki ga je zgodovinar Eric Hobsbawm poimenoval “čas skrajnosti”, je zaznamovalo sporno določanje mej in identitet v Srednji Evropi, tako v političnem kot v kulturnem, družbenem in intelektualnem smislu. Ob koncu prve svetovne vojne so se posamezne skupnosti nenadoma znašle v novih nacionalnih državah, politika asimilacije ter odnosi med manjšinami in njihovimi matičnimi državami pa so ustvarili napetosti, ki jih je moč zaznati še danes. Na študiji primera slovenske manjšine v Avstriji prispevek ponuja vpogled v dva mednarodna projekta, ki sta vključevala akterje civilne družbe na področju politike spomina ter mlade in njihov odnos do zgodovine in manjšin. Na podlagi izkušenj, pridobljenih z omenjenima projektoma, ki se z obravnavo bolečih preteklosti skušata zoperstaviti aktualnim oblikam izključujoče identitetne politike, avtor ugotavlja, da je učinkovita zaščita manjšin odvisna od tega, koliko družbeno okolje dopušča nasprotujoče si in iz etničnih sporov izhajajoče diskurze ter v raznolikosti prepoznavna prednost.

Ključne besede: politika spomina, etnični spor, dialog, Avstrija, avstrijska Koroška, plebiscit.

Correspondence address: Jürgen Pirker, Institute for Public Law and Political Science, University of Graz, Universitätsstraße 15/D3, A-8010 Graz, Austria, e-mail: juergen.pirker@uni-graz.at.

1. Introduction: The Angel of History and its Legacy of the Future

After the end of World War I, many new nation-states emerged across Central and Eastern Europe. Numerous cultural and linguistic communities became minorities within these new states. The politics of minority assimilation and relations between minorities and their kin-states caused tensions within and between the new national states, and these tensions can still be felt today. This article thus deals with the interplay of memory politics, diversity management, and approaches to dialogue for dealing with a troubled past. These instruments complement measures of minority protection by promoting the notion that “a climate of tolerance and dialogue” is required for cultural diversity (which is often considered a dividing factor) in order to contribute to the enrichment of society, as it is proclaimed in the preamble of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe.

Drawing on this approach, the article explores the bilateral dimensions of the situation of the Slovene minority in Austria, as a case study. It builds on and brings together the findings of several previous studies (Pirker 2020; 2018; Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker & Hofmeister 2015; Pirker 2013; 2012 a; 2012 b). From an Austrian perspective (for a recent juxtaposition of Austrian and Slovene positions see e.g., Brousek et al. (2020); for a comprehensive analysis of the history of the Slovene ethnic group since World War II from a Slovene perspective, in German, see Klemenčič, M. & Klemenčič, V. (2010)), it provides insight into two international projects with different foci: one involves civil society actors in the field of memory politics, whereas the other focuses on young people and their attitudes towards history and minorities.

These initiatives deal with the troubled past in the field of minority rights. They are based on a complementary approach to minority protection through law and dialogue, since effective minority protection depends on a conducive social environment that, on the one hand, allows for a reflection of opposing narratives stemming from ethnic conflict and, on the other, acknowledges diversity as enrichment. This is particularly the case in the Alps-Adriatic Region, an area located at the center of Europe that experienced all of the major conflicts and upheavals of the 20th century. Hence, the article provides lessons in overcoming deep historical divisions for the European Union.

2. A Typical European Case? The Ethnic Conflict in Carinthia (Austria)

Europe is inherently diverse: 190 minorities live within the European Union (Pan 2009). The respect for its cultural, ethnic, or linguistic diversity poses an

obligation (cf. Article 2 of the Treaty on the European Union or Article 22 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights) as well as a challenge for the EU, as an ever closer union, especially in times of economic or migration crisis, when old patterns of ethnic or national exclusion are reinforced and borders are closed again. Minority issues all over Europe indicate that old nationalism has not yet been overcome (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Brousek 2018), as, e.g., recently illustrated by the consequences of Brexit 100 years after the partition of Ireland. These issues emphasize the importance of dealing with mechanisms of othering and the dichotomy of them versus us that often use and misuse the past. These mechanisms should be tackled by initiating dialogue aimed at fostering mutual understanding through dealing with a troubled past.

The Alps-Adriatic Region lies at the heart of Europe, at the crossroads between Austria, Italy, Slovenia, Croatia, and Hungary (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Brousek 2018; Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 17); for the development of the term Alps-Adria and the former Alps-Adriatic Working Community see Valentin (2011b). From a historic perspective, this region suffered during all major European conflicts in the 20th century, from the two World Wars to the Balkan Wars. It is characterized by its ethnic and linguistic diversity (Wintersteiner 2011; Bajc 2011; Brousek & Pirker 2016; Brousek 2018). This region includes a founding member of the European Community (Italy, a member since 1957), a member since the fourth Enlargement of the European Union in 1995 (Austria), two members that acceded during the first Eastern Enlargement in 2004 (Slovenia, Hungary), and the most recent member that joined in 2013 (Croatia). Within this little Europe, Austria serves as an ideal focus point for studying the questions of dialogue and dealing with a troubled past regarding minority rights. It has a tradition of minority protection dating back to the Habsburg Empire, which was a multicultural entity that developed its first instruments for the protection and equality of ethnic groups. At the same time, the laws and institutions in the Austrian Empire led to disputes over language rights during the rise of nationalism from the middle of the 19th century (Judson 2016). After the fall of the Habsburg monarchy, these disputes culminated in the most aggressive forms of nationalism under the Nazi Regime. Subsequently, in the second half of the 20th century, Austria developed a promotive form of minority protection: the Constitution of Austria recognizes the country's cultural diversity represented by its autochthonous minorities (Article 8 paragraph 2 of the Federal Constitutional Law) (Pirker 2020).

The Austrian province of Carinthia is often regarded as a special case in Austrian contemporary history (Valentin 2009). This description relates to the ethnic conflict, which affected the history of this federal state (*Land*) for more than 150 years, particularly during the "age of extremes" (Hobsbawm 1994). This conflict still forms the basis for public discussions about minority rights. In recent decades, these became particularly emotional. These ethnic disputes

8

revolved around symbols, such as bilingual municipal signs as markers of identity, or even around mentioning the Slovene ethnic minority in the Constitution of the Land Carinthia, as in a public debate in the spring of 2017. In the end, the ethnic group was mentioned and proclaimed to be protected pursuant to the Federal Constitution; however, an explicit reference to the German language as the official language (*Landessprache*) of the Land Carinthia was included (Adamovich 2018, 22–23; Pirker 2020). These disputes are highly charged with symbolism. Within the Carinthian – as well as within the federal – constitution, the ethnic group and its language can be acknowledged as an integral part of the Land, while bilingual municipal signs represent a visible expression of bilingual heritage or evidence that this Land is home to the ethnic group; or, alternatively, to some these signs can even present a threat to concepts of German national identity (Pirker 2012a; 2020; cf. Jordan 2012).

A simplified mapping of the linguistic situation in Carinthia, including language censuses (despite all doubts about the soundness of the questions asked or the political pressure in the context of a census), reveals a tremendous assimilation and recession of the use of the Slovene language as a language of intercourse in the 20th century: in 1911, 18.3 % of the population of Carinthia used Slovene as a language of intercourse, while only 2.3 % did so in 2001 (Inzko 1988, 37; Reiterer 2000; Pirker 2013, 113). On the other hand, the numbers of people learning the Slovene language in primary education has increased steadily in past decades, reaching up to 40 % in the territory covered by bilingual schooling, while, on the other hand, the number of children with language skills acquired in the family is decreasing dramatically (Busch 2010, 139–140; Domej 2000, 47–48; Reiterer 2000; Vavti 2009, 166; Pirker 2013; for an analysis of the motivation for and functions of learning Slovene see also Zorčič (2019)). The last factor points to a decline of the ethnic group. Increasing interest in the Slovene language indicates that today, it is no longer an ethnic marker, though prejudices and mechanisms of othering are still present within younger generations, even though they did not experience any of the violent phases of the conflict (Wintersteiner 1996; 2015; Vavti 2009; Pirker 2014; 2018, 34–38).

The ethnic conflict can only be fully understood by analyzing its history in connection with the emergence of nationalism in the middle of the 19th century and based on language as the main feature distinguishing Germans and Slovenes (Hobsbawm 2005, 108–109, 114; Anderson 1996, 72–82). Events of the late 19th and 20th centuries set the basis for antagonistic paradigms and opposing narratives and must, therefore, be considered at least briefly (for this outline with further references cf. Pirker 2018, 22–38), starting with the desire for Slovene as the official language and the language of education in 1848 and the disputes about the bilingual school system in the second half of the 19th century. After World War I, the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (SHS State) claimed and occupied parts of the Southern Carinthian territory

where Slovene was spoken. This military action, which in Slovenia is commonly referred to as a struggle for the northern border, in the sense of establishing borders along ethnic lines, caused a military response from the Carinthian side, the so-called Carinthian defence war (*Abwehrkampf*). After international intervention, a plebiscite was held in 1920 to end this conflict. As a result of this plebiscite, Carinthia remained within Austria. This was only possible because about 10,000 Slovene-speaking people voted for remaining in Austria (see Valentin 1993; Fräss-Ehrfeld 2000).

The Carinthian government had even promised to further protect the Slovenes' ethnic identity within Austria. However, these promises were not kept after the plebiscite: policies of Germanization followed, culminating in the deportation of Carinthian Slovenes under the Nazi Regime. These incidents caused resistance and attacks by partisans, followed by renewed territorial claims for southern parts of Carinthia by the Yugoslavian government after World War II. After Yugoslavia reduced its claims, specific minority rights for the Slovene minority living in Carinthia and Styria as well as the Croat minority living in Burgenland were included in the Austrian State Treaty in 1955. The 1950s and 1980s were once again dominated by disputes about the bilingual school system in Carinthia, while intensive conflicts surrounding bilingual municipal signs characterized the 1970s: after the federal government decided to set up 205 bilingual town signs in local villages and towns, these were violently removed by the people belonging to the majority.

Bombings in the bilingual area further escalated the conflict, leading to tensions between Carinthia and Slovenia, though this issue was never fully internationalized opposite Austria by Yugoslavia. A new Federal Law on the Legal Status of Ethnic Groups of 1976 and a decree of 1977 temporarily ended this conflict with a regulation stating that in Carinthia, bilingual municipal signs should be erected in areas with a bilingual population of around 25 %. In 2001, the Constitutional Court of Austria declared this regulation unconstitutional, considering the aim of the Austrian State Treaty to protect the ethnic group (Decision VfSlg 16404/2001). This decision was exploited politically by various actors, among which the Carinthian and Austrian right-wing parties were dominant, until a constitutional law regulated the issue in 2011 (for an overview of Carinthian contemporary history and the ethnic conflict see, e.g., Valentin 2009; 2011a; Suppan 2004; Fräss-Ehrfeld 2000; Barker 1984; Inzko 1988; Haas & Stuhlpfarrer 1977; cf. for this illustration Pirker 2018, 22–33).

In the ten years since this settlement, the climate has improved (Vouk 2016). This comes down to many factors: from a change in politics, which no longer instrumentalizes the conflict as in earlier phases, to a change in the population's appreciation of the second language that was fostered by the disintegration of Yugoslavia and Slovenia's accession to the European Union. The new climate was visible at Carinthia's official and partly bilingual celebrations of the 100th

anniversary of the referendum on the 10th of October 2020, when – in presence of the president of Slovenia – the Austrian president apologized officially in German and Slovene to members of the Slovene minority for past injuries and failures in the implementation of minority rights: “As Federal President, I would like to apologize to you, dear citizens of Slovene mother tongue, for the injustice suffered and for the failures in the implementation of constitutionally guaranteed rights” (Address by Federal President 2020, 3).

Against the background of the history of the ethnic conflict in Carinthia, this act held enormous symbolic significance and importance. It presented an official acknowledgement of the suffering of members of the ethnic group in the last century, but this did not happen without criticism from the opponents of such an apology (e.g., a press release by representatives of the right-wing Freedom Party Austria on 10 October (FPÖ, 2020) or of the bilingual elements of the celebration in general. On a practical level, numerous issues regarding the implementation of minority rights remain to be addressed or improved (education, language protection and promotion, effective participation – see in detail Vouk 2016) and will constantly arise in the future as the protection of minorities and their languages has to be considered as a process that needs to be adapted to current requirements. This was also confirmed by the president in his speech, when he pointed out that “[m]inority policy must always be further developed” and “adapted to current living conditions and needs” (Address by Federal President 2020, 3). The same is true for the persistent improvement of the conducive atmosphere that is needed to effectively guarantee minority rights and their enactment. A sustainable process needs to permanently and further address the causes of the conflict and its dynamics; not only on the level of politics on specific occasions, but also within the wider public, to overcome official, collective, and individual narratives that stem from the conflict and contribute to its perpetuation or the transfer of its pattern to new problems in everyday life, such as migration.

3. Memory Culture and Memory Traps: German and Slovene Narratives

German and Slovene arguments in the context of the conflict in Carinthia refer to mutual historic grievances that are connected to specific fears: a typical Slovene position might place emphasis on promises broken by the Carinthian government after the plebiscite or the oppression by the Nazi regime, and it would claim minority rights guaranteed by the Austrian State Treaty. The Slovene side’s major fears revolve around the deprivation of rights, assimilation, or even extinction of the group. The arguments on the German side, on the other hand, relate to territorial claims after the two World Wars, emphasizing the status of the Ger-

man language as the state language and the portrayal of the minority as already privileged, while a loss or division of their homeland are among their major fears (Kramer 2004, 208–209; Pirker 2012b; 2014; 2018, 308–309). A central point of memory to address these fears in Carinthia is the annual commemoration of October 10th in remembrance of the Carinthian Plebiscite in 1920 (Valentin 1993; Valentin et al. 2002; Gstettner 2010). Over the course of the 20th century, the plebiscite was related to many narrative connotations – such as a pretend German victory, the right of self-determination, or even the common effort of minority and majority – in combination with an overall image of Carinthia as an area that is distinct, strong, and capable of defending itself (cf. Rumpler 1998; Fräss-Ehrfeld 1998; Pirker 2020).

Memory and the narratives of the past are connected to identity. Individuals integrate themselves into the official narratives of their community that strengthen their group identities and predict future actions (Assmann A. 1999; Assmann J. 1997; 1998; Halbwachs 1966). Groups tend to prefer common memories and exclude others (Halbwachs 1967), while there can be opposing narratives and even dialectics of official and unofficial memories (Pirker 2012b; cf. Pirker 2020). Jan Assmann (1988) and Aleida Assmann (2006, 134–137) further distinguish a “communicative” and “cultural” memory beneath a “functional” memory – corresponding to the official memory of a group serving the main purpose of legitimization – and a “storage” memory. The communicative memory has a scope of about 80 to 100 years. Its contents are related to people who have themselves experienced the incidents that are remembered collectively, and this memory can still be re-negotiated. Astrid Erll (2017) highlights the complexity of these differentiations by adding that some events may not be as old as 100 years but are nevertheless used to create cultural perceptions and therefore must be considered part of cultural memory, while others may be quite old but are made to be part of actual public debate and therefore belong to the communicative memory. Consequently, Erll introduces the distinction between “nearness” and “farness” of events in question (Erll 2017, 113). These concepts provide helpful analytical tools to explain why, and under which circumstances, past events, such as the Plebiscite in 1920, which have reached the floating point of transition from communicative to a rather stabilized cultural space of memory, can again become part of a public debate renegotiating its commemorative functions for collective identity, as is to be seen from the 2020 anniversary. It was the narrative of the minority, which is not dominant in the Carinthian context, that was addressed by the Austrian president’s apology, while various speakers pointed to a future respecting common cultural heritage.

Besides these concepts, unconscious and encompassing forms of memory and the passing of memories between generations have been considered by Harald Welzer (2001), who conceived the notion of “social” memory. Remembrance of the past is always a present process, related to identity formation and

a future purpose (Assmann 1997; Schmidt 2006; cf. Pirker 2018). In situations of ethnic conflict, groups tend to narrow down their identity concepts and people may then primarily be perceived as members of an ethnic group, speaking a specific language, or observing a specific religion (Volkan 1999a; cf. Heintel 1982). Commonalities are blanked out or overseen; e.g., that someone may have similar concerns in their everyday life or even be burdened by past traumatic events or grief (Sen 2007), that some are “indifferent” (Judson 2016) or in-between the majority and minority, since they question the fixed concepts of belonging and supposedly pose a threat to the group (Pirker 2018). Memory is thereby constantly negotiated, which leads to multiple, often contradicting narratives (Wintersteiner 2015). Despite criticism of the vagueness some of these concepts exhibit, they are helpful in understanding and analyzing memory conflicts in minority-majority situations.

Within Carinthia, language has become the main contested element in the conflict. Historic arguments and narratives are often utilized in disputes about minority rights and thus also the identities of the groups and the (common) land. One step towards understanding these mechanisms can be to bring them to the surface by revealing and acknowledging the diversity and variety of family histories, narratives, and identities without forcing the individuals to give up their very own story, but rather by accepting that this story may only be one possible and subjective perception among many others (Pirker 2014; Graf 2015). Concepts of identity and narratives are fluid, can be detected, analyzed, questioned, seen in relation to each other and in their mutual conditionality and relativity. Starting a dialogue can be one way to initiate this process (Kelman 1997) of contesting narratives in conflict.

4. The Challenge of Dialogue: Mutual Understanding through Dealing with a Troubled Past

Conflict interventions have to integrate various dimensions of a conflict in order to bring its underlying dynamics to the surface instead of fostering conflict mechanisms. As outlined by Friedrich Glasl (2011; 1980), conflicts develop from an initial fixing of positions to a common descent by total confrontation in the worst-case scenario. In the context of a minority-majority conflict, it is necessary to consider the dynamics of ethnopolitics (cf. Mujkić & Hulseley 2010), social dynamics and expectations, as well as institutional or systemic factors (Meyer 2011, 61–69). In a long-term perspective, Vamik Volkan (1999 b), in his “Tree-Model”, proposes to first explore the roots of the conflict, including the perceptions, fears and needs of conflict parties, before initiating a dialogue among the conflicting parties about their positions, and finally to invite them to develop initiatives and projects to intervene and change the conflict landscape. Within

this landscape, sustainable interventions should target, as Lederach (1999) and Lederach and Appleby (2010) argue, the levels of (1) political leaders, (2) people in a mid-level position, who can influence political leaders, but who are not official representatives, and (3) the “grassroots” level of civil society (Lederach 1999; Lederach & Appleby 2010, 35–38; see also Hamber 2015, 10–14; cf. Pirker 2018). An intervention must therefore consider the level on which it is carried out and the fault lines between and within the groups, actors and generations.

In a minority-majority context, there can be dialogue groups between the minority and majority as well as within the groups (Graf 2015). These groups are not monolithic, but often consist of various interest groups. This can be seen in the Slovene minority in Carinthia that has developed various cultural organizations, one political party, and three political organizations: the two major Narodni svet koroških Slovencev (NSKS) and Zveza slovenskih organizacij na Koroškem (ZSO), and the younger Skupnost koroških Slovencev in Slovenk (SKS) (for more see Wutti 2017). The focus of dialogue interventions is set on an internal transformation of collective group identities in a way that allows groups to accept the other groups and their needs (Kelman 2010c; 1997; cf. Rothman 1997; 2012). Therefore, the basic needs of the conflict actors are to be identified in joint examinations to allow trust and empathy for the other’s perception (Graf 2015; Kelman 2010c).

The ethnic conflict in Carinthia shaped collective and individual perceptions, memories and narratives, or caused traumata that are passed on within generations. Ethnopolitical and civil society actors representing interest groups within the majority and minority have different agendas, thus passing on various, even opposing, narratives and presenting themselves as representatives of the groups. Deeper dimensions of the conflict are created through symbolic, epistemic or structural violence as a result of power relations, asymmetries between the majority and minority, alliances of group actors with political decision makers, individual and collective identifications, traumata, as well as narratives and counter-narratives and their political use and misuse. The institutionalized power relations in public institutions can foster power relations and identifications (Pirker 2018). These structural factors constitute the complex and multilayered framework of dialogue initiatives. The following sections analyze two different interventions that have been carried out in the context of the Carinthian ethnic conflict: an initiative for creating a Peace Region Alps-Adria (Brousek 2018), which addresses civil society actors and people engaged in ethnopolitics, and a youth initiative that targets adolescents on the grassroots level, both within Carinthia and between Carinthia and Slovenia.

5. Dealing with Memory Politics: Peace Region Alps-Adria

In 2013, a dialogue was initiated concerning the troubled past between Austria and Slovenia (Graf & Brousek 2014; Brousek 2018; Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018, 338–343; Graf & Brousek 2020). In 2016, participants from Italy were also included in this conversation. The idea was to establish processes of dialogue at an international level between actors from different states on an intra-national level within and between conflict parties by including extreme positions and hardliners, and to influence the public through the dissemination of the results of this initiative (Graf & Brousek 2014; Brousek 2018; Pirker 2018). The initiative invited civil society actors that influence memory politics and the preservation of specific narratives in Austria and Slovenia (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018; Graf & Brousek 2020). The participants were not engaged in official politics (track one), though they were active in ethnopolitics and some of them were in positions to inform or advise politicians regarding minority rights or memory politics (track two). Participants were recruited from various age groups, with various ideological positions and professions, yet the percentage of males and academics remained high (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 28; Graf & Brousek 2020).

The main task of the process was to explore the historical roots of the conflicts, their sociopsychological and political dynamics, as well as the perceptions and needs of the conflict parties involved. Despite these tasks, the overall ambition was directed towards the future development of inter-ethnic relations within the region by addressing the main questions of how to: deal with the complex conflict parameters within one's own and the neighboring country; avoid these conflict lines being instrumentalized by politics; and to create a peace region focusing on future perspectives (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 28; cf. Wintersteiner 2012). Initiating a dialogue about new forms of dealing with opposing narratives and developing common perspectives, policy advice, and common public events with the timely focus on the 100th Jubilee of the Carinthian Plebiscite were identified as working tasks for the dialogue group (Graf & Brousek 2020, 61).

This initiative, which was decisively shaped by the Herbert C. Kelman Institute, was based on a broad range of methodological approaches of interactive conflict resolution, building on the format of "Problem Solving Workshops" (Kelman 1972; 2010a; 2010b) and the methodology of Track II diplomacy (Fischer 2002; Ahlbrecht et al. 2009; Graf et al. 2006; Graf 2015; Brousek & Pirker 2016; Brousek 2018; Pirker 2018; Wintersteiner et al. 2020b; Graf & Brousek 2020). One of the underlying theoretical pillars beneath interactive conflict resolution (Brousek 2018, 97) was the concept of an open and inclusive public dialogue that must be open for all parties interested in a plural context, and that must not be limited to specific topics; rather, it needs to be facilitated with regard

to the interest of the actors involved and structured with a clear distribution of roles among actors (Žagar 2020, 120–121; cf. Žagar 2008). The overall structure of the project led to the establishment of an international (plenary) dialogue group and various sub-groups. It included the positions of civil society coordinators from Carinthia and Slovenia, researchers, facilitators, a central coordinator, and participants (see in detail Graf & Brousek 2020, 60–61), mainly suggested and invited by the civil society coordinators and facilitators.

After the first phase of establishing confidential conversations (cf. Hoffmann 2011), the approach of interactive conflict transformation applied by the Herbert C. Kelman Institute aimed at setting up a process from (1) the analysis of the current conflict through (2) a deeper analysis of the structural, socio-political and cultural dimension of the conflict context to (3) a context-sensitive conflict transformation (Schönbauer-Brousek et al. 2016; Graf 2015; 2010; Pirker 2018; Graf & Brousek 2020). Some of the topics and challenges addressed by the international group were related to the overall heritage of violent conflicts in the countries involved, taboos in dealing with the specific past of each country or group, relations between the states and groups, and the instrumentalization of these factors by politics (Graf & Brousek 2020, 64). Sub-groups focused on specific issues and made up the core of the working phase of the project in the sense of Volkan's "trunk" of the tree (Graf & Brousek 2020, 67). The groups worked on youth initiatives, minority rights, World War II, integration issues, or memory culture (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018; Graf & Brousek 2020). Their outcomes were discussed in the international plenary sessions. One first joint effort to communicate results and contribute to a public discourse was the publication of a declaration of the international dialogue group.

For this first declaration, dealing with the 100th anniversary of the beginning of World War I in 1914, the international dialogue group agreed on the preamble cited below. The aim of this preamble was to frame the underlying idea of dialogue about a troubled past, which acknowledges contradictions and subjectivity in memory and suffering but tries to frame contradictions in the broader sense of a common history of violence without relativizing crime and suffering. The preamble states: "In memory of all victims who died because politics did not resolve conflicts peacefully. Dialogue as a way of recognizing diversity, historical reconciliation and common future-oriented action" (Feldner et al. 2018, 31 [translated to English from German]). Additionally, the working group outlined the vision of the project:

One hundred years after the outbreak of World War I, we are witnessing a global crisis and deep upheavals, which seriously question the great project of European integration. This development relates not only to the emergence of new political and social conflicts – from the economic crisis and the conflicts over migration to the impotence of European diplomacy in the face of new armed conflicts (from the Ukraine to the Middle East) – but also to the return of stubborn "old European"

attitudes such as nationalism, chauvinism, fundamentalism, xenophobia, and other forms of intolerance and the lack of recognition of the other. [...] The 20th century was a century of two horrendous World Wars, [...] and it is by no means sufficient to concede that political peace prevails and there are good economic relations between the states and ethnically defined nations of Europe. We must overcome what has separated us for so long and sometimes made us enemies. Otherwise, there will be a risk that old enemies will re-emerge as in Ukraine and the Middle East this year or the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s. [...] The Alps-Adriatic region is still very much influenced by the consequences of these all-European historical conflicts. Therefore, history should be critically and self-critically reflected in the entire Alps-Adriatic region, beginning in Slovenia and in Austria, and especially in the borderland of Carinthia, with the desire to achieve a deeper recognition of the potentials of cultural differences in the region to achieve a more “objective” historical memory and to take the first steps towards reconciliation between minorities and majorities. [...] In the 20th century, the Alps-Adriatic region became a battleground of different totalitarian ideologies, which have not yet disappeared from the collective memory of the peoples in this region. [...] A prerequisite for the formation of a peace region Alps-Adria must – as one of the experiences of history – be the willingness to discuss on all sides, aiming for reconciliation. A cross-border dialogue cannot revive the historically neglected cultures of this region. However, it can try to use the memory of these neglected forms of living together to find new forms of regional, European, and global coexistence. Such a cross-border dialogue is the next step in establishing a transnational, multicultural, multilingual and economically prosperous peace region Alps-Adria – with the guiding principles of diversity, intercultural education, regional development and constructive conflict management (Feldner et al., 2018, 31–34 [translated to English from German]).

A similar declaration was prepared by the working group in 2015, 70 years after the end of World War II, highlighting the strategy of overcoming historic collective trauma through cross-border dialogue. This second declaration hints at the divergences in memory cultures in Austria and Slovenia that are related to different interpretations of World War II and at the ideologies of communism and fascism between and within the states which became visible in public commemorative events as every side sought to hide the dark sides of their own history (Feldner et al. 2018, 57–58; cf. Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 16). Yet, the declaration lists various political and civil societal achievements in international relations, even if an official systematic approach of reconciliation has not been developed on a political level (Feldner et al. 2018, 58–59; cf. Graf & Brousek 2020). Building on this premise, the declaration of the working group calls for the recognition of the other’s interpretation of the past as well as “the victims of the other side in their victim status” (Feldner et al. 2018, 59–60 [translated from German to English]), including shared grief and eventually conducting joint commemoration events (Feldner et al. 2018, 60). This acknowledgement is outlined as a first step in the process of initiating a dialogue that strives for empathy for the various experiences of violence suffered by different groups living in the Alps-Adriatic Region, while analyzing the power relations in the past and present that become visible

in manifold personal stories and facilitating a dialogue that respects the deeper human needs behind the visible strategies of the conflict parties involved (Feldner et al. 2018, 61).

Joint commemorative events among participants of the working group were carried out on the initiative of the consensus group (*Konsensgruppe*), a platform of the German civil society organizations Kärntner Heimatdienst (KHD) and Plattform Kärnten and two of the three political organizations of the Slovene minority, the ZSO and SKS. This platform was initially created while jointly working on a draft solution for the place name sign issue in 2005 on behalf of the federal chancellor. In the first commemorative events, representatives of the German organizations and the Slovene minority (mainly the ZSO) remembered victims of the Nazi Regime as well as partisans on respective sites in Carinthia and Slovenia. This was continued after 2013 within the framework of the outlined cross-border dialogue initiative with participation of the civil society coordinators from both countries and in the spirit of the preamble of the first declaration (cf. Feldner et al. 2018, 60; Graf & Brousek 2020).

The 100th anniversary of the Carinthian Plebiscite in 2020 served as the occasion for the publication of a book including the statements of participants of the project and articles written by scholars (Brousek et al. 2020). The book contains chapters on Austria, Slovenia and Italy. It presents a reflection of a dialogue in which opposing narratives, such as interpretations of World War I, territorial claims or atrocities in and after World War II, were addressed and confronted in a structured way that assumes a shared and interrelated space of memory between the countries (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 13, 21). Considering the overall ambition of the project, some of the articles were even published in form of a controversy between opposing positions (Lausegger & Wintersteiner 2020). Parallel to this joint initiative, various participants of the dialogue group initiated further projects with the collaboration of other members of the international dialogue group or outside the group that were dedicated to dealing with the past or forms of political education, e.g., the publication of an Alps-Adriatic Manifest (Wintersteiner et al. 2020a; cf. Graf 2020; Graf & Brousek 2020; Wintersteiner et al. 2020b).

As the editors of the joint 2020 publication outline, the prior task and outcome of the dialogue initiative was to identify models for addressing various (subjective) historic truths by people with often opposing perspectives, which requires the establishment of a consensus on dissensus (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 29). This allows, as one of the facilitators argues, for a plural dialogue that, contrary to reconciliation, addresses the past as well as current issues while focusing on alternative solutions (Žagar 2020, 123–124; cf. Žagar 2009). The international working group's meetings, including intensive debates on opposing understandings of past events and the establishment of sub-groups, the two declarations dealing with the acknowledgement of these divergences and their use

as a resource for understanding the other group's perspective and needs as basis for a dialogical process, projects related to the dialogue, as well as the complementary initiatives and the 2020 publication can all be regarded as achievements of this process.

Limitations and challenges also emerged in the process. Some of the topics addressed could not to be dealt with in the given time. This caused opposition between participants seeking for more in-depth discussions, while others aimed at producing outcomes in the form of public declarations or events (Graf & Brousek 2020, 70). A compromise was found in working on the common declarations parallel to continuing the debates related to controversial issues. Some of the participants refrained from the dialogue because of these kinds of proceedings (Graf & Brousek 2020, 71). Internal tensions between the in-depth dialogue and producing public outcomes thus continued to influence the working process. Additionally, the roles of the facilitators and scientists were sometimes blurred (Graf & Brousek 2020, 74), as some engaged in debates with the participants about narratives from their own perspectives.

Among the actors involved, a further tension became visible between reconciliation and orientation towards the future (Nicolescou & Graf 2014; cf. Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018). The dialogue process thus aimed at enabling empathy for experiences of violence that have been experienced by various groups in the 20th century and which still influence them as "victim and perpetrators, but also as victim-perpetrators and perpetrator-victims" (Graf 2020, 105 [translated to English from German]). Working on historic traumata and violations of human rights by totalitarian regimes addresses, as one of the facilitators explains, the experiences of war and violence, the transmission of trauma and possibilities of a politics of reconciliation in the form of dialogue as a learning process (Graf 2020, 106) from a systemic macro as well as an individual perspective, including the necessary reflection of the historic context and power asymmetry without legitimizing or the equation of unequal parameters or the reversal of perpetrator-victim relations but to allow for an context-related understanding of the ambivalent perspectives (Graf 2020, 110).

In line with this approach, Marjan Sturm, one of the civil society coordinators of the international dialogue initiative and former head of the ZSO, provides an example for contesting narratives by arguing that in Carinthia, the narrative of Austria being the first victim of Nazi aggression and the Land being confronted with renewed territorial claims after World War II was accompanied by the denial of early engagements in national socialist activities and the assigned deportation of Carinthian Slovenes to the Nazi regime. On the other side, the resistance against this regime was, in Sturm's assessment, used to emphasize the antifascist alliance, while the atrocities of the Nazi perpetrators provided legitimation for the movement in favor of the annexation to Yugoslavia and the killing of Carinthians after the end of the war (Sturm 2020, 364; cf. Wintersteiner et al.

2020b, 24). Within the discussions of the working group, a Slovene perspective could emphasize, for example, the necessity to acknowledge the contribution of German-Carinthian actors to the assimilation of the minority. From a German-Carinthian point of view, by contrast, the demand for the acknowledgement of partisan crimes, the detection of involvement in bomb attacks in the 1970s, or even the activities of Yugoslav intelligence on Carinthian territory, which have become a focus of recent historiographic and public interest (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 20; Pirker 2018), may be demanded. Notably, these are just examples, which are asymmetrical and not causally linked.

As these narratives influenced the separation of the population along ethnic lines, Sturm and others argue that a new form of dialogic remembrance should acknowledge one's own suffering while providing space for the other's suffering in one's own memory, and that it should comprise common historic knowledge regarding complex and changing constellations of perpetrators and victims within a shared history of violence (Sturm 2020, 365; cf. Bauriedl 1998; Brousek 2006; Graf et al. 2014). This requires, in the retrospective evaluation of the editors of the 2020 publication of the project, accepting contradictions in one's position and perspective, establishing at least a basic consensus on why under specific circumstances and times one group acted as perpetrator or became a victim, and accepting that there are manifold subjective interpretations of the past beneath established historic truth that motivate one's behavior and perception in understanding other's positions without agreement or legitimization (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 25–26). This kind of reframing can be explained with concepts by Erll (2017, 132), who argues that opposing narratives may be interrelated and interdependent, for example in specific and mono-causal victim-perpetrator interpretations of a violent past. She suggests framing such constellations – without tapping into relativism – with regard to a common history of violence and allowing memories and different interpretations of the past to become more agonistic than antagonistic by paying respect to the specific context of a conflict and at the same time trying to promote orientation towards a more transnational future.

The overall question of how to confront a troubled past properly is related to this issue. In Carinthia, over the last century there have been numerous initiatives fostering mutual understanding, yet some initiatives result in a dialogue between conflicting parties that forges trust and alliances with the partners involved and then creates a new differentiation between dialogue advocates and dialogue opponents (cf. Pirker 2018). This new separation often builds on conflict lines within the groups and seemingly aspires to generate legitimacy for one specific way of dealing with the past. There is imminent danger of the dialogue being exploited for ethnopolitical reasons. Thus, a “dialogue about dialogue” is needed in order to invite conflicting parties to discuss their perceptions, strategies, and possible complementary approaches to dealing with the past (Brousek &

Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018). In this sense, a particular challenge was caused by the fact that the initiative is in part a continuation of the mentioned consensus – and a dialogue processes between two organizations (KHD and ZSO), led by Josef Feldner and Marjan Sturm (Graf & Brousek 2020). These earlier processes have been the subject of public support as well as intensive criticism from both within and outside the groups involved (Pirker 2018, 246–279), e.g., by the conservative NSKS. These earlier developments even caused the invited participants to refrain or withdraw from the international dialogue. It has thus been and continues to be evaluated differently by supporters and opponents of the earlier initiatives on both sides of the border, and it is therefore either framed as a continuation or as a different initiative.

Finally, this points to the challenge of deciding which participants are to be selected. It depends on the analysis of the field of conflict as well as the willingness of the actors to engage. Thus, they should identify who is to represent, or even influence, which groups; they should also consider how to integrate hard-liner positions, which may otherwise hamper the process. This must be done without legitimizing extreme positions, but by reckoning and analyzing them as part of the conflict field and its dynamics. In connection with this, there is a risk that extreme positions from the countries involved might strengthen the other extreme positions (Wintersteiner et al. 2020b, 22), or cross-border alliances between parties may foster internal conflicts within different interest groups within the majority of the minority (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018).

The conflict itself, as a system, entails the risk of spilling to different levels or establishing new alliances if resources for conflict transformation are insufficient. What is needed to tackle this is a transformation of (1) individual and family histories, (2) collective memory and politics, and (3) cultural and social structures and power relations. In dealing with the past, it is often necessary to deepen and broaden the process: to deepen it by allowing adequate time and space for intensive reflection on emotions, individual stories, and perceptions; at the same time, the process may need to be broadened by raising its complexity (cf. Graf et al. 2010), that is, by including more issues and additional countries and improving impact on the public sphere. This process should target society as a whole, as well as new conflict lines, such as those between old minorities and new ones, in order to acknowledge lessons for dealing with diversity (Brousek & Pirker 2016; Pirker 2018). The dialogue initiatives highlighted the necessity of conflict transformation in the field of memory politics and functioned as a learning process for civil society (Graf & Brousek 2020). Continued and extended on-site dialogues in villages and towns, facilitated by civil society organizations or municipalities, could provide possibilities to talk about individual stories and make narratives visible on all levels – from politics to civil society. The international dialogue process targeted actors from civil society in expectation of a kind of spillover effect to official politics. This is important in influencing the social

parameters, the social and political climate, of a conflict situation, but it was not carried out systematically on all possible levels, which makes it difficult to assess its outcomes.

The 100th anniversary of the Carinthian Plebiscite in 2020 and the 10th anniversary of the regulation of the municipal sign issue in 2021 provide(d) opportunities for increased public attention for initiatives reflecting the past on a broader and interactive scale, as was also one of the intentions of the official exhibit of the Land of Carinthia Carinthija 2020. It moved around the country and focused on the following topics: infrastructure/economic development/space, networking/neighbors/dialogue, and identity/memory culture in the past, present and future (Fritz 2020). The current period could be used for further refining and evaluating dialogue initiatives regarding these intentions. The 10th anniversary of the regulation of the municipal sign issue would be apt for taking stock and identifying possibilities for further improvements to minority protection regimes in correspondence to the needs of the groups concerned, considering often-overlooked gender and intergenerational perspectives.

6. Involving the Next Generation: Separate Ways – Common Future

Involving young people in working on past conflicts sets up a specific challenge for peace initiatives and dialogue processes. Between 2013 and 2015, a project named Carinthia and Slovenia: Separate Ways – Common Future aimed at raising awareness for the troubled past, principles of minority protection, and transnational understanding in Europe among young people. By including nearly all grammar schools (secondary education) in Carinthia and Slovenia, more than 5,000 pupils aged 16 to 18 took part in a survey on their attitudes towards minorities, languages, neighboring countries, and the European Union, as well as the history and relations between Carinthia and Slovenia. In the second part of the project, 80 pupils explored their family history and attitudes among family members and friends towards the mentioned topics. In the end, they were invited to discuss these topics in a three-day workshop dealing with the past, present and future of the region (Pirker 2014; 2015; Pirker & Hofmeister 2015; Dangelmaier et al. 2017).

In their research on family histories and opinions among families and friends that allowed an emotionalization of the topic (cf. Dangelmaier et al. 2017, 236–237), some of the pupils found out that, in fact, they have manifold relations to the ethnic question in their family history of which they had not been previously aware. For others, it was their first chance to talk to members from the ethnic group or pupils from Slovenia. The joint discussion of various family histories and perceptions of the other group or country in the meeting opened the floor

for questioning one-dimensional narratives and learning about another's perspective. The project allowed direct contact and instructed the pupils to work on common tasks as they had to prepare for a joint discussion with experts from the areas of diplomacy, politics, and education at the end of the process (cf. Pirker 2015). Members of the Slovene minority, with their language and intercultural competence, functioned thereby as a bridge between Austrian and Slovene participants. Building on the contact hypothesis (Allport 1954; Güttler 2003) and concepts of dialogue, the project worked on the reflection of common history, narratives, and the transformation of perceptions towards an inclusive and multilingual region. Accordingly, participants within the project stated, e.g., that "commonalities evolved primarily from family histories", while others became aware of the influence of history and narratives on their own perceptions (Pirker 2014).

Regarding minority protection, the outcomes of the quantitative survey indicate that two thirds of pupils evaluate measures that (a) promote language education or (b) support cultural organizations of minorities in a positive way (Carinthia/Slovenia: (a) 65 %/72.7 %; (b) 61.5 %/60.2 %). This is specifically the case for measures that may also offer advantages for the majority, such as learning the other language for economic reasons (Pirker 2014; Pirker & Hofmeister 2015). The project in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions indicated that language awareness, combined with an exploration of family histories and narratives beneath the history of the region, information about the purpose of minority protection, and personal contact to get involved with the another's perspective, enables reflection on narratives and promotes a positive perception of minorities and bi- or multilingualism (Pirker 2014). To ensure sustainability, such initiatives of dealing with the past must become part of school curricula and could be used for a joint analysis of the processes of memory and identity formation, starting with the individual historic consciousness of the pupils involved, based on family histories and value systems, as well as the perspectives and perceptions of others, for which narratives in cross-border areas offer a specific potential (Danglmaier 2020). Dealing with emotionally challenging issues such as World War II demands sufficient time but also a response to specific interests articulated by pupils, while allowing for some autonomy in the definition of the issues addressed (Albing 2017, 222).

The initiative provided some additional lessons for complementary processes of dialogue. Young people may serve as a bridge between different organizations and generations, ideologies, or intra-familial patterns. For example, one girl participating in the project began interviewing her parents based on the questionnaire of the project. She found out that her father was in fact a member of the Slovene minority but had decided not to pass on the language to his children. In cases of intermarriage, the loss of the minority language and assimilation of one partner was often a common consequence of the intense conflict context (Vavti 2009). When her father started talking about his Slovene origin, her mother

interrupted and did not wish to discuss this issue. The girl continued to work on these issues in school and her parents both read the book *Angel of Oblivion* (*Engel des Vergessens*), an autobiographical novel by Maja Haderlap about the situation of the minority, its resistance against the Nazi regime, and its later treatment by official Austrian memory. In the end, the girl expressed her feeling of loss and her wish to learn the Slovene language. In the families of other participants, grandparents who had experienced World War II began discussing their experiences with their grandchildren. Some of them had kept silent until then, though traumatic events may be passed on over generations even if they are not discussed. It is, thus, sometimes easier for people to talk with their grandchildren than with their children (Wutti 2015; cf. Wutti 2018, 20–25). Additionally, within workshops at the University, as neutral ground for conflicting parties to talk with students, young people within opposing groups showed readiness to talk with older people from the other side and to question fixed narratives. They were willing to detect commonalities through talking in a safe atmosphere.

Secondly, there is a possibility of re-considering identities in contact by reflecting on one's own and another's perspective. Within the workshop, one girl identified being Carinthian Slovene as one of her most important identifications. She further reflected that in the context of the conflict she feels that she always must fight for her rights as her group always had to seek the protection of language and the minority (Pirker 2014). As a result, she further argued in the talks with other pupils, she cannot speak of herself as simply Carinthian in a broader regional sense, because she considers herself excluded rather than included by this term. In the end, the girl stated within a public discussion that she had learnt that there is no contradiction between being Carinthian, which was for her related to being German, and being Slovene. She had been able to integrate these identity layers and to learn that she could be both, without fear of losing either her Slovene or Carinthian identity. Such and many other personal anecdotes helped participants to relate to or at least to understand the other's perspective and the diversity of identity concepts.

In fact, there are plenty of identifications in between minority and majority which tend to be blended out in case of conflict (Brunner 1988). However, studies indicate that in the minority and majority context, young people especially tend to identify in a more global or cosmopolitan way, and some of them even reject the notion of choosing between the groups, but prefer to express multiple identifications (Vavti 2009; 2012; 2013; cf. Zorčič 2019). Highlighting this pluralism can be helpful in relativizing fixed borders. The concepts on both sides are not static but fluid, which can become visible through personal contact and exchange between minorities and majorities within and across state borders. Peace initiatives can, thus, involve also young people and reflect on their heritage of the past as well as use them as a resource in the context of reflecting memory and working towards a common future.

7. Memory Wars and Memory Cures

24

The above considerations highlight a few principles regarding sustainable dialogue about a troubled past: (1) First, in the case of cold (non-violent, past) conflict, one should raise awareness about the relevance of past incidents and their interpretation for peaceful living together and for managing diversity. Narratives should be identified in this respect. (2) Within discussions, the other perspective needs to be acknowledged based on respect for different views and interpretations. One way of providing the necessary sensitive framework for such proceedings is outlined in the approaches of interactive conflict transformation, the initiatives targeting young people and their engagement in research of the common past and the influence of history/ies on one's own perspective and perception, as well as the approach of open and inclusive public dialogue. (3) A multi-level approach is thereby required for addressing actors on different levels with common actions, including different generations and taking account of pluralism within the groups concerned, on an international, national, and intra-group level. (4) It includes giving voice to manifold positions that are usually not heard in the context of conflict: young people, women, people that position themselves in between or within both of the groups, outsiders, or people who have lost or neglected their cultural heritage in the form of not passing on the minority language. An in-depth analysis of the history of the respective conflict and the interethnic relations, as emphasized by theoretical approaches of conflict resolution, is a precondition for the identification of such positions that contest major narratives in and between the groups involved. (5) Cross-border lines of conflict should be considered in this regard, as well as the institutionalization of memory, the strategies of political players, and the functions of legal instruments. (6) Overall, this calls for a multilayered approach to diversity recovery within the Alps-Adriatic Region that, in the end, might contribute to the development of context-sensitive interventions and legal instruments of minority protection that correspond to the needs of the groups involved and contribute to the improvement of interethnic relations.

Without a doubt, research on minority issues and dialogue is a unique undertaking in that it should consider the specific preliminaries and context of the majority-minority situation (historic development, political discussion, and actors) to produce appropriate explanations and impulses for conflict transformation. Law provides a specific way of conflict resolution that seeks to balance legitimate interests by assuaging emotions and conflict history/ies, whereas approaches in conflict management or resolution tend to ignore the regulative functions of law in conflicts. A complementary approach seeks to learn from history and open perspectives to foster mutual understanding, in addition to instruments of minority protection.

A complementary approach to conflict resolution regarding the long-lasting, highly symbolic and political municipal sign issue could have been based on the needs of the groups involved, e.g., by recognizing the minority's longing for recognition or (symbolic) security, and the majority's need for the homeland and their identity to remain uncontested; these are interwoven with various complex narratives and the wish for an acknowledgement of subjective individual and collective suffering in the past. Related to these needs were the opposing strategies of ending the conflict once and for all or leaving at least the door open for further increasing the number of municipal signs to be erected in the future. Ending the conflict legally by regulating it on a constitutional level to hamper further revision could thus have been complemented by public support for in-depth dialogues about the troubled past within the region and municipalities concerned, while allowing a regulation that is open for further adjustment at a later date if requested by a substantive part of the population of the respective town. This simplified example hints at the necessity of designing legal solutions that at first contribute to a regulation of the conflict, as the municipal sign issue has done.

Looking back over the past ten years since this regulation, it has been stated from many sides, even its critics (e.g., Vouk 2016), that it has helped to calm the debate, to hinder political instrumentalization of the topic, and it has contributed to an improvement of the situation of the Slovene language in public discourse and the overall climate of inter-ethnic relations. As can be seen from the history of the conflict, this climate is important for the effective protection and implementation of minority rights. Taking the contested issue off the table through compromise can, thus, be a first step towards calming the conflict. Yet, complementary formats of dialogue could further contribute to an improvement of interethnic relations. Legal regulations should be open to further adjustments considering this improvement, which might result in acknowledging the minority, its language, and culture, as well as shared diversity as an added value.

Finally, broadening the perspective on a specific issue means not only digging in history/ies through the common examination of narratives, power structures, and individual/collective needs, but also including current challenges of diversity raised, for example, on the level of European (dis-)integration or by migration into the dialogue about the narratives relating to the troubled past and present of national identities. Mechanisms of othering tend to be the same, increasingly shifting from excluding old minorities to others from outside the state. Migrants are perceived as the others in terms of culture. Laws even institutionalize their otherness, based on assumptions of their requirements and needs for integration. To positively use diversity as a resource and ensure that old patterns of conflict may not be reaffirmed by processes of migration, we need to rethink classical concepts of minority protection while facing challenges raised by globalization and migration. The complementary approach of dialogue

thus seeks to learn from history and open broader perspectives related to current challenges in diversity. This ambition requires an interdisciplinary approach and cooperation between research and practice to work complementarily on the interrelations of memory politics, minority rights, and conflict transformation by using history as a starting point for a broadly-effective public reflection and transformation process that, in the selected case of Carinthia, emits signals for Carinthia, the Alps-Adriatic region, and Europe.

References

- Adamovich, L., 2018. Kärntner Landesverfassung und Minderheit. *Europäisches Journal für Minderheitenfragen* 11 (1/2), 11–23.
- Address by Federal President Alexander Van der Bellen on the Occasion of 100 Years Carinthian Plebiscite, on 10 October 2020, Klagenfurt, https://www.bundespraesident.at/fileadmin/user_upload/100_Jahre_Kaerntner_Volksabstimmung_ENG_formatiert.pdf (accessed 8 May 2021).
- Ahlbrecht, K., Benediek, A., Meyers, R. & Wagner, S., 2009. *Konfliktregelung und Friedenssicherung im Internationalen System*. Springer, Wiesbaden.
- Albing, K., 2017. Jugendliche als AkteurInnen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses. In N. Danglmaier, A. Hudelist, S. Wakounig & D. Wutti (eds.) *Erinnerungsgemeinschaften in Kärnten/Koroška: Eine empirische Studie über gegenwärtige Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Nationalsozialismus in Schule und Gesellschaft*. Hermagoras / Mohorjeva, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 205–224.
- Allport, G., 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Perseus Books, Cambridge.
- Anderson, B., 1996. *Die Erfindung der Nation: Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts*. Campus, Frankfurt am Main.
- Assmann, A., 1999. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. C. H. Beck, München.
- Assmann, A., 2006. *Der lange Schatten der Vergangenheit: Erinnerungskultur und Geschichtspolitik*. C. H. Beck, München.
- Assmann, J., 1988. Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität. In J. Assmann & T. Höscher (eds.) *Kultur und Gedächtnis*. Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main, 9–19.
- Assmann, J., 1997. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. C. H. Beck, München.
- Bajc, G., 2011. Twentieth Century Border Developments in the Alps-Adriatic Region. In B. Gruber & D. Rippitsch (eds.) *Modell Friedensregion Alpen Adria?*. Wochenschau, Schwalbach, 93–114.
- Barker, T., 1984. *The Slovene Minority of Carinthia*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Bauriedl, T., 1998. *Das Leben riskieren: Psychoanalytische Perspektiven des politischen Widerstands*. Piper, München.
- Brousek, J., 2006. Wider einen eindimensionalen Versöhnungsbegriff. *Zeitschrift für Friedenspolitik* 3, 12–16.
- Brousek, J., 2018. The Concept of Peace Region as Alternative to (Traditional) Political Autonomy: Experiences from the Project Building the Peace Region Alps-Adriatic. *Treatises and Documents, Journal of Ethnic Studies* 81, 87–104.
- Brousek, J. & Pirker, J., 2016. Zukunft durch Vergangenheit? Interaktive Konflikttransformation und Erinnerungspolitik am Beispiel der Alpen-Adria-Region. In W. Wintersteiner

- & L. Wolf (eds.) *Friedensforschung in Österreich: Bilanz und Perspektiven* (Jahrbuch Friedenskultur, 10). Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 264–278.
- Brousek, J., Grafenauer, D., Wutti, D. & Wintersteiner, W. (eds.), 2020. *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvobajajoče spominjanje: Dialogsko obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Brunner, K., 1988. "Wer sind wir?" Zur ethnischen und nationalen Selbsteinschätzung von Menschen slowenischer Herkunft. In K. Boeckmann, K. Bunner, M. Egger, G. Gombos, M. Jurić & D. Larcher (eds.) *Zweisprachigkeit und Identität*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 189–220.
- Busch, B., 2010. Slowenisch in Kärnten – Sprache jenseits ethnischer Kategorien. In W. Wintersteiner, G. Gombos & D. Gronold (eds.) *Grenzverkehr/ungen: Mehrsprachigkeit, Transkulturalität und Bildung im Alpen-Adria-Raum*. Wieser, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 174–188.
- Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*. Official Journal of the European Union, 2012/C 326/02, 26 October 2012, doi:10.3000/1977091X.C_2012.326.eng (accessed 14 May 2021).
- Constitution of the Land Carinthia (Kärntner Landesverfassung)*. LGBl 85/1996 idF LGBl 117/2020, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=LrK&Gesetzesnummer=10000208> (accessed 14 May 2021).
- Danglmaier, N., 2020. Geschichtsnarrative im Grenzraum als Lernchance. In D. Wutti, N. Danglmaier & E. Hartmann (eds.) *Erinnerungskulturen im Grenzraum / Spominske kulture na obmejnem območju*. Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 35–48.
- Danglmaier, N., Hudelist, A. & Wutti, D., 2017. Good Practice: Herausragende Schulprojekte zum Thema. In N. Danglmaier, A. Hudelist, S. Wakounig & D. Wutti (eds.) *Erinnerungsgemeinschaften in Kärnten/Koroška: Eine empirische Studie über gegenwärtige Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Nationalsozialismus in Schule und Gesellschaft*. Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 231–240.
- Decision of the Austrian Constitutional Court on the Matter of Bilingual Topography – Ortstafelerkenntnis*, VfSlg 16404/2001, https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/Dokument.wxe?Abfrage=Vfgh&Sammlungsnummer=16404&SkipToDocumentPage=True&SucheNachRechtssatz=False&SucheNachText=True&ResultFunctionToken=f2a4c6b5-0a51-4ce6-a360-c88c4e88d501&Dokumentnummer=JFT_09988787_01G00213_00 (accessed 10 May 2021).
- Decree of the Federal Government of 31st May 1977 on the Designation of Parts of the Territory in Which Topographical Signs in German and Slovene Are to be Erected (Verordnung der Bundesregierung vom 31. Mai 1977 über die Bestimmung von Gebietsteilen, in denen topographische Bezeichnungen in deutscher und slowenischer Sprache anzubringen sind)*. BGBl 306/1977, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10000616&FassungVom=2006-06-30> (accessed 12 May 2021).
- Domej, T., 2000. Das Schulwesen für die Bevölkerung Südostkärntens. In A. Moritsch (ed.) *Kärntner Slowenen – Koroški Slovenci 1900–2000*. Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 29–66.
- Erl, A., 2017. *Kollektives Gedächtnis und Erinnerungskulturen: Eine Einführung*. J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart.
- Federal Constitutional Law (Bundes-Verfassungsgesetz)*. BGBl 1/1920 idF BGBl I 24/2020, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10000138> (accessed 14 May 2021).
- Federal Law on the Legal Status of Ethnic Groups in Austria (Bundesgesetz über die Rechtsstellung der Volksgruppen in Österreich (Volksgruppengesetz – VoGrG)*. BGBl 396/1976 idF 84/2013, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10000602> (accessed 12 May 2021).

- Feldner, J., Grafenauer, D., Graf, W., Stergar, J., Sturm, M. & Wintersteiner, W. (eds.), 2018. *Building the Peace Region Alps-Adriatic / Mirovna regija Alpe-Jadran*, <https://zso.slo.at/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Building-PRAA-SLO4.pdf> (accessed 8 May 2021).
- Fisher, R., 2002. Historical Mapping of the Field of Interactive Conflict Resolution. In J. Davis & E. Kaufman (eds.) *Second Track/Citizens' Diplomacy: Concepts and Techniques for Conflict Transformation*. Rowman & Littlefield, Oxford, 61–80.
- FPÖ, 2020. FPÖ-Hofer/Darmann: Wir blicken mit Dank und Stolz auf die Volksabstimmung zurück!, FPÖ, 10 October 2020, https://www.fpoe-klagenfurt.at/reader-meldungsuebersicht/r_item/OTS_20201010_OTSO020 (accessed 28 April 2021).
- Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities*, 1998. European Treaty Series 157, <https://www.coe.int/en/web/conventions/full-list/-/conventions/rms/090000168007cdac> (accessed 12 May 2021).
- Fräss-Ehrfeld, C., 1998. Das Kärntner Landesbewusstsein. In H. Rumpler (ed.) *Geschichte der österreichischen Bundesländer seit 1945. Kärnten*. Böhlau, Wien, 777–802.
- Fräss-Ehrfeld, C., 2000. *Geschichte Kärntens 1918–1920*. Heyn, Klagenfurt.
- Fritz, P., 2020. Inhalte und Themen der Landesausstellung 2020. In *Einführung, Überblick, Reflexionen zum neuen Landesausstellungsformat*. Amt der Kärntner Landesregierung, Klagenfurt, 6–21.
- Glasl, F., 1980. *Konfliktmanagement*. Haupt, Bern.
- Glasl, F., 2011. Konfliktmanagement. In B. Meyer (ed.) *Konfliktregelung und Friedensstrategien: Eine Einführung*. Springer, Wiesbaden, 125–145.
- Graf, W., Sturm, M. & Brousek, J., 2014. Politik der Gewalt – Politik der Versöhnung: Vom Kärntner Ortstafelkonflikt zur Friedensregion Alpen-Adria? *Kärntner Jahrbuch für Politik* 2014, 149–166.
- Graf, W., 2015. Experimente mit inoffizieller Diplomatie: Das Kelman Programm für Interaktive Konflikttransformation: Geschichte, Projekte, methodologische Verfahren. In W. Wintersteiner & L. Wolf (eds.) *Friedensforschung in Österreich: Bilanz und Perspektiven* (Jahrbuch Friedenskultur, 10). Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 238–263.
- Graf, W., 2010. Konfliktbearbeitung durch interkulturellen Dialog? Gedanken zum laufenden Dialogprojekt “Kärnten neu denken”. In W. Wintersteiner, G. Gombos & D. Gronold (eds.) *Grenzverkehr/ungen: Mehrsprachigkeit, Transkulturalität und Bildung im Alpen-Adria-Raum*. Wieser, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 125–137.
- Graf, W., 2020. Dialog als Lernprozess: Vorgeschichte/n zum Manifest. In W. Wintersteiner, C. Beretta & M. Zalaznik (eds.) *Manifest|o Alpe-Adria: Stimmen für eine Europa-Region des Friedens und Wohlstands: Voci per una regione europea di pace e prosperità: Glasovi za evropsko regijo miru in blagostanja*. Löcker Verlag, Wien, 104–113.
- Graf, W. & Brousek, J., 2014. Dialog als Methode zum Aufbau einer Friedensregion Alpen-Adria. In B. Gruber & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Learning Peace – an Integrative Part of Peace Building: Experiences from the Alps-Adriatic Region* (Yearbook Peace Culture 2014). Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 317–330.
- Graf, W. & Brousek, J., 2020. Auf dem Weg zur “Friedensregion Alpen-Adria”: Konzept, Methoden und Ergebnisse eines grenzübergreifenden Dialogprojekts. In J. Brousek, D. Grafenauer, D. Wutti & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvojajajoče spominjanje: Dialoško obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 57–75.
- Graf, W., Kramer, G. & Nicolescou, A., 2006. Conflict Transformation through Dialogue: From Lederach's Rediscovery of the Freire Method to Galtung's “Transcend” Approach. *Journal für Entwicklungspolitik* 3, 55–83.

- Graf, W., Kramer, G. & Nicolescou, A., 2010. Complexity Thinking as a Meta-Framework for Conflict Transformation: In Search of a Paradigm and a Methodology for a Transformative Culture of Peace. In V. Ratković & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Culture of Peace: A Concept and a Campaign Revisited* (Yearbook Peace Culture 2010). Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 58–81.
- Gstettner, P., 2010. *Erinnern an das Vergessen: Gedenkstättenpädagogik und Bildungspolitik*. Kitab Verlag, Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Güttler, P., 2003. *Sozialpsychologie*. Oldenburg, München.
- Haas, H. & Stuhlpfarrer, K., 1977. Österreich und seine Slowenen. Löcker & Wögenstein, Wien.
- Halbwachs, M., 1966. *Das Gedächtnis und seine sozialen Bedingungen*. Luchterhand, Berlin.
- Halbwachs, M., 1967. *Das kollektive Gedächtnis*. Enke, Stuttgart.
- Hamber, B., 2015. Dealing with Painful Memories and Violent Pasts: Towards a Framework for Contextual Understanding. In B. Austin & M. Fischer (eds.) *Transforming War-related Identities*. Berghof Foundation, Berlin, 1–22.
- Heintel, P., 1982. Zur Sozialpsychologie des Mehrheiten- /Minderheitenproblems. In *Kein einig Volk von Brüdern: Studien zum Mehrheiten-/Minderheitenproblem am Beispiel Kärntens*. Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik, Wien, 301–328.
- Hobsbawm, E., 1994. *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century*. Abacus, London.
- Hobsbawm, E., 2005. *Nationen und Nationalismus: Mythos und Realität seit 1780*. Campus, Frankfurt am Main.
- Hoffmann, M., 2011. Konfliktlösung durch gesellschaftliche Akteure: Möglichkeiten und Grenzen von Problemlösungs-Workshops. In B. Meyer (ed.) *Konfliktregelung und Friedensstrategien: Eine Einführung*. Springer, Wiesbaden, 147–162.
- Inzko, V., 1988. *Geschichte der Kärntner Slowenen von 1918 bis zur Gegenwart: Unter Berücksichtigung der gesamtslowenischen Geschichte*. Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Jordan, P., 2012. Zur Bedeutung zweisprachiger geographischer Namen für die kulturelle Identität. In M. Panel & K. Hren (eds.) *Ein Jahr danach: Die Ortstafelregelung 2011 und was daraus wurde / Ureditev krajevnihih napisov 2011 in kaj je iz tega nastalo*. Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 125–146.
- Judson, P., 2016. *The Habsburg Empire: The New History*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (MA).
- Kelman, H., 1972. The Problem-Solving Workshop in Conflict Resolution. In R. Merritt (ed.) *Communication in International Politics*. University of Illinois Press, Champaign (IL), 168–203.
- Kelman, H., 1997. Negotiating National Identity and Self-Determination in Ethnic Conflicts: The Choice between Pluralism and Ethnic Cleansing. *Negotiation Journal* 13, 327–340.
- Kelman, H., 2010a. Peace Research: Beginnings. In N. Young (ed.) *The Oxford International Encyclopedia of Peace*. Volume 3. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 453–458.
- Kelman, H., 2010b. Interactive Problem Solving: Changing Political Culture in the Pursuit of Conflict Resolution. *Peace and Conflict* 16, 389–413.
- Kelman, H., 2010c. Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation: A Social-Psychological Perspective on Ending Violent Conflict between Identity Groups. *Landscapes of Violence* 1 (1), <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/lov/vol1/iss1/5> (accessed 10 May 2021).
- Klemenčič, M. & Klemenčič, V., 2010. *Die Kärntner Slowenen und die zweite Republik*, Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Kramer, S., 2004. Zweisprachigkeit – Spiegelbild meiner Seele: Eine psychologisch-therapeutische Annäherung an den Kärntner Volksgruppenkonflikt. In M. Pandel, M. Polzer-

- Srienz, M. Polzer & R. Vospernik (eds.) *Ortstafelkonflikt in Kärnten – Krise oder Chance?*. Braumüller, Wien, 200–215.
- Lausegger, J. & Wintersteiner, W., 2020. Friedensregion Alpen-Adria? Eine Kontroverse. In J. Brousek, D. Grafenauer, D. Wutti & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvobajajoče spominjanje: Dialoško obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 203–235.
- Lederach, J., 1999. Justpeace: The Challenge of the 21st Century. In P. Van Tongeren (ed.) *People Building Peace: 35 Inspiring Stories from Around the World*. European Center for Conflict Prevention, Utrecht, 27–36.
- Lederach, J. & Appleby, S., 2010. Strategic Peacebuilding: An Overview. In D. Philpott & G. Powers (eds.) *Strategies of Peace: Transforming Conflict in a Violent World*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 19–44.
- Meyer, B., 2011. Entstehung und Austragungsformen von Konflikten. In B. Meyer (ed.) *Konfliktregelung und Friedensstrategien: Eine Einführung*. Springer, Wiesbaden, 27–100.
- Mujkić, A. & Hulsey, J., 2010. Explaining the Success of Nationalist Parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Politička misao* 47 (2), 143–158.
- Nicolescou, A. & Graf, W. (eds.), 2014. *Conference Report: The Transformation of Intractable Conflicts: Perspectives and Challenges for Interactive Problem Solving*. Herbert C. Kelman Institute, Wien.
- Pan, C., 2009. Die Minderheitenfrage in der Europäischen Union. *Europäisches Journal für Minderheitenfragen* 1, 20–31.
- Pirker, J., 2012a. How to Stop a Perpetuum Mobile? Interdisciplinary Insights into the Ongoing Issue of the Slovene Ethnic Minority in Austria: The Question of Bilingual Topography. *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 9 (2010), 717–748.
- Pirker, J., 2012b. Vom (Eigen-)Sinn der Geschichte(n): Große und kleine Erzählungen in Kärnten. In W. Petritsch, W. Graf & G. Kramer (eds.) *Kärnten liegt am Meer. Konfliktgeschichte/n über Trauma, Macht und Identität*. Drava, Heyn, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 448–465.
- Pirker, J., 2013. *Wir sind Kärnten – Mi smo Koroška: Jugend, Begegnung und politische Bildung in Volksgruppenfragen*. Nomos, Baden-Baden.
- Pirker, J., 2014. Crossing Borders – Facing Diversity: Trans-National Youth Initiatives within and between Carinthia and Slovenia. In B. Gruber & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Learning Peace – an Integrative Part of Peace Building: Experiences from the Alps-Adriatic Region*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 331–344.
- Pirker, J. (ed.), 2015. *Kärnten und Slowenien: Getrennte Wege – Gemeinsame Zukunft: Jugend zwischen Heimat, Nation und Europa / Koroška in Slovenija: ločene poti – skupna prihodnost: mladi o domovini, narodu in Evropi*. Nomos, Baden-Baden.
- Pirker, J., 2018. *Geschichte(n) im Konflikt: Der Konsens- und Dialogprozess in Kärnten: Vom nationalen Konflikt zur Friedensregion Alpen-Adria?*. Facultas, Wien.
- Pirker, J., 2020. (Kein) Ende in Sicht? 150 Jahre Geschichte(n) und Minderheitenrechte im nationalen Konflikt. In J. Brousek, D. Grafenauer, D. Wutti & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvobajajoče spominjanje: Dialoško obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 357–370.
- Pirker, J. & Hofmeister, L., 2015. Ergebnisse der Umfrage und Intervention. In J. Pirker (ed.) *Kärnten und Slowenien: Getrennte Wege – Gemeinsame Zukunft: Jugend zwischen Heimat, Nation und Europa / Koroška in Slovenija: ločene poti – skupna prihodnost: mladi o domovini, narodu in Evropi*. Nomos, Baden-Baden, 175–233.
- Reiterer, A., 2000. Lebenswelt Muttersprache: Das Slowenische und seine heutige Wahrnehmung – Ein Bericht. *Kärntner Jahrbuch für Politik* 2000, 340–362.

- Rothman, J., 1997. *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict in Nations, Organizations and Communities*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Rothman, J. (ed.), 2012. *From Identity-Based Conflict to Identity-Based Cooperation*. Springer, New York.
- Rumpler, H., 1998. Der schwierige Weg aus der Vergangenheit in die Zukunft. In H. Rumpler (ed.) *Geschichte der österreichischen Bundesländer seit 1945. Kärnten*. Böhlau, Wien, 48–64.
- Schmidt, S. J., 2006. Gedächtnis und Erinnerung: Zur Erinnerungspolitik der Gegenwart. *Zeitgeschichte* 34 (2), 53–58.
- Schönbauer-Brousek, L., Brousek, J. & Graf, W., 2016. Interaktive Konflikttransformation: Neun Perspektiven für partizipative Aktionsforschung mit Konfliktparteien. In M. Lakitsch & S. Reitmair-Juarez (eds.) *Zivilgesellschaft im Konflikt: Vom Gelingen und Scheitern in Krisengebieten*. Lit, Wien, 95–117.
- Sen, A., 2007. *Die Identitätsfalle: Warum es keinen Krieg der Kulturen gibt*. C. H. Beck, München.
- Suppan, A., 2004. Zur Geschichte Südkärntens: Aus der Perspektive einer zweisprachigen Region. In M. Pandel, M. Polzer-Srienz, M. Polzer & R. Vospernik (eds.) *Ortstafelkonflikt in Kärnten – Krise oder Chance?*. Braumüller, Wien, 128–197.
- State Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria (Staatsvertrag betreffend die Wiederherstellung eines unabhängigen und demokratischen Österreich)*. BGBl 152/1955 idF BGBl I 2/2008, <https://www.ris.bka.gv.at/GeltendeFassung.wxe?Abfrage=Bundesnormen&Gesetzesnummer=10000265> (accessed 10 May 2021).
- Sturm, M., 2020. Friedensregion Alpen-Adria: Zwei Defizite der Kärntner Erinnerungskultur. In W. Wintersteiner, C. Beretta & M. Zalaznik (eds.) *Manifest|o Alpe-Adria: Stimmen für eine Europa-Region des Friedens und Wohlstands: Voci per una regione europea di pace e prosperità: Glasovi za evropsko regijo miru in blagostanja*. Löcker Verlag, Wien, 362–368.
- Treaty on European Union*, Official Journal of the European Union, 2012/C 326/01, 26 October 2012, doi:10.3000/1977091X.C_2012.326.eng (accessed 14 May 2021).
- Valentin, H., 1993. *Abwehrkampf und Volksabstimmung in Kärnten 1918–1920: Mythen und Fakten*. Archiv der Arbeiterbewegung, Klagenfurt.
- Valentin, H., 2009. *Der Sonderfall, Kärntens Zeitgeschichte 1918–2004/08*. Mohorjeva / Herma-goras, Klagenfurt/Celovec.
- Valentin, H., 2011a. *Vom Ersten Weltkrieg bis zur Gegenwart*. Haymon, Innsbruck.
- Valentin, H., 2011b. Cross-Border-Cooperation in the Alps-Adriatic Territory – a Contribution to Peacekeeping. In B. Gruber & D. Rippitsch (eds.) *Modell Friedensregion Alpen Adria?*. Wochenschau, Schwalbach, 157–167.
- Valentin, H., Haiden, S. & Maier, B. (eds.), 2002. *Die Kärntner Volksabstimmung 1920 und die Geschichtsforschung: Leistungen, Defizite, Perspektiven*. Heyn, Klagenfurt.
- Vavti, S., 2009. *“Wir haben alles in uns ...”: Identifikationen in der Sprachenvielfalt: Beispiele aus Südkärnten (Österreich) und dem Kanaltal (Italien)*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Vavti, Š., 2012. “Slowenisch ist meine Heimat, irgendwie!” – Identifikationsmuster bei jungen Sloweninnen und Slowenen in Kärnten. *Kärntner Jahrbuch für Politik* 2012, 97–106.
- Vavti, S., 2013. *“Ich bin einfach ein Mensch”: Ethnische Selbstverortung und lokale Bezüge junger Slowenen in Kärnten (Österreich)*. Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.
- Volkan, V., 1999a. *Blutsgrenzen: Die historischen Wurzeln und die psychologischen Mechanismen ethnischer Konflikte und ihre Bedeutung bei Friedensverhandlungen*. Fischer Scherz, New York.
- Volkan, V., 1999b. The Tree Model: A Comprehensive Psychopolitical Approach to Unofficial Diplomacy and the Reduction of Ethnic Tension. *Mind and Human Interaction* 10, 142–206.

- Vouk, R., 2016. Fünf Jahre "Ortstafellösung" – war's das schon?. *Europa Ethnica* 73 (3/4), 68–71.
- Welzer, H., 2001. Das soziale Gedächtnis. In H. Welzer (ed.) *Das soziale Gedächtnis: Geschichte, Erinnerung, Tradierung*. Edition, Hamburg, 9–24.
- Wintersteiner, W., 1996. Kleine Kärntner Pornographie. In M. Wakounig & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Mit einander: Orientierungen für ein multikulturelles Österreich* (Friedenserziehung konkret, Band 4), 8–29.
- Wintersteiner, W., 2011. "Zypressen. Krieg. Frieden. Kinder": Krieg und Frieden am Beispiel der Alpen-Adria-Region. In B. Gruber & D. Rippitsch (eds.) *Modell Friedensregion Alpen Adria? Lernerfahrungen in einer europäischen Grenzregion*. Wochenschau, Schwalbach, 57–92.
- Wintersteiner, W., 2012. "Kärnten liegt am Meer": Vision einer Friedensregion Alpen-Adria. In W. Petritsch, W. Graf & G. Kramer (eds.) *Kärnten liegt am Meer. Konfliktgeschichte/n über Trauma, Macht und Identität*. Drava, Heyn, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 524–545.
- Wintersteiner, W., 2015. Erinnerungspolitik und Friedenspädagogik: Eine Annäherung. In J. Pirker (ed.) *Kärnten und Slowenien: Getrennte Wege – Gemeinsame Zukunft: Jugend zwischen Heimat, Nation und Europa / Koroška in Slovenija: ločene poti – skupna prihodnost: mladi o domovini, narodu in Evropi*. Nomos, Baden-Baden, 53–68.
- Wintersteiner, W., Beretta C. & Zalaznik, M. (eds.), 2020a. *Manifest|o Alpe-Adria: Stimmen für eine Europa-Region des Friedens und Wohlstands: Voci per una regione europea di pace e prosperità: Glasovi za evropsko regijo miru in blagostanja*. Löcker Verlag, Wien.
- Wintersteiner, W., Brousek, J., Grafenauer, D. & Wutti, D., 2020b. Die Zukunft von der Gewalt der Vergangenheit befreien! In J. Brousek, D. Grafenauer, D. Wutti & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvobajajoče spominjanje: Dialogsko obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 13–34.
- Wutti, D., 2015. Gedächtnis, Kollektiv, Identität: Die Entstehung kollektiver Identitäten am Beispiel Kärntens/Koroška. *ide – Informationen zur Deutschdidaktik* 2, 9–19.
- Wutti, D., 2017. Between Self-Governance and Political Participation: The Slovene Minority in Carinthia, Austria. *Treatises and Documents, Journal of Ethnic Studies* 78, 59–71.
- Wutti, D., 2018. Gedächtnis, Trauma, Identität: Zum theoretischen Hintergrund des Buchs. In N. Danglmaier, A. Hudelist, S. Wakounig & D. Wutti (eds.) *Erinnerungsgemeinschaften in Kärnten/Koroška: Eine empirische Studie über gegenwärtige Auseinandersetzungen mit dem Nationalsozialismus in Schule und Gesellschaft, Mohorjeva / Hermagoras, Klagenfurt/Celovec*, 17–34.
- Zorčič, S., 2019. Linguistic Habitus, Different Capitals and the Identity of Bilingual Youth: The Case of Austrian Carinthia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 787–800, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2019.1568442>.
- Žagar, M., 2008. Diversity Management and Integration: From Ideas to Concepts. *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 6 (2006/2007), 307–327.
- Žagar, M., 2009. Strategies for the Prevention, Management, and/or Resolution of (Ethnic) Crisis and Conflict: The Case of the Balkans. In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Sandole-Staroste & J. Senéhi (eds.) *Handbook of Conflict Analysis and Resolution*. Routledge, London, 456–474.
- Žagar, M., 2020. Offener, inklusiver, öffentlicher Dialog: Ansatz, Instrument, Ideologie und Ziel. In J. Brousek, D. Grafenauer, D. Wutti & W. Wintersteiner (eds.) *Slovenija – Österreich: Befreiendes Erinnern – Osvobajajoče spominjanje: Dialogsko obravnavanje zgodovine – Dialogische Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit*. Drava, Klagenfurt/Celovec, 108–126.