Introduction

Soviet-Austrian relations 1945–1955

In Soviet-Austrian relations, much more than in Austrian dealings with any other great power, the year 1955 marked the beginning of a new era. Until then, Soviet intentions vis-à-vis the Alpine republic, located at the edge of what was to become the Eastern bloc, had been far from clear, and relations between the communist superpower and the small state with its roughly seven million inhabitants were generally strained. It seems that in 1945 Stalin hoped to bring this country, which had been liberated from Nazi rule and was occupied by the four Allied powers, gradually into the Soviet orbit by having a national-front government formed in Vienna and establishing close bilateral economic and political ties. With the Austrian communists' defeat in the general elections of 25 November 1945, the failure of this strategy was soon obvious. As a consequence, the Kremlin was not ready to do the Austrians any favors: the Allied control over the Austrian government was maintained; the former "German assets" in the Soviet zone of Austria were seized; communist tactics to destabilize the Austrian government received Soviet support; and the state treaty negotiations for withdrawing the Allied forces were left in limbo as long as it seemed useful to the Kremlin to keep troops in both Austria and, by alluding to their right to maintain communication lines, in neighboring Hungary.[1] The dawning Cold War between the Soviet Union and the West convinced both sides that pulling out of Austria was not immediately possible. While the West feared that its withdrawal would be followed by a communist attempt to topple the Austrian government, Stalin neither wanted to surrender the country entirely to Western influence nor to give it up as a bargaining chip in his Grand Game over Germany.[2]

---

[1] For a history of the state treaty negotiations, see Gerald Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit: Staatsvertrag, Neutralität und das Ende der Ost-West-Besetzung Österreichs 1945–1955*, 5th ed. (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005). Stourzh has provided the most comprehensive history of the negotiations to date. On the history of the state treaty and on Austria's relations with the Allies in the postwar decade, see also Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Strategy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005). Cf. Günter Bischof, *Austria in the First Cold War, 1945–1955: The Leverage of the Weak* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 1999); Manfried Rauchensteiner, *Stalinplatz 4: Österreich unter alliierter Besatzung* (Vienna: Steinbauer, 2005); Rolf Steininger, *Der Staatsvertrag: Österreich im Schatten von deutscher Frage und Kaltem Krieg, 1938–1955* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005).

[2] On Soviet policy in Austria in the postwar decade, see Wolfgang Mueller, "Stalin and Austria: New Evidence on Soviet Policy in a Secondary Theatre of the Cold War, 1938–1953/55," in

Meanwhile, bilateral relations became increasingly unfriendly. From 1946–47 on, Soviet propaganda attacked Austrian noncommunist parties and politicians, and in 1948 the Soviet deputy high commissioner Aleksei Zheltov, in a conversation with Leopold Figl, called the Christian-social Austrian chancellor "a great enemy of the Soviet Union."[3] The harsh Soviet policy proved counterproductive as it rendered the Austrian population even more anti-communist than it had already been. Notwithstanding these unpromising circumstances, the Soviet authorities in Austria, at least until 1953, did not give up their hope of "strengthening Soviet influence" in the country and leading Austria towards "people's democracy" by, albeit cautiously, supporting the local communists and trying to cause splits in the noncommunist parties. However, the Austrian communists' scheme to divide Austria, like the German model, into a communist and a capitalist half was rejected in a secret conversation by the Kremlin in February 1948 (most probably in order to avoid a new Anschluss of western Austria with West Germany).[4]

It was only during the "thaw" after Stalin's death in March 1953 that, in the course of the resulting global détente, a significant relaxation in Soviet-Austrian relations could be achieved. In response to US president Eisenhower's call upon the Kremlin to prove that it intended to relax tensions, the new Soviet leadership consented to various changes in policy: Negotiations with regard to the Korean War were resumed, and in July 1953 an armistice was signed. Western diplomats in Moscow were granted more freedom of movement, Soviet anti-Western propa-

---

Cold War History 6, no. 1 (2006), 63–84. For more detail, cf. idem, *Die sowjetische Besatzung in Österreich 1945–1955 und ihre politische Mission* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005); and idem, "Gab es eine verpasste Chance? Die sowjetische Haltung zum Staatsvertrag," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Strategy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 89–120. See also Stefan Karner, Barbara Stelzl-Marx, and Alexandr Tschubarjan (eds.), *Die Rote Armee in Österreich: Krasnaia armiia v Avstrii, 1945–1955* (Graz: Oldenbourg, 2005); and Andreas Hilger, Mike Schmeitzner, and Clemens Vollnhals (eds.), *Sowjetisierung oder Neutralität? Optionen sowjetischer Besatzungspolitik in Deutschland und Österreich 1945–1955* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006). Key Russian documents on Soviet policy in Austria are published, in Russian and German, in Wolfgang Mueller, Arnold Suppan, Norman Naimark, and Gennadij Bordjugov (eds.), *Sowjetische Politik in Österreich: Dokumente aus russischen Archiven: Sovetskaia politika v Avstrii: Dokumenty iz Rossiiskikh arkhivov* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005). For a history of Soviet-Austrian relations 1918–1955, see Wolfgang Mueller and Hannes Leidinger, "Tiefes Misstrauen – begrenztes Interesse: Die österreichisch-sowjetischen Beziehungen 1918 bis 1955," in Arnold Suppan, Klaus Koch, Walter Rauscher, and Elisabeth Vyslonzil (eds.), *Von Saint-Germain zum Belvedere: Österreich und Europa 1919–1955* (Vienna: Oldenbourg, 2006), 70–114.

[3] Quoted in Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 142

[4] Conversation of Zhdanov with the leaders of the Austrian Communist Party Koplenig and Fürnberg, 13 February 1948, in Mueller, Suppan, Naimark, Bordjugov, *Sowjetische Politik: Sovetskaia politika*, 452–465. A German translation is published in Wolfgang Mueller, "Die Teilung Österreichs als politische Option für KPÖ und UdSSR 1948), in *Zeitgeschichte* 32, no. 1 (2005), 47–54.

ganda was tempered, territorial claims against Turkey were relinquished, and diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia, Greece, and Israel were reestablished.[5] In the United Nations, the Soviet delegate ended his earlier blockade by giving a green light for the nomination of Dag Hammarskjöld for the position of Secretary General, and in Germany, Soviet traffic blocks around Berlin were loosened. Most sensationally, the US president's address to the Soviet people was published in *Pravda*. With regard to Austria, whose release from four-power control had also been demanded in Eisenhower's "Chance for Peace" speech of 16 April, as a test case for the seriousness of Soviet intentions to end the Cold War,[6] the Kremlin allowed certain relaxations in its control over the Austrian authorities, which eased everyday life in the Soviet zone and slackened the bilateral tensions.[7] The diplomatic representations in Vienna and Moscow were upgraded to embassies (roughly at the same time the USSR established an embassy in East Berlin).

The new Austrian chancellor, Julius Raab of the Christian-democratic Austrian People's Party (ÖVP), publicly expressed his gratitude for the Soviet concessions. He grasped that, given the Soviet reluctance hitherto shown for withdrawing from Austria, the country's path to full sovereignty was via Moscow, and he was therefore ready to please the Soviets in order to achieve this goal. His interest in developing trade and commerce, particularly *Osthandel*, (an interest partially based on Raab's roots in small business and his political activity as president of his party's organization for entrepreneurs, the *Wirtschaftsbund*) seemed to be a further incentive for developing ties with Eastern Europe. Austria's geographic location between the frontlines of the two emerging blocs, squeezed in between communist Hungary and Czechoslovakia, between NATO member Italy and soon-to-be member West Germany, between neutral Switzerland and nonaligned Yugoslavia, made an accommodation with the East appear even more desirable. Therefore Raab called on his fellow citizens not only to stop the "propaganda against the 'people's democracies'" but also to refrain from, as he famously put it, too often "pinching the tail of the Russian bear who is standing right in the middle of [our] garden."[8]

Additionally, the Austrian government started to sound out whether an Austrian declaration of neutrality might improve chances for concluding the state treaty.

---

[5] Wilfried Loth, *Overcoming the Cold War: A History of Détente* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 19.

[6] Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 157. On the background of including Austria into the speech, see Deborah Welch Larson, "Crisis Prevention and the Austrian State Treaty," in *International Organization* 41, no. 1 (1987), 27–60, 36.

[7] Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 220–239; Rauchensteiner, *Stalinplatz*, 213–215.

[8] Quoted in Günter Bischof, "The Robust Assertion of Austrianism: Peaceful Coexistence in Austria after Stalin's Death," in Klaus Larres and Kenneth Osgood (eds.), *The Cold War after Stalin's Death: A Missed Opportunity for Peace?* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 233–256, 241. The Western powers remained suspicious of Raab's intentions. Cf. Warren W. Williams, "British Policy and the Occupation of Austria" (PhD Thesis, University of Wales, Swansea, 2004), 356–360.

Since the end of the Habsburg Monarchy in 1918, members of the political elite of the small country had repeatedly aired their support for the idea of adopting a neutral status.[9] After 1945 some leaders of the main political parties in Austria had continued to do so; however, while social democrats and conservatives refused ideological neutrality and insisted on Austria's status as a Western democracy, the communists' advocacy of keeping the country out of the West contributed to the idea of neutrality being somewhat discredited. After Stalin's offer for neutralizing Germany was rejected, Soviet diplomats joined their Austrian colleagues in discussing the option for Austria. At a four-power conference in Berlin in January and February of 1954, the USSR's delegation seemed pleased with the idea of neutralizing Austria. However, no agreement could be reached regarding the Soviet foreign minister's demand of a prolonged military presence of the four powers in Austria until the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. If the Soviet government had, in the spring of 1953, intended to withdraw from Austria, it must have faltered in the wake of the anti-communist uprising in East Germany in June. After the Soviet crackdown on East German workers, the chances for further experiments in foreign relations such as a withdrawal from Austria looked dim. A new cooling down in Soviet-Austrian relations was the consequence.[10]

"Peaceful coexistence"

It seems doubtful that a breakthrough could have been achieved had not the new Soviet leadership underlined its readiness for global détente by embarking on a new policy called "peaceful coexistence." During the late Stalin years, the Soviet doctrine had stressed the permanent struggle between the forces of communism and capitalism. In consideration of mounting East-West tensions and with the Cold War actually turning into a hot war on the Korean peninsula, Stalin had repeatedly underlined the danger of a general conflagration between the two main opponents, the Soviet Union and the United States, and their allies.[11] The confrontation between the two blocs in an age of thermonuclear weapons, however, included the risk of mutual or even global destruction.

---

[9] Stephan Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität: Ein Grundriss* (Vienna: Manz, 1967), 47–60. Cf. Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 242–282; and his "The Origins of Austrian Neutrality," in Alan Leonhard (ed.), *Neutrality: Changing Concepts and Practices* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1988), 35–57. It is therefore not entirely correct to claim that "neutrality in Austria has no historical roots prior to World War II," as stated in Joan Johnson-Freese, "Austria," in S. Victor Papacosma and Mark R. Rubin (eds.), *Europe's Neutral and Nonaligned States: Between NATO and the Warsaw Pact* (Wilmington: Scholarly Resources, 1989), 161–180, 161.

[10] William Lloyd Stearman, *The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria: An Analysis of Soviet Policy in Austria, 1945–1955* (Bonn: Siegler, 1961), 146–148.

[11] Vojtech Mastny, *The Cold War and Soviet Insecurity: The Stalin Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 60.

In addition to this risk that the new Russian leaders seemed eager to avoid, at least two other factors may have been involved when the Kremlin opted for a new course: In Western Europe, the expansion of communism had been stopped by Western Containment and various attempts had been made at creating a united West European bloc, attempts that the Kremlin tried to prevent from materializing. In Asia and Africa, vast areas, from Egypt to India to Indonesia, freed themselves of colonial rule and gained independence. Their leaders' political tendency was rather more nationalist and neutralist than communist, but they were open to advances from any supporters, including the USSR.[12] The new Soviet leadership was interested in exploiting the former colonies' natural anti-colonialist sentiment as well as not letting these countries join the Western camp.[13] To reach both goals, it was necessary to project a friendlier and more "peaceful" image of Soviet policy than had been possible in the late Stalin years.

Therefore, after Stalin's death the new Kremlin leadership launched a "peace initiative."[14] Already in 1953, Georgii Malenkov revoked the thesis of the inevitability of war and declared that "peaceful coexistence between countries of different social systems" was not only possible but also the correct and "truly Leninist" basis for Soviet foreign policy. In his speech on the occasion of Stalin's funeral, on 9 March, the prime minister stated that there was a "possibility of a lasting coexistence and peaceful competition between the two different systems."[15] This received confirmation in his speech at the session of the Supreme Soviet on 8 August, in which he declared: "There is no outstanding issue of dispute which cannot be settled in a peaceful manner […]. We stand for the peaceful coexistence of the two

---

[12] David Reynolds, *One World Divisible: A Global History Since 1945* (London: Penguin, 2000), 58–66.

[13] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: University Press, 2005), 67; Alexander Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin* (London: Methuen, 1962), 286–295; on India, cf. Andreas Hilger, "The Soviet Union and India: The Khrushchev Era and its Aftermath until 1966," in idem, Anna Locher, Roland Popp, Shana Goldberg, Matthias Pintsch (eds.), *Indo-Soviet Relations Collection* (Zurich: Parallel History Project, 2009), http://www.php.isn.ethz.ch/collections/coll_india/documents/IntroII_final_001.pdf, 1; on Indonesia, see Ragna Boden, *Die Grenzen der Weltmacht: Sowjetische Indonesienpolitik von Stalin bis Brežnev* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2006), 99–114.

[14] Geoffrey Roberts, *A Chance for Peace: The Soviet Campaign to End the Cold War, 1953–1955*, Cold War International History Working Paper 57 (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2008). Whether the initiative really was a "chance for peace" and a lasting East-West settlement is doubted by many scholars. See Mark Kramer, "International Politics in the Early Post-Stalin Era: A Lost Opportunity, a Turning Point, or More of the Same?," in Klaus Larres and Kenneth Osgood (eds.), *The Cold War after Stalin's Death: A Missed Opportunity for Peace?* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), xiii–xxxiv, xiii.

[15] Loth, *Overcoming the Cold War*, 19; *Keesing's Contemporary Archives* IX (1952–1954), 12869 and 13097–13099. The thesis of the inevitability of wars among capitalist powers had been recently reconfirmed by Stalin in his *Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing, 1952), 32–37.

systems." This claim was further underlined in Foreign Minister Molotov's speech[16] at the session of the Supreme Soviet on 9 February 1955 and by the new Kremlin chief, Nikita Khrushchev, at the twentieth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in February 1956.[17]

Although Lenin, Foreign Commissars Leon Trotskii and Georgii Chicherin, and later Stalin had sometimes spoken of the possibility and even necessity of peaceful relations between the Soviet state and the capitalist world,[18] the embracing of the idea could be regarded a major sea change in postwar international politics. Khrushchev's concept differed from Lenin's and Stalin's in many respects: The earlier leaders' theses had allowed for short periods of coexistence only, designed to create breathing space for the Bolshevik regime. Stalin's heir, however, claimed that the emergence of the socialist camp after World War II had created the preconditions needed for a longer lasting, albeit limited, period of "peaceful coexistence." As always in communist propaganda, avoiding war was depicted as the result not of Soviet insecurity or Western compromises, but exclusively of Soviet strength and the growth of the socialist bloc, which had allegedly disrupted Western war plans and forced the West to accept a continuation of peace.[19] Nonetheless, it was

---

[16] *Archiv der Gegenwart*, 9 February 1955, 05003-1. On the Soviet doctrine of "peaceful coexistence," see Margot Light, *The Soviet Theory of International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988), 27–68; for further details, cf. Edward McWhinney, *Peaceful Coexistence and Soviet-Western International Law* (Leyden: Sythoff, 1964); and Bernard A. Ramundo, *Peaceful Coexistence: International Law in the Building of Communism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967); Alois Riklin, *Weltrevolution oder Koexistenz?* (Zurich: Schweizerischer Aufklärungsdienst, 1969); Henn-Jüri Uibopuu, *Die sovjetische Doktrin der friedlichen Koexistenz als Völkerrechtsproblem* (Vienna: Notring, 1971); Jessica E. Martin, "Peaceful Coexistence," in Ruud van Dijk et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Cold War* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 689–690. The Soviet theory is elaborated in, e.g., N.S. Chruschtschow, *Für dauerhaften Frieden und friedliche Koexistenz* (Berlin: Dietz, 1959); A.A. Gromyko (ed.), *Die friedliche Koexistenz: Der Leninsche Kurs der Außenpolitik der Sowjetunion* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, [1964]); A.E. Bovin, "Peaceful Coexistence," in A. M. Prokhorov et al. (eds.), *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* 16, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1977), 625–627; G.I. Tunkin, *Theory of International Law* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 37–39; W.I. Jegorow, *Friedliche Koexistenz und revolutionärer Prozess* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1972); Schalwa Sanakojew and Nikolai Kaptschenko, *Theorie der Außenpolitik des Sozialismus* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1979), 90–102.

[17] N.S. Chruschtschow, *Rechenschaftsbericht des Zentralkomitees der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion an den XX. Parteitag 14. Februar 1956* (Moscow: Verlag für Fremdsprachige Literatur, 1956), 21–25, 32–51; N.S. Khrushchev, *O mirnom sosushchestvovanii* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1959). For an English version, see "On Peaceful Coexistence," in *Foreign Affairs* 38, no. 1 (October 1959), 1–18.

[18] V.I. Lenin, *On Peaceful Coexistence* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing, [1962]); J. Stalin, *For Peaceful Coexistence: Postwar Interviews* (New York: International Publishers, 1951). Cf. Riklin, *Weltrevolution oder Koexistenz?*, 27.

[19] N.S. Khrushchev, *Otchetnyi doklad Tsentral'nogo Komiteta Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza XX s"ezdu partii* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1956), 40; "Doklad tov. N.S. Khrushcheva," in *Vneocherednoi [XXI] s"ezd Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza: Stenograficheskii otch-*

made clear that a period of "peaceful coexistence" was seen as merely a transitory phase on the road to communism. Khrushchev's somewhat naïve and therefore over-optimistic belief in Marxism-Leninism and its victory convinced him that a few years of peace in the world would be sufficient for all mankind to recognize that communism was the most efficient system.[20]

Formally, the new doctrine drew heavily on non-Soviet sources such as the five Principles Guiding the Relations between the People's Republic of China and India that had been listed in the Chinese-Indian treaty of 29 April 1954 and solemnly declared by Nehru and Chou En-Lai in June, and the ten principles of the final declaration of the Third World countries' conference in Bandung in April 1955. According to the Chinese-Indian treaty, "peaceful coexistence" was comprised of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, coexistence and economic cooperation. Of these, the first four were part of the UN Charter.[21]

The adoption of such "peaceful" principles notwithstanding, Soviet leaders stressed that the ideological struggle between communism and capitalism had not been given up.[22] In their estimation, "peaceful coexistence," as a "special form of the class struggle," would even intensify such competition and promote the transition of the world to communism by demonstrating the superiority of the socialist bloc and by supporting the struggle of anti-imperialist and "progressive forces" in the West and in the southern hemisphere.[23] At the same time, the economic advancement of the Soviet Union was expected to make it possible to win a nonviolent race with the West. Thus, "peaceful coexistence" did neither mean reconciliation with capitalism nor the elimination of the East-West conflict but merely its transformation into an ideological, political, economic, technological, and cultural "footrace" between the "two systems." Western observers were critical whether

---

et (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1959), 73; N.S. Khrushchev, *Otchet Tsentral'nogo Komiteta Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza XXII s"ezdu partii* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 8.

[20] Khrushchev, "On Peaceful Coexistence," 5. Cf. Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War: The Inside Story of an American Adversary* (New York: Norton, 2006), 23.

[21] Gabriele Sinigoj, *Indien und Blockfreiheit als außenpolitische Strategie* (New York: Lang, 1998), 38–42.

[22] See, e.g., N.S. Chruschtschow, "Gespräch mit dem Korrespondenten der amerikanischen Nachrichtenagentur United Press, Henry Shapiro, 14 November 1957," in idem, *Für dauerhaften Frieden,* 280–303, 290; Gromyko, *Die friedliche Koexistenz*, 115, 119; Programm der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion, angenommen auf dem XXII. Parteikongress 1961, in Boris Meissner (ed.), *Das Parteiprogramm der KPdSU 1903 bis 1961* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1962), 143–244, 229; Erklärung der Beratung von Vertretern der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien in Moskau, November 1960, in Fritz Schenk (ed.), *Kommunistische Grundsatzerklärungen 1957–1971* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1972), 86–130, 108; Jegorow, *Friedliche Koexistenz und revolutionärer Prozess*, 216.

[23] Gromyko, *Die friedliche Koexistenz*, 98; Michael S. Woslenskij, "Friedliche Koexistenz aus sowjetischer Sicht," in *Osteuropa* 23, no. 11 (1973), 848–855, 852.

this kind of "coexistence" meant anything other than Cold War.[24] If, in such a situation, war could be avoided depended – from the Soviet point of view – upon whether the leading classes in capitalist states finally conceded to communism. "Peaceful coexistence" did not comprise a renunciation of the "armed struggle of the proletariat," or of local wars. Not openly declared was that "peaceful coexistence," in particular economic cooperation with the West, was to provide the Soviet economy with much-needed imports, which would reduce the burden on the overstretched industry as well as raise the exhausted East European workers' mood.

In general, the Soviet aim of "peaceful coexistence" appears to have been twofold: first, avoiding a global war with the West while undermining Western resistance against communism, and secondly, strengthening the Soviet side by increasing trade, projecting a friendly image and winning new friends abroad. It was anticipated that this new strategy would make it easier for the USSR to achieve some of its main foreign policy goals by safeguarding beneficial international conditions for the development of communism in the Soviet Union and the "World Socialist System," the struggle of the Third World for decolonization and independence, as well as the class struggle abroad.[25] At the same time, as claimed by the Soviet theory of international law and as proven by the Soviet interventions of 1956, 1968, 1979 and 1981 in the USSR's neighborhood, "peaceful coexistence" and noninterference in internal affairs did not apply to the Soviet relations with its small neighboring states.[26]

The Austrian state treaty and declaration of neutrality

It was within this framework of "peaceful coexistence" that Khrushchev, the emerging Soviet leader, took the opportunity to scale down international tensions and to improve the image of the USSR in the West and in the Third World by tak-

---

[24] Rodney Gilbert, *Competitive Coexistence: The New Soviet Challenge* (New York: Bookmailer, 1956), 17. Quoted in Gromyko, *Die friedliche Koexistenz,* 116.

[25] Programm der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion, angenommen auf dem XXII. Parteikongress 1961, in Meissner, *Das Parteiprogramm der KPdSU*, 181–184; Erklärung der Beratung von Vertretern der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien in Moskau, November 1960, in Schenk, *Kommunistische Grundsatzerklärungen*, 108.

[26] See, e.g., N.S. Chruschtschow, "Gespräch mit dem Chefredakteur der japanischen Zeitung *Asahi Shimbun*, Tomoo Hirooka, 18 June 1957," in idem, *Für dauerhaften Frieden*, 125; Gromyko, *Die friedliche Koexistenz*, 11. Among Western analyses, see Theodor Schweisfurth, *Sozialistisches Völkerrecht? Darstellung – Analyse – Wertung der sowjetmarxistischen Theorie vom Völkerrecht „neuen Typs"* (Berlin: Springer, 1979), 262–284. For a critical analysis of the content and development of "peaceful coexistence" from 1956 until the mid-1970s, see Standenat to Austrian MFA, 22 December 1975, in Österreichisches Staatsarchiv (hereafter: ÖStA), AVA, NL Bielka, File 115. On the Brezhnev doctrine, see Matthew J. Ouimet, *The Rise and Fall of the Brezhnev Doctrine in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

ing various steps, such as joining the Geneva conference on Indochina, reducing Soviet forces, withdrawing from obsolete Soviet bases such as Port Arthur, China, and Porkkala, Finland, settling the Soviet dispute with Yugoslavia, and agreeing on the Austrian state treaty, thus ending its Allied control and occupation. After Khrushchev had demoted Malenkov from leadership, on 8 February 1955 Molotov announced that the Austrian question should be solved soon, and following some bilateral exploratory contacts, the country's leaders were invited to Moscow. Their promise to see to it that Austria adopt a neutral status like the one of Switzerland,[27] as agreed upon in bilateral negotiations in Moscow and laid down in a memorandum of 15 April, was an unofficial *conditio sine qua non* for the Soviet consent to join the Western powers in the signing of the state treaty. This Soviet promise was also inserted into the Soviet-Austrian Moscow memorandum. The trip of an Austrian governmental delegation to the Soviet capital – the first high ranking bilateral Austrian visit to the USSR[28] – and the successful conclusion of the negotiations were highly celebrated in the communist propaganda.

The State Treaty for the Re-establishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria was signed on 15 May in Vienna by the foreign ministers of the four powers plus Austria. The document declared the union with Germany, as it had been established after Hitler's *Wehrmacht* had marched into Austria in March 1938, as null and void and recognized the reconstruction of a democratic independent Austria within its pre-Anschluss borders. As stipulated by article 4 of the treaty, a new Anschluss was prohibited, as were the purchase and use of certain categories of weapons, in particular torpedoes and missiles (article 13). Furthermore, it was codified, as had been agreed in the Moscow memorandum, that Austria buy the Soviet-run "German assets," including oil wells and the Danube Steamship Company, in eastern Austria for a lump sum of 150 plus 2 million dollars plus the delivery of 10 million tons of oil to the USSR. This provision was especially important, as the Western powers had feared that the prolonged existence of major Soviet enterprises in Austria might undermine the country's independence. But surprisingly, one searches the treaty in vain for a clause on Austria's neutrality, this despite the country's neutralization being the price that had to be paid for the Soviet's willingness to join the Western allies in its signing. Neutrality was declared only afterwards in an act of national legislation. This was thanks to the Western powers, who insisted

[27] The official Swiss doctrine of neutrality of 26 November 1954, in *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Internationales Recht* (1957), 195–199. Also published in Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 113–117. On the relation between Swiss and Austrian neutrality, see Christian Jenny, *Konsensformel oder Vorbild? Die Entstehung der österreichischen Neutralität und ihr Schweizer Muster* (Bern: Haupt, 1995). For Soviet comments on draft declarations of Austria's neutrality, see Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 404–405.

[28] The minister of agriculture Franz Thoma was invited to the All-Union Agricultural Exhibit in July 1954. Ludwig Steiner, "Zur Außenpolitik der Zweiten Republik," in Erich Zöllner (ed.), *Diplomatie und Außenpolitik Österreichs* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1977), 169–187, 179.

that Austria's neutrality should only be enacted if self-chosen.[29] However, on the eve of the state treaty's signing, all four powers issued a joint declaration that they were willing to respect and honor Austria's neutral status.

Both the Soviet "green light" and the end-spurt towards the state treaty had come quite unexpectedly. Hitherto, a withdrawal from Austria had been obstructed mainly by the Soviet foreign minister,[30] whose advisors warned that an end of the Soviet armed presence "would give the country into the hands of the Americans."[31] This does not mean, however, that Molotov had been opposing mainstream Kremlin opinions that were pro-state treaty. It seems that his opinion *was* the mainstream until the end of 1954, and old "iron bottom," as Molotov was sometimes referred to, simply did not react quickly enough when the new leadership under Khrushchev changed its course in the Austrian question. After the treaty's successful conclusion, the Austrian solution and Molotov's alleged resistance against it came in handy in Khrushchev's subsequent power struggle to demote the experienced foreign minister and capture supremacy in foreign-policy issues.[32] Apparently, the new

---

[29] Kurt Steiner, "Negotiations for an Austrian State Treaty," in: Alexander L. George, Philip J. Farley and Alexander Dallin (eds.), U.*S.-Soviet Security Cooperation: Achievements, Failures, Lessons* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 46–82, 60.

[30] A. M. Aleksandrov-Agentov, *Ot Kollontai do Gorbacheva: Vospominaniia diplomata, sovetnika A.A. Gromyko* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1994), 53–54, 94–98; Zubok and Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*, 156–158; Gerald Stourzh, "Der österreichische Staatsvertrag in den weltpolitischen Entscheidungsprozessen des Jahres 1955," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Strategy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 965–995, 979–983. For an English version, see "The Austrian State Treaty and the International Decision Making Process in 1955," in *Austrian History Yearbook* 38 (2007), 208–228. The Soviet diplomat Vladimir Semenov claims that it was Khrushchev who, in 1954, dismissed withdrawing from Austria as being premature. Wladimir S. Semjonow, *Von Stalin bis Gorbatschow: Ein halbes Jahrhundert in diplomatischer Mission* (Berlin: Nicolai, 1995), 309. However, as of today, there is no documentary evidence for the accuracy of this claim.

[31] Pushkin, Il'ichev, Gribanov to Molotov, 27 November 1953, in Arkhiv vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Federatsii (hereafter: AVPRF), 066/35/137/28, 1–5. Cf. Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 298; Mueller, "Gab es eine verpasste Chance?," 119. On the following, see Roberts, *A Chance for Peace*, 42–43.

[32] Rostislav Sergeev, "Wie der Durchbruch in der österreichischen Frage erreicht wurde," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Policy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 195–204, 204. Khrushchev's and Mikoian's accusations against Molotov during the plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee, 11 July 1955, in Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv noveishei istorii (hereafter: RGANI), 2/1/159, 84–88; 2/1/176, 282–295. Cf. "Plenum Transcripts, 1955–1957," in *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 10 (1998), 34–60, 42–43; Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 454–461; Karner, Stelzl-Marx, Tschubarjan, *Die Rote Armee in Österreich: Dokumente*, 840–843. In the final reckoning with Molotov at the June 1957 plenum, Gromyko again brought up the charges against Molotov regarding the Austrian treaty. *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 10 (1998), 56. For the context, see Mark Kramer, "Declassified Materials from CPSU Central Committee Plenums: Sources, Con-

leader's readiness to withdraw from this Alpine country did not stem as much from Austrian as from inner-Soviet and international factors, as the social democratic state secretary in the Austrian Foreign Department at that time, Bruno Kreisky, cleverly assessed.[33] The state treaty and the neutralization of Austria were only possible due to a number of special factors. These included a perceived balance of forces between the East and West in the international sphere that was roughly equal, relative stability and low conflict intensity in the area, Austria's peripheral location between the two military blocs, the country's relatively small size, weakness, and passivity on the international stage.

By consenting to the state treaty and insisting on Austria's neutralization, the Soviet leaders were able to aim at various objectives: [34] Because denying the Austrian territory to the opposing alliance had been a goal in the policy of both superpowers since the beginning of the Cold War, the reciprocal withdrawal of forces under the condition of Austria's neutralization offered a classic solution.[35] In the nineteenth century, the neutralization of a weak territory that was strategically located between two major powers or blocs had been applied in many cases that were similar to postwar Austria, such as Switzerland, Belgium, and Luxemburg. By withdrawing reciprocally from such contested territories, recognizing their neutrality, and, thus, creating a strategic buffer, the great powers – France and Germany in the nineteenth century or the United States and the Soviet Union after World War II – chose to avoid further tensions that could escalate into a major conflagration.

---

text, Highlights," ibid., 7–25; and Vladislav Zubok, "CPSU Plenums, Leadership Struggles, and Soviet Cold War Politics," ibid., 28–33.

[33] Karl Molin, "The Supportive Observer: Sweden and the Austrian State Treaty 1955," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Policy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 397–415, 407. On the following, see Hanspeter Neuhold, "Der Staatsvertrag als Grundlage der österreichischen Außenpolitik," in Alois Mock, Ludwig Steiner, Andreas Khol (eds.), and Rainer Stepan (red.), *Neue Fakten zu Staatsvertrag und Neutralität* (Vienna: Politische Akademie, [1980]), 157–180, 161–162.

[34] For a discussion of the Soviet motives for ending their occupation of Austria, see also William L. Stearman, "An Analysis of Soviet Objectives in Austria," in Robert A. Bauer (ed.), *The Austrian Solution: International Conflict and Cooperation* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1982), 99–125. The most comprehensive analysis, based on Soviet archival material, is found in Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 450–485. Cf. Suppan et al., *The Austrian State Treaty*, here especially Aleksei Filitov, "The Post-Stalin Succession Struggle and the Austrian State Treaty," ibid., 121–143; Vojtech Mastny, "The Launching of the Warsaw Pact and Soviet Grand Strategy," ibid., 145–162.

[35] The classic alternative was either the creation of a militarized buffer zone, the division of the territory – an option that was rejected by both sides for different reasons – or a condominium, an option that had failed in the early Cold War years due to the interallied rift. Daniel Frei, *Dimensionen neutraler Politik: Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der internationalen Beziehungen* (Geneva: Institut Universitaire de Hautes Études Internationales, 1969), 28–47.

Furthermore, the Soviet readiness for withdrawing from Austria was very much increased by the integration of West Germany into the Atlantic alliance, a decision that was agreed upon by NATO members in the autumn of 1954 and in the process of being ratified. The French National Assembly had passed the Paris Treaty in December 1954, albeit by a narrow margin, the West German Bundestag approved it on 27 February 1955, and the French Senate followed in March. It seems unlikely that the Kremlin counted on fully preventing the ratification by means of signaling that neutrality might also open the way for Germany's reunification and demilitarization. Nevertheless, Soviet propaganda in early 1955 alluded to the theme, thus attempting to stir up resistance in Western Europe against West Germany's inclusion into NATO and to delay the implementation of its rearmament.[36]

By insisting on Austria's becoming neutral Khrushchev also managed to prevent it from following the neighboring FRG into the Atlantic alliance. This actually seems to have been the main reason for the Soviet urgency to solve the Austrian problem. Indeed, this was recognized by contemporaries: On 8 April 1955, US Ambassador Charles Bohlen wrote to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: "The chief immediate motivation of the Soviets in reopening the Austrian question is to endeavor to ensure neutralization of Austria in order to prevent military integration three western zones of Austria into NATO."[37] In the postwar decade, Austria had positioned itself on the Western side and was even treated by the United States as a "secret ally."[38] In the early 1950s, Soviet internal reports and political statements increasingly warned against the growing possibility of Austria being integrated into NATO's military

---

[36] Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 466–480. This issue has sparked dicussion among historians whether Khrushchev was ready to abandon the GDR and consent to a German reunification if the FRG declared itself neutral. This possibility is refuted by Stourzh. Cf. Bruno Thoß, "Modellfall Österreich? Der österreichische Staatsvertrag und die deutsche Frage 1954/55," in Bruno Thoß and Hans-Erich Volkmann (eds.), *Zwischen Kaltem Krieg und Entspannung. Sicherheits- und Deutschlandpolitik der Bundesrepublik im Mächtesystem der Jahre 1953–1956* (Boppard: Boldt, 1988), 93–136. Other authors avoid a clear answer, e.g. Rolf Steininger, "1955: The Austrian State Treaty and the German Question," in *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 3, no. 3 (1992), 494–522, 517; Michael Gehler, "'L'unique objectif des Soviétiques est de viser l'Allemagne.' Staatsvertrag und Neutralität 1955 als „Modell" für Deutschland?," in Thomas Albrich, Klaus Eisterer, Michael Gehler, and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Österreich in den Fünfzigern* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 1995), 259–297.

[37] Quoted in Günter Bischof, "The Making of the Austrian Treaty and the Road to Geneva," in idem and Saki Dockrill (eds.), *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 117–154, 139; 154.

[38] Stourzh, "The Origins of Austrian Neutrality," 40; Günter Bischof, "Österreich – ein „geheimer Verbündeter" des Westens?," in Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Österreich und die europäische Integration 1945–1993: Aspekte einer wechselvollen Entwicklung* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), 425–450; Günter Bischof, "'Austria looks to the West.' Kommunistische Putschgefahr, geheime Wiederbewaffnung und Westorientierung am Anfang der fünfziger Jahre," in Thomas Albrich, Klaus Eisterer, Michael Gehler, Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Österreich in den Fünfzigern* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 1995), 183–209.

planning.[39] As a result of the Allied occupation, the Western powers had been free to use the Western parts of the country for troop and supply transports between West Germany and Italy. With the FRG's full integration into the Atlantic alliance, opportunities like this became even more precious for the West. It was exactly at this moment, that the Kremlin agreed to a four-power withdrawal from Austria, thus forcing NATO transports between the Munich and Verona headquarters to make a considerable detour. It was clear that Austria's neutralization made life more difficult for the Atlantic alliance by driving a wedge between West Germany and Italy.[40]

In addition to disrupting the Western communication lines and forestalling western Austria's integration into NATO, the conclusion of the state treaty offered several positive side effects for the Kremlin on the international stage: In early 1955, the USSR had received further signals from the West that solving the Austrian problem was a precondition for a much-wanted summit with the Western powers – the first meeting of such kind since the end of the war. This summit later took place in the summer of the same year in Geneva.[41] The US president had kept his word and in May extended an invitation for a four-power conference. The Soviet concessions regarding Austria therefore made it easier for the Soviet leadership to leave the international isolation it had found itself in since the Cold War. Furthermore, a Soviet withdrawal from Austria seems to have been repeatedly demanded by Belgrade as a precondition for relaxing the tense Yugoslav-Soviet relationship.[42] On 13 May, Khrushchev announced his intention to go to Canossa and visit Stalin's old boogey man Tito. Besides straightening out relations with the Yugoslav leader, this initiative – like the Austrian one – would serve Khrushchev in undermining Molotov's position in the Kremlin.

---

[39] Valentin Falin, *Politische Erinnerungen* (Munich: Droemer Knaur, 1993), 321; Vladislav Zubok, *Soviet Intelligence and the Cold War: The "Small" Committee of Information, 1952–53*, Cold War International History Project Working Paper 4 (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 1992), 12.

[40] On the strategic context, see Bruno Thoß, "Festschreiben oder Auflockern der Blockkonfrontation? Der NATO-Beitritt der Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Kontext von Sicherheit und Entspannung," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Policy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 33–56.

[41] Thomas Angerer, "Frankreich und die Österreichfrage: Historische Grundlagen und Leitlinien 1945–1955" (PhD Thesis, Vienna, 1996), 354–355. Cf. idem, "Re-launching East-West Negotiations while Deciding West German Rearmament: France, the Paris Treaties, and the Austrian State Treaty 1954/55," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Policy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 265–334. On the Geneva summit, see Bischof, Dockrill, *Cold War Respite.*

[42] Arnold Suppan, "Jugoslawien und der österreichische Staatsvertrag," in idem, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Policy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 430–471.

Signing the Austrian treaty offered still more advantages for the Soviet Union: The postponement, prior to 1955, of the Soviet withdrawal from Austria had not only embarrassed Soviet diplomats on the international stage, but also increasingly strained Austrian-Soviet relations. Most economic enterprises that had been seized by the USSR in this country had turned from being assets to being financial burdens.[43] By giving a green light for the state treaty, Khrushchev not only got rid of this political and increasingly economic liability. As Khrushchev recalled, the improvements at the bilateral level were not the least of his aims when he pushed for a quick conclusion of the state treaty.[44]

Since turning Austria into a pro-communist state and Soviet ally had failed in 1945,[45] the state treaty plus neutrality formed the second best solution from the Soviet perspective. For the Kremlin, permanent neutrality opened the chance for improving Soviet-Austrian relations and, in addition, having a say in future Austrian international behavior. Since neutrality was explicitly mentioned in the Soviet-Austrian Moscow memorandum (albeit not in the state treaty, as mentioned above), it promised to provide the Kremlin a lever over this country's foreign policy – a lever that could be useful for distancing Austria from the West, in particular from its traditional postwar patron, the United States.

Last but not least, by creating a showcase of the benefits of neutrality, Khrushchev reinforced the Soviet attempts to undermine the pro-Atlantic consensus in Western Europe. The Austrian solution was thus part of the Soviet campaign for promoting neutrality in order to contain or dissolve NATO and other pro-Western blocs and to neutralize Western Europe and South Asia.[46] In order to make neutrality more attractive for other Western and pro-Western states, Soviet relations with neutral Austria were designed to serve as a "model for peaceful and mutually beneficial relations between states of different social systems," as was frequently claimed by Khrushchev and other Soviet voices.[47] Soviet leaders repeatedly drew

---

[43] Michail Prozumenščikov, "Nach Stalins Tod: Sowjetische Österreichpolitik 1953–1955," in Stefan Karner and Barbara Stelzl-Marx (eds.), *Die Rote Armee in Österreich: Beiträge* (Graz: Oldenbourg, 2005), 729–753.

[44] Nikita S. Khrushchev, *Vremia, liudi, vlast': Vozpominaniia* 2 (Moscow: Novosti, 1999), 211–220. A similar explanation was given by Khrushchev and Presidium member Anastas Mikoian during the plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee on 11 July 1955. Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 454–461; Karner, Stelzl-Marx, Tschubarjan, *Die Rote Armee in Österreich: Dokumente*, 840–843. For an English version, see Nikita Khrushchev, *The Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev III: Statesman 1953–1964*, ed. by Sergei Khrushchev (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007), 4–28.

[45] Mueller, "Stalin and Austria," 67–68; idem, *Die sowjetische Besatzung in Österreich*, 71–135.

[46] See below, pages 48–54. Cf. Harto Hakovirta, "The Soviet Union and the Varieties of Neutrality in Western Europe," in *World Politics* 35, no. 4 (1983), 563–585.

[47] Quoted in William Banks Bader, *Austria between East and West, 1945–1955* (Stanford: University Press, 1966), 208. See also, e.g., Sovremennik, "Das österreichische Beispiel," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 20 (1955), 6–8; S. Okhantsev, "An Example of Peaceful Coexistence," in *International Affairs*, no. 9 (1958), 85–86; L. Vidyasova, "An Impressive Example of Peaceful Coexistence," in

the attention of their foreign guests to Austria, which, by declaring neutrality "had given an excellent model, which by following would be beneficial for other people as well."[48] While the Austrian model, in Soviet eyes, should be imitated by as many Western states as possible, it seems to be one of the many ironic footnotes of the Cold War that the United States, in particular under the Kennedy administration, also envisaged Austria as functioning as a model – a model, however, that would work in the opposite direction, namely, attracting East European and nonaligned states and shaping their behavior.[49] Gerald Stourzh seems to have been the first historian to draw our attention to this type of Soviet propaganda, in which Austrian neutrality is praised as a model for other Western states.[50] This praise did not come without strings attached; its aim was to accomplish a certain goal. Khrushchev and his successors wanted to break states out of the Western bloc and to prevent others from entering. Therefore, they had to offer an acceptable alternative to them. Neutrality was meant as such an alternative. Soviet leaders also wanted their diplomatic initiatives to be successful and thus, needed them to be supported by Western countries as well. The neutral countries were expected to provide such helpful services by promoting communist proposals. Although neutrality underwent several changes during the next forty years as a consequence of the changing international environment, this approach proved highly serviceable.

For Austria, neutrality was the price to be paid for the Soviet willingness to join the West in signing the state treaty. When the country was offered the choice between the factual neutralization by foreign occupation or a declaration of permanent neutrality, it chose the latter. Solemnly adopted by the Austrian parliament on 26 October 1955, neutrality enabled the country to attain full sovereignty. This reflected the classical purpose of neutrality for neutral states, i.e. the realization and/or preservation of independence. However, as we shall see, being small and neutral turned out to be less attractive, easy and secure than Austrian leaders had imagined.

The signing of the treaty, which was ratified by all contracting parties by 27 July, and the Austrian declaration of neutrality were perceived by Khrushchev as his first

---

International Affairs, no. 8 (August 1960), 11–15; Speech by N.S. Khrushchev in Vienna, 30 June 1960, in *Druzhestvennyi vizit: Prebyvanie Predsedatel'ia Soveta Ministrov SSSR N.S. Khrushchëva v Avstriiskoi Respublike 30 iiuniia–6 iiulia 1960g.* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1960), 10; I.K. Kobliakov, G.G. Kuranov, and D.N. Mochalin, *SSSR v bor'be za nezavisimost' Avstrii* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1965), 166; I.G. Zhiriakov, *SSSR i Avstrija v 1945–1975 gody* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1982), 28.

[48] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 19 May 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, Pol. Berichte Moskau.

[49] Martin Kofler, *Kennedy und Österreich: Neutralität im Kalten Krieg* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2003), 26–27.

[50] Gerald Stourzh, "Grundzüge der österreichischen Außenpolitik, 1945–1960," in Anton Kolabek (ed.), *Österreichische Zeitgeschichte im Geschichtsunterricht* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1961), 185–211, 209. Cf. Sovremennik, "Österreichs Neutralität und ihre Bedeutung," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1955), 7–9.

major "victory" in foreign policy and duly celebrated by Soviet propaganda. It had been only in 1954 that Khrushchev had started to focus on foreign affairs. In his recollections, the inexperienced country bumpkin's "trip to Europe had been a success," and the Austrian state treaty was

> "a demonstration that we were capable of orienting ourselves in international affairs without Stalin's guidance and instructions. To put it in a more colorful way, in our international policy we had now changed from the short pants of boyhood into the trousers of grown men. Our successful debut was recognized not only in the USSR but in other countries as well, which was of great importance. We were feeling our strength."[51]

In the following months and years, Soviet propaganda would elevate the state treaty into a gem of détente and a cornerstone of Soviet-Austrian relations. In order to keep the memory alive and to engrave it into Austrian public consciousness, on the occasion of the anniversary of the signing of the state treaty the Kremlin sent annual congratulatory messages and Soviet media published articles about the happy event.[52] Kremlin leaders and propagandists would systematically claim that it was the USSR that had made the state treaty possible.[53] In bilateral meetings, Khrush-

---

[51] Khrushchev, *Memoirs III*, 15. Cf. Sergei N. Khrushchev, *Nikita Khrushchev and the Creation of a Superpower* (University Press: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 79; William Taubman, *Khrushchev: The Man: His Era* (London: Simon & Schuster Free Press, 2003), 349; 331; 333; 349.

[52] See, e.g., Telegram Mikoian to Schärf, 14 May 1965, in *Vneshniaia politika Sovetskogo Soiuza i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia 1965* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1966), 218: "The past decade shows convincingly that the state treaty and the policy of permanent neutrality satisfy the national interests of the Austrian people and other European peoples." Cf. "Das Jubiläum der österreichischen Neutralität," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1965), 9; S. Tarow, "20 Jahre Neutralitätspolitik," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 43 (1975), 23–24; G. Rozanov, "Austria: Twenty Years of Independent and Democratic Development," in *International Affairs,* no. 6 (June 1975), 66–72; Wjatscheslaw Jelagin, "Fundament der Neutralität," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 45 (1978), 8–9; Igor Melnikov, "Partner im Alpenland," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 7 (1980), 12–13; Lew Besymenski, "Belvedere, 25 Jahre später," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1980), 10–11.

[53] See, e.g. *Die Initiative der Sowjetunion brachte Österreich den Staatsvertrag: Dokumente und Materialien zum Abschluss des Staatsvertrages mit Österreich* (Vienna: Sowjetischer Informationsdienst, 1955); Sovremennik, "Das österreichische Beispiel," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 20 (1955), 6–8, "Gosudarstvennyi dogovor o vosstanovlenii nezavisimoi i demokraticheskoi Avstrii," in A.A. Gromyko, S. A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvosotov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 1, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1960), 403; V.N. Beletskii, *Sovetskii Soiuz i Avstriia* (Moscow: Institut Mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii, 1962), 132–240; I.K. Kobliakov, G.G. Kuranov, and D.N. Mochalin, *SSSR v bor'be za nezavisimost' Avstrii* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1965), 148; "Avstriia," in A.M. Prokhorov et al. (eds.), *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* 1, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia, 1970), 100; "Gosudarstvennyi dogovor o vosstanovlenii nezavisimoi i demokraticheskoi Avstrii," ibid. 7 (1972), 168; N. Polyanov, "Austria, Neutrality, Europe," in *International Affairs*, no. 9 (September 1973), 82–88, 84; A. A. Gromyko and B. N. Ponomarjow (eds.), *Geschichte der sowjetischen Außenpolitik 1945 bis 1976* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1978), 291. Cf. Ludwig Steiner, *Diplomatie – Politik: Ein Leben für Südtirol: Ein Leben für Österreich 1972–2007* (Bozen: Athesia, 2008), 351; Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 258.

chev repeatedly encouraged witnesses of the Soviet-Austrian state-treaty negotiations to testify the correctness of his thesis. When Austrian statements did not adopt the official Soviet version that the treaty had been concluded largely thanks to the Kremlin's efforts, the Soviets voiced their displeasure through official channels as well as the media.[54] Since it was the Soviet Union that had blocked the treaty prior to 1955, there was some truth to this claim. However, it was deeply unfair to assert that the Western powers had consistently boycotted the conclusion of a treaty; indeed, they had already agreed much earlier to sign one. Therefore, they were particularly displeased when Austrian leaders started to repeat the Soviet thesis.

This was only one of several changes in Austrian-Soviet and Austrian-Western relations, changes that Khrushchev seems to have hoped for. Even though the Soviet-Austrian honeymoon did not last long and certain tensions quickly arose, relations never again became as "icy" as they had been during the years of the Allied occupation of Austria.

The aim, sources and structure of this study

Austria was among the first to be an addressee of this kind of Soviet policy and became one of its most important models. Historian Timothy Snyder called the neutral state "perhaps the perfect creation" of its era.[55] The aim of this book is to contribute, by looking at the Soviet and Austrian interpretations of neutrality and the two countries' foreign policies and relations with one another during the years 1955–91, to the general knowledge about Soviet foreign policy in the détente period and the Cold War. General analyses of Soviet foreign policy usually do not dedicate much attention to small states,[56] nor do syntheses of the history of the Cold War waste many words on neutrality.[57] In their narratives, countries like Aus-

---

[54] See, e.g., Vorsprache des Gesandten Awramow, 11 May 1971, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 105.880-6/71, Z.111.835; Staribacher Diaries, 16–21 July 1976, in Stiftung Bruno Kreisky Archiv (hereafter: SBKA).

[55] Timothy Snyder, *The Red Prince: The Secret Lives of a Habsburg Archduke* (New York: Basic Books, 2008), 243.

[56] Cf., e.g., Adam B. Ulam, *Expansion and Coexistence: Soviet Foreign Policy 1917–73*, 2nd ed. (New York: Praeger, 1974); idem, *Dangerous Relations: The Soviet Union and World Politics, 1970–1982* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); Robin Edmonds, *Soviet Foreign Policy: The Brezhnev Years* (Oxford: University Press, 1983); Mastny, *The Cold War*; Zubok and Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War*; Geoffrey Roberts, *The Soviet Union in World Politics: Coexistence, Revolution, and Cold War, 1945–1991* (London: Routledge, 1999); Fursenko and Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War*; Vladislav Zubok, *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Svetlana Savranskaya and William Taubman, "Soviet Foreign Policy, 1962–1975," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War II: Crises and Détente* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010), 134–157.

[57] The same holds true with regard to recent syntheses of the history of the Cold War, e.g. John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: Penguin, 2005); Melvyn P. Leffler and

tria or Finland usually pop up in the discussion of certain historic events, such as the signing of the state treaty or the return of Porkkala, only to fall into oblivion immediately afterwards. In a recent article, historian Jussi Hanhimäki called the role of small-state neutrality "one of the less researched topics of the Cold War."[58] Understandably, the focus of most Cold War studies rests on the main features of the bipolar system, the big players and the hotspots of interbloc tension, as well as, increasingly, the various forms of intrabloc client-patron relationships, which were positioned between obedience and insubordination, support and brutal suppression. Nonetheless, during the Cold War neither small states nor neutrality were irrelevant, and Soviet-Austrian relations offer a case study for both.

It has been said that "it is rewarding when a bilateral state relationship of tertiary importance focuses our attention on fundamental questions of international relations."[59] This study shows that Austria – despite its small size – was given disproportionate Soviet attention in order to achieve the Soviet goals outlined above. Neutral Austria was not only a product of Soviet foreign policy; the USSR also attempted to exploit it as an instrument of foreign policy. The Kremlin used official statements and the media as well as certain privileges to encourage desired behavior in Austria and suppress unwanted, with the latter being depicted as at odds with neutrality.

By analyzing the Austrian example from the Soviet perspective, this book, secondly, intends to add to our understanding of the role of small states as objects and actors in the European international system in the Cold War.[60] In particular, if we want to better understand what constituted détente, we have to take into account the foreign relations of its small members on both sides of the Iron Curtain.[61]

Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: University Press, 2010). The massive, two-volume *Encyclopedia of the Cold War* contains neither articles on "neutralism" or "neutrality," nor on "nonalignment." Ruud van Dijk et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Cold War,* 2 vols. (New York: Routledge, 2008). A recent synthesis of the Cold War dedicates one chapter to the nonaligned movement. Bernd Stöver, *Der Kalte Krieg 1947–1991: Geschichte eines radikalen Zeitalters* (Munich: Beck, 2007), 110–116.

[58] Jussi M. Hanhimäki, "The Lure of Neutrality: Finland and the Cold War," in Klaus Larres and Kenneth Osgood (eds.), *The Cold War after Stalin's Death: A Missed Opportunity for Peace?* (Lanham: Rowland & Littlefield, 2006), 257–276, 257.

[59] Julie M. Newton, *Russia, France, and the Idea of Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2003), 1.

[60] August Schou and Arne Olav Brundtland (eds.), *Small States in International Relations*, Nobel Symposium 7 (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1971); Efraim Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States* (London: Routledge, 1988); Otmar Höll, "Kleinstaaten im Spannungsfeld von Autonomie und Abhängigkeit am Beispiel Österreichs" (Habil. Thesis, Vienna, 1989); James J. Sheehan, "What Does It Mean To Be Neutral? Postwar Austria from a Comparative Perspective," in Amir Eshel, Roland Hsu, Wolfgang Mueller, Arnold Suppan (eds.), *Austria and Central Europe Since 1989* (Vienna: forthcoming).

[61] For a history of détente, see Loth, *Overcoming the Cold War*; for recent research on its "European" roots, cf. idem and Georges-Henri Soutou, (eds.), *The Making of Détente: Eastern and Western Europe in the Cold War, 1965–1975* (London: Routledge, 2008).

While the small and neutral states, in order to increase their maneuvering room, were generally interested in a relaxed international climate, they, due to their lack of weight, were not able to "create" détente, but only to reinforce it. However, due to their small size and strong interest in détente they were often much quicker in establishing channels for East-West communication than the superpowers, which were generally less dependent on international exchange and more concerned about their prestige, the possible deceptiveness of the other side's initiatives, and the risks that détente or diplomatic failure might bring to the cohesion of their alliances.

Thirdly, this book will take a fresh look at certain key aspects of Austria's international relations and its shifting interpretation of neutrality.[62] It will argue that the drift in the direction of the Soviet understanding of neutrality was, at least in part, a consequence of the Kremlin's "carrot and stick" policy. Open Austrian criticism of Soviet actions disappeared from official Viennese statements, and Austrian governments – in accord with the Soviet neutrality doctrine – tended towards replacing a commitment to armed defense with their claim of achieving security through foreign policy activism.

To write this monograph, the first on this topic in English or another West European language to rely on Soviet sources, this author drew on a large body of Soviet and Western literature, including Soviet texts and Western research on Soviet theories concerning international law,[63] international relations in general[64] and

---

[62] An analysis of and agenda for research on Austria's neutrality is set forth in Thomas Angerer, "Für eine Geschichte der österreichischen Neutralität," in Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *The Neutrals and the European Integration, 1945–1995* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 702–708.

[63] Among Soviet works, see, e.g., F.I. Koschewnikow (ed.), *Völkerrecht* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1960); [D.B. Levin, and G.P. Kaliuzhnaia (eds.)], *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo* (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1964); *Drei sowjetische Beiträge zur Völkerrechtslehre* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1969); G.I. Tunkin, *Theory of International Law* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974). For a Western bibliography of Soviet works, see Boris Meissner (ed.), *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht 1917 bis 1962: Eine bibliographische Dokumentation* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1963); idem, Dietrich Frenzke, Erika Chilecki (eds.), *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht 1962 bis 1973: Bibliographie und Analyse* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1977). For Western analyses, see, e.g. Hans Kelsen, *The Communist Theory of Law* (New York: Praeger, 1955), 148–192; Edward McWhinney, *Peaceful Coexistence and Soviet-Western International Law* (Leyden: Sythoff, 1964); Hans Werner Bracht, *Ideologische Grundlagen der sowjetischen Völkerrechtslehre* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1964); Bernard A. Ramundo, *Peaceful Coexistence: International Law in the Building of Communism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967); Henn-Jüri Uibopuu, *Die sovjetische Doktrin der friedlichen Koexistenz als Völkerrechtsproblem* (Vienna: Notring, 1971); Richard J. Erickson, *International Law and the Revolutionary State: A Case Study of the Soviet Union and Customary International Law* (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1972); Dietrich Geyer (ed.), *Osteuropa-Handbuch Sowjetunion Außenpolitik III: Völkerrechtstheorie und Vertragspolitik* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1976).

[64] Among Soviet works, see, e.g., [O.W. Kuusinen et al.,] *Grundlagen des Marxismus-Leninismus* (Berlin: Dietz, 1960); W.I. Jegorow, *Friedliche Koexistenz und revolutionärer Prozess* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1972); Schalwa Sanakojew and Nikolai Kaptschenko, *Theorie der Au-*

neutrality in particular,[65] on Soviet political language and foreign propaganda, and on the Soviet foreign policy towards the European neutrals.[66] The research that has already been done on Austrian general foreign policy and its neutrality is quite sufficient for the purpose of this study.[67] Furthermore, there are useful Soviet and

---

ßenpolitik des Sozialismus (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1979). For Western analyses, see, e.g. Boris Meissner, "Die Entwicklungstendenzen in der sowjetischen außenpolitischen Theorie und Völkerrechtslehre 1962 bis 1973," in idem, Dietrich Frenzke, Erika Chilecki (eds.), *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht 1962 bis 1973: Bibliographie und Analyse* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1977), 9–58; Margot Light, *The Soviet Theory of International Relations* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988).

[65] Among Soviet works, see, e.g., L.A. Modzhorian, *Politika podlinnogo neitraliteta – vazhnyi factor bor'by narodov za mir i nezavisimost'* (Moscow: Znanie, 1956); B.V. Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet* (Moscow: Institut mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii, 1958); L.A. Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta* (Moscow: Znanie, 1962); B.V. Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1965); O.I. Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave* (Perm: Gosudarstvennyi universitet im. Gor'kogo, 1968); L.A. Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," in Grigory Tunkin (ed.), *Contemporary International Law: Collection of Articles* (Moscow: Progess, 1969), 216–232. For a bibliography of Soviet works, see Stelianos Scarlis, *Neutralität in Europa aus sowjetischer Sicht im Zeitalter der Entspannung: Die Rolle der neutralen Staaten Europas in der Außenpolitik der Sowjetunion 1969–1975* (Munich: Tuduv, 1984), 185–187. For Western analyses, cf. Heinz Fiedler, *Der sowjetische Neutralitätsbegriff in Theorie und Praxis: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Disengagement* (Cologne: Politik und Wirtschaft, 1959); P.H. Vigor, *The Soviet View of War, Peace, and Neutrality* (London: Routledge, 1975).

[66] E.g. Bo Huldt and Atis Lejins (eds.), *European Neutrals and the Soviet Union* (Stockholm: Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 1986); Scarlis, *Neutralität in Europa aus sowjetischer Sicht im Zeitalter der Entspannung*; Harto Hakovirta, *East-West Conflict and European Neutrality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); Bo Petersson, *The Soviet Union and Peacetime Neutrality in Europe: A Study of Soviet Political Language* (Stockholm: MH Publishing, 1990); Dominik Geppert and Udo Wengst (eds.), *Neutralität – Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005).

[67] E.g. E.N. Novosel'tsev, *Vneshniaia politika Avstrii* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1962); Thomas O. Schlesinger, *Austrian Neutrality in Postwar Europe: The Domestic Roots of a Foreign Policy* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1972); Konrad Ginther, *Neutralität und Neutralitätspolitik: Die österreichische Neutralität zwischen Schweizer Modell und sowjetischer Koexistenzdoktrin* (Vienna: Springer, 1975); Felix Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität* (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1975); Alfred Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität Österreichs* (Vienna: Geschichte und Politik, 1980); Renate Kicker, Andreas Khol, Hanspeter Neuhold (eds.), *Außenpolitik und Demokratie in Österreich: Strukturen – Strategien – Stellungnahmen* (Salzburg: Neugebauer, 1983); Manfried Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei: Die Große Koalition in Österreich 1945–1966* (Vienna: Bundesverlag, 1987); Reinhard Meier-Walser, *Die Außenpolitik der monocoloren Regierung Klaus in Österreich 1966–1970* (Munich: Tuduv, 1988); Michael Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik der Zweiten Republik: von der alliierten Besatzung bis zum Europa des 21. Jahrhunderts* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2005); Elisabeth Röhrlich, *Kreiskys Außenpolitik: Zwischen österreichischer Identität und internationalem Programm* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2009). For bibliographies on postwar Austrian foreign relations, see Lilly Behrmann, Peter Proché, and Wolfgang Strasser (eds.), *Bibliographie zur Außenpolitik der Republik Österreich seit 1945* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1974); Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 1175–1252.

Western studies concerning the bilateral Soviet-Austrian relations[68] and mutual perceptions.[69] However, in contrast to the considerable number of archival sources on the occupation period that have been made available since the partial opening of Russian archives, almost no Soviet documents on Soviet-Austrian relations after 1955 have been published.[70] It is therefore the aim of this book not only to base itself on the large corpus of Soviet and Western official and semi-official publications, speeches, and media, as for instance the Moscow *New Times* and *International Affairs* (with the Soviet press seen as expressing an official point of view[71]), available scholarly literature as well as eyewitness accounts[72] of former

---

[68] Viktor N. Beletskii, *Sovetskii Soiuz i Avstriia: Bor'ba Sovetskogo Soiuza za vozrozhdenie nezavisimoi i demokraticheskoi Avstrii i ustanovlenie s nei druzhestvennykh otnoshenii 1938–1960gg.* (Moscow: Institut Mezhdunarodnykh otnoshenii, 1962); Hedwig Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich: Ein Beispiel für Beziehungen der friedlichen Koexistenz 1955–1965" (PhD Thesis, Halle, 1967). Glasneck's description is based "on Marxist-Leninist principles" (ibid., iv) and therefore cannot be considered balanced in its interpretation. For a Soviet account, see I.G. Zhiriakov, *SSSR i Avstrija v 1945–1975 gody* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1982) and idem, *Sovetskii Soiuz – Avstriia: Na puti k sozdaniiu obshcheevropeiskogo doma* (Moscow: Akademiia obshchestvennykh nauk TsK KPSS, 1991). From the factographical point of view, these works have proved mostly reliable. See also Hanspeter Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," in Bo Huldt and Atis Lejins (eds.), *European Neutrals and the Soviet Union* (Stockholm: Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 1986), 83–118; Heike Malicek, "Die Beziehungen Österreich-Sowjetunion 1945 bis 1975: Ein pragmatisches Verhältnis" (MA Thesis, Vienna, 1995); Ludmilla Lobova, "Die Außenpolitik und Neutralität Österreichs aus Sicht der UdSSR 1955–1972," in Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *The Austrian State Treaty 1955: International Strategy, Legal Relevance, National Identity* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 891–922; and N. M. Bogoliubova and Iu. V. Nikolaeva, Russko-avstriiskie kul'turnye sviazi v XVIII–XXI vv. (St. Petersburg: SPbKO, 2010).

[69] Monika Reitinger, "Österreich in den Augen der Sowjetliteratur nach 1945" (PhD Thesis, Vienna, 1969); Evelina Merhaut-Gurevitsch, "Die Innen- und Außenpolitik Österreichs in der sowjetischen Presse 1954–1961" (MA Thesis, Vienna, 1995); Ruth Stifter, "Das politische Österreichbild in der sowjetischen Berichterstattung vom Beginn der Zweiten Republik bis zum Zusammenbruch der UdSSR" (MA Thesis, Vienna, 1998); Ludmilla Lobova, "Die Moskauer Perzeption politischer, ökonomischer und sozialer Entwicklungen in Österreich in den 1980er und 90er Jahren," in Oliver Rathkolb, Otto Maschke, and Stefan Lütgenau (eds.), *Mit anderen Augen gesehen: Internationale Perzeptionen Österreichs 1955–1990*, Österreichische Nationalgeschichte 2 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2002), 91–160.

[70] Hans Mayrzedt and Waldemar Hummer (eds.), *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik 1955–1975*, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Außenpolitik Schriftenreihe 9 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1976); Ministerium für auswärtige Angelegenheiten der UdSSR (ed.), *UdSSR – Österreich 1938–1979* (Moscow: Novosti, 1980).

[71] On the Soviet press in the Cold War, see Jeffrey Brooks, *Thank you, Comrade Stalin! Soviet Public Culture from Revolution to Cold War* (Princeton: University Press, 2001); Martin Ebon, *The Soviet Propaganda Machine* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987).

[72] For memoirs of Soviet diplomats and political actors, see, e.g., A. M. Aleksandrov-Agentov, *Ot Kollontai do Gorbacheva: Vospominaniia diplomata, sovetnika A.A. Gromyko* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1994); Georgy Arbatov, *The System: An Insider's Life in Soviet Politics* (New York: Times Books, 1992); Anatoly Dobrynin, *In Confidence: Moscow's Ambassador to*

political and diplomatic actors, but also to draw on internal political documents stored in the Archive of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation (in particular the Third European Department of the Foreign Ministry which was responsible for dealing with German speaking countries), the former party archives of the CPSU, now the Russian State Archives of Contemporary History, the archives of the Gorbachev Foundation, the Austrian State Archives, and the Bruno Kreisky Archive.

The archival situation in Russia and Austria confronts the researcher with a number of problems. At the time this manuscript was completed, neither the papers of Khrushchev and Brezhnev, nor of the CPSU Central Committee's Foreign Department had been fully declassified. While the archives of the Russian Foreign Ministry and the Gorbachev Foundation do allow access to certain documents from the 1960s to the 1990s, search aids at the Foreign Ministry do not give the researcher a clear overview of what is available and what not. In Austria, the documents of the Political Department of the Foreign Ministry (upon which the "Austrian perspective" of the first two parts of this study is mainly based) and of the Council of Ministers have been transferred to the State Archives, but only for the years up to 1977. Copies of documents from the remaining period were acquired from the Bruno Kreisky Archive (covering the years up to 1983) and from published sources, in particular the *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Außenpolitik*. Unfortunately, the papers of the Bureau of International Law of the Austrian Foreign Ministry have not yet been transferred to the State Archives. The US perspective, as the view of the leading Western power, has been deduced from published documents. Due to the above-mentioned archival restrictions, some conclusions that are drawn in this volume are therefore preliminary, inasmuch as not all documents are declassified. However, the ground is solid enough for making quite well-based theses, and the general interpretation is unlikely to be changed fundamentally by any records that are released in the future. All quotations from languages other than English

---

America's Six Cold War Presidents 1962–1986 (New York: Times Books, 1995); Valentin Falin, *Politische Erinnerungen* (Munich: Droemer Knaur, 1993); Nikita Khrushchev, *Memoirs of Nikita Khrushchev III: The Statesman, 1953–1964*, ed. by Sergei Khrushchev (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007); Anastas I. Mikoian, *Tak bylo: Razmyshleniia o minuvshem* (Moscow: Vagrius, 1999). For memoirs of Austrian ambassadors in Moscow, see Heinrich Haymerle, "Die Beziehungen zur Großmacht im Osten," in Erich Bielka, Peter Jankowitsch, Hans Thalberg (eds.), and Reinhold Wagnleitner (red.), *Die Ära Kreisky: Schwerpunkte österreichischer Außenpolitik* (Vienna: Europaverlag, 1983), 143–193; Otto Eiselsberg, *Erlebte Geschichte 1917–1997* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1997); Herbert Grubmayr, "In zwei Wochen gehst Du nach Moskau," in *Demokratie und Geschichte* (1999), 127–154; idem, "Streiflichter aus meiner Moskauer Zeit," in Alfred Stirnemann and Gerhard Wilflinger (eds.), *Russland und Österreich*, Pro Oriente XXIII (Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1999), 258–277; Gerald Hinteregger, "Erinnerungen an Moskau 1978–1981," ibid., 244–257; idem, *Im Auftrag Österreichs: Gelebte Außenpolitik von Kreisky bis Mock* (Vienna: Amalthea, 2008); Friedrich Bauer, *Russische Umbrüche: Von Gorbatschow über Jelzin zu Putin* (Graz: Vehling, n.D.).

have been translated by the author of this book. The system of transliteration from Cyrillic used in this volume is that of the Library of Congress, without diacritics.

Taking into account political, economic and cultural relations, personal contacts, and mutual perceptions (as far as they are decipherable from the media and a handful of opinion polls), this volume, inspired by the methods of New International History,[73] aims at providing the reader with a comprehensive picture of various layers of international relations. Due to archival restrictions, the area of Soviet secret service activities in Austria had to be excluded from the project. In order to fully comprehend the Soviet-Austrian relationship and the role neutrality played in it, the author of this study has deemed it particularly important to complement the method with relevant aspects of ideology as well as both countries' theories of international law, factors that were especially important for Soviet foreign policy. Despite the declared primacy of internal affairs for the Marxist-Leninist doctrine and despite the influence that historic, power-political, and geostrategic factors doubtlessly exerted on Soviet behavior, the communist ideology played a fundamental role in shaping Soviet perceptions and foreign policy as well as providing its inward and outward justification. The "scientific" teachings of Marxism-Leninism made Soviet foreign policy, as its leaders always proudly emphasized, "unlike any other."[74] This is not to say that ideology left no space for pragmatism and realpolitik: While creating a system of beliefs, defining long-term goals and interpreting the outside world according to the "laws of historic materialism," Marxism-Leninism offered a set of rules for Soviet foreign policy that was, to a certain extent, flexibly applicable and regularly updated. The belief in the ultimate victory of communism never closed Soviet leaders' eyes to the possibility of alliances with noncommunists, tactical retreats and temporary compromises. Western compromising, in contrast, was generally depicted as a sign of the imminent decline of capitalism. Due to the principle that any gain for the USSR was a success for socialism, ideology was always used with regard to Soviet power interests.[75]

---

[73] See, e.g. Wilfried Loth and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Internationale Geschichte: Themen – Ergebnisse – Aussichten* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2000); Eckart Conze, Ulrich Lappenküper, and Guido Müller (eds.), *Geschichte der internationalen Beziehungen: Erneuerung und Erweiterung einer historischen Disziplin* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2004); Hans-Christof Kraus and Thomas Nicklas (eds.), *Geschichte der Politik: Alte und Neue Wege,* Historische Zeitschrift Beihefte 44 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2007). For a classic study of bilateral relations, see Arnold Suppan, *Jugoslawien und Österreich 1918–1938: Bilaterale Außenpolitik im europäischen Umfeld* (Vienna: Oldenbourg, 1996); on methods, see 21–23.

[74] Vojtech Mastny, "Soviet Foreign Policy, 1953–1962," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War I: Origins* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010), 312–333, 312.

[75] Boris Meissner, "Triebkräfte und Faktoren sowjetischer Außenpolitik," in idem and Gotthold Rhode, *Grundfragen sowjetischer Außenpolitik* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970), 9–40, 15. On the role of ideology in the Cold War and the relation between ideology and foreign policy in the Soviet Union, see Mark Kramer, "Ideology and the Cold War," in Michael M. Cox (ed.), *Twentieth*

Although Soviet experts of international law claimed the opposite,[76] the same can be said with regard to the development of the Soviet theory of international law – a theory that, due to its politically motivated inconsistencies, consistent anti-Western bias and one-sided self-praise, was regarded by some Western observers as lacking most of the characteristics that define legal analysis.[77] In the USSR, the theory of international law was and had for the most part been shaped by ideology and the aim of serving foreign policy. Since from time to time the revolutionary state was forced to enter agreements with noncommunist states and governments, the Marxist-Leninist theory of international law could not flatly deny the rules of the bourgeois world. In contrast to the Western understanding, however, international law was seen in the USSR as reflecting the balance of economic power and as serving the ruling classes by legally underpinning the "class struggle in the international arena."[78] In order to best advance Soviet political interests in a chang-

---

Century International Relations 2: The Rise and Fall of the Cold War (London: Sage, 2008), 26–68. For a classic view of the role of ideology in Soviet foreign policy, cf. Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, *Ideology and Power in Soviet Politics* (New York: Praeger, 1962). Among recent works, see Gabriel Gorodetsky, "The Formulation of Soviet Foreign Policy: Ideology and Realpolitik," in idem (ed.), *Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917–1991: A Retrospective* (London: Frank Cass, 1994), 30–44; Nigel Gould-Davis, "Rethinking the Role of Ideology in International Politics during the Cold War," in *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1, no. 1 (1999), 90–109; Nikolaus Katzer, "Ideologie und Pragmatismus in der sowjetischen Außenpolitik," in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, no. 1–2 (2009), 3–10; David C. Engerman, "Ideology and the Origins of the Cold War, 1917–1962," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War I: Origins* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010), 20–43.

[76] "Together with the growth of the forces of peace, which stand up for the strict observance of the principles and norms of international law, the influence of international law on the foreign policy and diplomacy of states increases." „Mit dem Anwachsen der Friedenskräfte, die für die strikte Einhaltung der Prinzipien und Normen des Völkerrechts eintreten, erhöht sich der Einfluss des Völkerrechts auf die Außenpolitik und die Diplomatie der Staaten." G. I. Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1963), 190.

[77] Eberhard Menzel, "Vorwort des deutschen Herausgebers," in F.I. Koschewnikow (ed.), *Völkerrecht* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1960), xi–xxvii, xvi.

[78] D.B. Lewin, and G.P. Kaljushnaja (eds.), *Völkerrecht* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1967), 16. Among Western analyses, cf. Meissner, *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht*, 22–25; 33. See also Erickson, *International Law*, 1–26; Theodor Schweisfurth, "Entwicklung und ideologische Grundlagen der sowjetischen Völkerrechtstheorie," in Dietrich Geyer (ed.), *Osteuropa-Handbuch Sowjetunion Außenpolitik III: Völkerrechtstheorie und Vertragspolitik* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1976), 27–48, 47. For further literature on the Soviet theory of international relations, see above, footnote 64. For the "class character" of international law, see [E.A. Korowin,] "Begriff, Quellen und System des Völkerrechts," in F.I. Koschewnikow (ed.), *Völkerrecht* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1960), 1–20, 2–5. Kelsen, *The Communist Theory of Law*, 150, argues that "international law, in itself, is perfectly neutral with respect to the struggle of classes within the state subjects of this law and that, consequently, international law, guaranteeing state-domination of any kind, has in itself no class character at all. Just because international law is no class law in any sense of this term, the Soviet Government – and, following their government, the legal scientist – finally recognized the existing international law as a normative order […]."

ing environment and to justify the Kremlin's oft contradictory actions, the Soviet theory of international law, too, had to be regularly adjusted. This also applied to the Soviet view of neutrality, which will be put into the context of Soviet-Austrian relations.

The narrative of this volume mainly follows a chronological approach. The first five years, from the signing of the state treaty until Khrushchev's visit to Austria, outlined in Part I, are seen as a formative period in the Soviet attitude towards neutrality and Soviet-Austrian relations. The first chapter compares the Soviet and the Austrian concepts of neutrality as they emerged in the 1950s. While the Soviet Union was interested in defining neutrality in a manner that was as all-encompassing as possible, Austria initially confined it to mere nonparticipation in military alliances. Despite such disagreements, bilateral relations were established that were demonstratively friendly. The Hungarian revolution of 1956 and the resulting Soviet crackdown on it, which occurred in Austria's closest neighborhood, put bilateral relations to a hard test and ushered in a process that would finally lead to an Austrian reinterpretation of neutrality, a reinterpretation that was provoked, not only a little, by Soviet policy and, in particular, its criticism of Austria's implementation of neutral policy.

The following period, from 1961 to 1972, depicted in Part II, was dominated by Soviet-Austrian quarrels over (a) the Austrian wish to become part of West European integration and (b) the Soviet hope that Austria would initiate one of the Soviet Union's dearest détente projects – a conference on European security that, in the Soviet view, would rubberstamp the postwar status quo with regard to communist rule over Eastern Europe and East Germany and loosen the transatlantic bonds of Western Europe as well as the cohesion of NATO. Although neither wish was fulfilled, amicable Soviet-Austrian relations were nevertheless preserved despite the second major Soviet military intervention in Austria's neighborhood: the Warsaw Pact's crackdown on the "Prague Spring" of 1968. This will be dealt with in a separate chapter in Part II. In this context, the Eastern military alliance's war planning from the late 1950s to the 1980s with regard to Austria as well as the Soviet attitude towards Austria's armed defense will also be discussed.

After both the EEC and the conference issues were resolved in 1972–73 (the first by Austria's free-trade agreement with the Common Market, the second by the convening of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the CSCE), bilateral relations entered the decade delineated in Part III that was defined, on one hand, by a dropping Soviet interest in having its projects promoted by neutrals as well as in promoting neutrality itself, and, on the other hand, by the foreign policy activism of Austrian chancellor Bruno Kreisky, which was devised to enhance his country's international reputation, security, and maneuvering space. Paradoxical as it may seem, although the détente of the 1970s saw a reduction in Austria's importance as an international mediator for Soviet diplomacy and as a supplier of Western goods on the Soviet market, it also marked, in Austria's understanding of

neutrality, a further drift towards the more all-embracing Soviet interpretation. This was at least in part a consequence of the events of 1968.

The Gorbachev years saw a reversal of some of these developments. While the final peak of the Cold War (had it lasted longer) might have brought about a revival of Austria's mediatory importance for the Soviet Union, the Cold War's end set the seal on the decline of the special relationship between the two countries. At the same time, the neutral discontinued respecting Soviet reservations about European integration and applied for EC membership.