I. LAYING THE GROUNDWORK AND CHANGING NEUTRALITY, 1955–1960

"Neutrality is rather like virginity. Everybody starts off with it, but some lose it quicker than others, and some do not lose it at all. Unlike virginity, however, neutrality once lost can sometimes be recovered, albeit with difficulty." Roderick Ogley, *The Theory and Practice of Neutrality in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1970), 1.

1. Two Differing Concepts of Neutrality

In Western theory and practice, neutrality is defined as a state of nonparticipation in war, including the refusal to lend the own territory to foreign military, and of impartiality towards belligerent countries.[1] Until World War II, the main focus rested on classical, wartime neutrality, as codified in the Hague Conventions of 1907.[2] According to these documents, belligerents are obliged to refrain from attacking or using neutral territory, while the neutral state is to abstain from joining the war except for self-defense; to prevent belligerents from entering, crossing, or using neutral territory for military purposes; to refrain from supporting any belligerent; and to treat belligerents equally (except in economic matters).[3]

In the second half of the twentieth century, as a consequence of the waning acceptance of the "right to war" in international law on one hand, and the permanence of the Cold War on the other, permanent neutrality, as it had been adopted by Switzerland in 1815 and by Austria in 1955, garnered more interest. If in peacetime a country commits itself to observe neutrality in future wars, it may issue a declaration of permanent neutrality – an act that can happen either in the context of an international settlement (as in the case of Switzerland) or solely through a unilateral declaration of will (as was the case in Austria). In wartime, a permanently neutral state bears roughly the same obligations as any other wartime neutral.[4] In peacetime, a permanent neutral must not start a war, although it is obliged to prepare for self-defense. Furthermore, a permanent neutral shall maintain a discretionary "neutral policy," i.e. refrain from any action that might draw it into a conflict or restrict its neutrality during a future war.[5] In particular, it may not join a military alliance,

---

[1] On the history and Western theory of neutrality, see Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 7–44; Hans Haug, *Neutralität und Völkergemeinschaft* (Zurich: Polygraphischer Verlag, 1962); Michael Schweizer, *Dauernde Neutralität und europäische Integration* (Vienna: Springer, 1977), 95–103; Karsh, *Neutrality and Small States*, 13–30; Michael Gehler, *Finis Neutralität? Historische und politische Aspekte im europäischen Vergleich: Irland, Finnland, Schweden, Schweiz und Österreich*, Center for European Integration Studies Discussion Paper C 92 (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 2001), 3–29.

[2] Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 118–133.

[3] Gerhard Hafner, "Österreichs Neutralität 1955–2005," in Thomas Olechowski (ed.), *Fünfzig Jahre Staatsvertrag und Neutralität* (Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 2006), 15–44, 24.

[4] Boleslaw A. Boczek, "The Conceptual and Legal Framework of Neutrality and Nonalignment in Europe," 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), 1–42, 8; on the following, see also 9–16.

[5] Schweitzer, *Dauernde Neutralität*, 111–145.

permit the establishment of foreign military bases on its soil, or take on any (political, military, or economic) obligation that might render it impossible to maintain neutrality in a future war. In their entirety, such "secondary obligations" or "anticipatory effects" of permanent neutrality in peacetime were, however, never internationally codified, ill-defined and, therefore, subject to diverging interpretations and conflicting views. While most Western experts argued that such obligations had to be interpreted restrictively so that acts of prudence were not turned into legal duty, other actors indeed were interested in or contributed to making such acts obligatory.

In the wake of the Cold War and the decolonization process, the phenomena of neutralism and nonalignment emerged. Like the European permanent neutrals, the nonaligned states, mainly in South Asia, Africa, and Latin America, were not to join military alliances with any of the two big Cold War blocs or allow foreign military bases on their soil. Since neutralism was, in contrast to permanent neutrality, not an institute of international law but merely an orientation of foreign policy, such pledges were, however, not legally binding.[6] The nonaligned, including small European states such as Yugoslavia and Malta, aimed at not getting involved in the Cold War. In contrast to the Western concept of permanent neutrality, however, their nonalignment did not apply to regional military alliances. In addition, the nonaligned states vowed to support the decolonization struggle of the Third World and actively contribute to the spread of disarmament and coexistence. While they strove for equal distance, not only between the military alliances, but also between the ideologies of the Western and the communist world and their societal, political, and economic systems, some of them turned out to be much more critical of the West than of the Soviet bloc[7] and refrained from making the commitment of remaining neutral in the case of war.

---

[6] For a brief comparison of permanent neutrality and nonalignment, see Hanspeter Neuhold, "Permanent Neutrality and Nonalignment: Similarities and Differences," in Robert A. Bauer (ed.), *The Austrian Solution: International Conflict and Cooperation* (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia, 1982), 161–204, esp. 174, 180; Daniel Frei, *Neutrality and Non-Alignment: Convergencies and Contrasts* (Zurich: Forschungsstelle politische Wissenschaft, 1979); Jens Hacker, "Neutralität, Neutralismus und Blockfreiheit," in *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, no. 18 (1983), 3–20. Cf. on neutralism and nonalignment Peter Lyon, *Neutralism* (Leicester: University Press, 1963); Peter Willetts, *The Non-Aligned Movement: The Origins of a Third World Alliance* (London: Pinter, 1982); Paul Luif, "Neutralität – Neutralismus – Blockfreiheit: Ideologien und Interessen," in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 8, no. 3 (1979), 269–285; Karl E. Birnbaum, and Hanspeter Neuhold (eds.), *Neutrality and Non-Alignment in Europe*, Laxenburg Papers 4 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1981).

[7] Boczek, "Conceptual and Legal Framework," 18.

The Soviet attitude towards neutrality

When Khrushchev decided that Austria should become a "life-size test of neutrality,"[8] he relied on a concept relatively fresh in postwar Soviet foreign-policy thinking. In Marxism-Leninism, the general attitude towards neutrality was defined by the theory of class struggle, a permanent conflict of historical dimensions taking place in all societies of the world between the proletariat, supported by "progressive," i.e. socialist, forces, and reactionary ones, the bourgeoisie. Until the final victory of socialism was achieved, this struggle would not allow any sort of indifference. Any person not supportive of the proletariat was by definition a bourgeois or "class enemy." Neutrality was often depicted by Marxists as camouflage, a cover-up for the neutral's preference for bourgeois forces. In a similar vein, Frederick Engels attacked neutral Switzerland's authorities for cracking down on exiled revolutionaries, thus giving in to the demands of the foreign reaction.[9] In his "Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists," written during World War I, Lenin stated that neutrality was merely a "bourgeois deception or hypocrisy, that in fact it means passive submission to the bourgeoisie and to such of its particularly disgusting undertakings as imperialist war."[10]

Once the Bolsheviks had taken power in Russia, the Marxist-Leninist attitude towards neutrality was influenced by Soviet state interests. This applied not only to (a) the Soviet interpretation of what duties neutrality comprised. As we shall see soon,[11] in Soviet theory and practice, neutrality meant different things at different times, and its content was redefined several times according to the political aims of the USSR. The "highly changeable character of Soviet views on neutrality"[12] also applied to (b) whether the USSR welcomed or promoted the neutrality of a particular state at a particular time. If neutrality was good or evil from the Soviet perspective depended on the side exercising it, the specific circumstances under which it was declared, and its effect on the fate of communism.[13] In the case of a war between two imperialistic powers, the neutrality of a socialist state was con-

---

[8] Thomas M. Verclytte, "Austria between East and West," in N.I. Egorova and A.O. Chubar'ian (eds.), *Kholodnaia voina i politika razriadki: diskussionnye problemy* 1 (Moscow: Institut Vseobshchei Istorii Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, 2003), 103–116, 104.

[9] Engels, "Political Position of the Swiss Republic," [1853], 90–92.

[10] V.I. Lenin, "Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists in the Swiss Social Democratic Party," [1916], in idem, *Collected Works* 23, 4th English edition (Moscow: Progress, 1964), 137–148, 144.

[11] See below, pages 56–67, 205–207, 246–248.

[12] Petersson, *The Soviet Union and Peacetime Neutrality*, 111. Cf. Harto Hakovirta, "East-West Tensions and Soviet Politics of European Neutrality," in Bengt Sundelius (ed.), *The Neutral Democracies in the New Cold War* (Boulder: Westview, 1987), 198–217.

[13] "One must not decide, once and for all, that neutrality in general, or of this or that particular country is good or bad. It all depends on the concrete historical circumstances. Under contemporary historical conditions, as they emerged after World War II, the main criterion for evaluating neutrality is the neutral state's attitude towards supporting the cause of peace and the prevention of war." Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 8.

sidered possible. If a war was revolutionary, defensive, or a war of liberation, and therefore according to Lenin "just," no type of neutrality was justifiable.[14] In such a case, all countries had to decide whether to be friend or foe.

The changing Soviet attitude towards neutrality can be traced through several decades. After the revolution, when the existence of Soviet Russia was endangered by the armed intervention of capitalist powers, the Marxist-Leninist attention shifted somewhat from wartime to peacetime (i.e. permanent) neutrality and the prestige of such neutrality improved. With an eye on the weakness of Soviet Russia and its perception of the threat of capitalist "encirclement," every neighbor that stepped out of the *cordon sanitaire* and declared itself neutral vis-à-vis the Bolshevik state was regarded a gain. When in 1920 some of Soviet Russia's newly independent neighbors, such as Lithuania and Estonia, showed interest in strengthening their independence by declaring neutrality, the Kremlin readily accepted.[15] Similarly, the Copenhagen agreement of the same year between Soviet Russia and Austria on the repatriation of prisoners of World War I stipulated Austria's neutrality in the Polish-Soviet war.[16]

In the interwar years, the USSR continued to aim at weakening the capitalist camp by concluding agreements of neutrality and nonaggression with bourgeois countries, such as Afghanistan, China, Finland, Iran, Turkey and others. It has been argued that, from the Soviet point of view, nonaggression was not the objective in any of these treaties:[17] On one hand, such pledges could be torn up as soon as an invasion took place, on the other, no sane human being would expect a tiny country like Estonia to attack its huge neighbor on its own. Therefore the real meaning of these treaties was rather the declaration that these countries would neither join alliances hostile to the Soviet state, nor allow foreign troops to use their soil as a base against the motherland of communism. For this reason, peacetime neutrality was hailed by Stalin as a guarantee against foreign aggression, and the respective treaties on neutrality and nonaggression were praised as a "weapon in our fight for the destruction of the imperialistic states' front against the USSR."[18]

This, however, did not change the utilitarian Soviet attitude towards neutrality as exercised by capitalist states: From 1939 to 1941 the Soviet Union provided Nazi Germany's war effort with raw material and also violated the neutrality agreements with Finland, the Baltic republics and Iran by attacking or occupying these states.

---

[14] Light, *The Soviet Theory of International Relations*, 229–237.

[15] Heinz Fiedler, "Politische Verträge mit westlichen Staaten und Entwicklungsländern," in Dietrich Geyer (ed.), *Osteuropa-Handbuch Sowjetunion Außenpolitik III: Völkerrechtstheorie und Vertragspolitik* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1976), 194–223, 195–197.

[16] Mueller and Leidinger, "Tiefes Misstrauen – begrenztes Interesse: Die österreichisch-sowjetischen Beziehungen 1918 bis 1955," 75.

[17] Vigor, *The Soviet View*, 184–186.

[18] "Neitralitet," in O. Iu. Shmidt et al. (eds.), *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* 41 (Moscow: OGIZ, 1939), 487–489, 488.

At the same time, Soviet propaganda castigated the "nonintervention" policy of the West during the Spanish Civil War as some "sort of special, unarmed participation in the war."[19] According to this interpretation, countries that declared themselves neutral during World War II, such as Switzerland, Sweden and Turkey, in Soviet eyes supported the enemy's war effort.[20] An exception was Japan, whose neutrality benefited the Soviet Union. In 1945, not only the USSR, but many nations were critical of the European neutrals for their behavior during the war and thus of neutrality in general. In the aftermath of World War II, neutrality was deemed incompatible with UN membership by many members and legal experts.[21] It was even considered to include a passage banning neutrality into the Charter of the United Nations, and the Soviet representative delayed the Portuguese accession to this organization with reference to this country's wartime neutrality.[22]

Another kind of neutrality had emerged in Soviet wartime plans. These assigned to each of the great powers several European countries as a sphere of influence. Between these spheres, a neutral buffer zone consisting of Denmark, Germany, Austria, Switzerland and Italy was to be created.[23] In this case, belonging to this zone was not a matter of permanent neutrality chosen by a sovereign state, but rather a consequence of great power politics. However, the Cold War and the formation of two blocs made neutrality virtually impossible. Zhdanov's doctrine of the "two camps," launched in 1947 by Stalin's mouthpiece, left little space between the blocs. Apparently, the Soviet leader did not consider neutrality feasible between the opposing powers; especially small states would ultimately gravitate to one or the other emerging bloc.[24] The most prominent examples of small, permanently neutral states in Europe, Sweden and Switzerland, were repeatedly attacked by Soviet propaganda for allegedly following NATO, and their neutrality was accused of being "camouflage."[25]

---

[19] Ibid., 487.

[20] "Neitralitet," in A. Ia. Vyshinskii (ed.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 1st ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1950), 230–234, 232. Cf. George Ginsburgs, "Neutrality and Neutralism and the Tactics of Soviet Diplomacy," in *The American Slavic and East European Review* 19, no. 4 (1960), 531–560, 534–537.

[21] O.I. Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave* (Perm: Gosudarstvennyi universitet im. Gor'kogo, 1968), 59.

[22] Menzel, "Vorwort," xxii.

[23] Memorandum, Litvinov to Molotov, 11 January 1945, in G.P. Kynin and J. Laufer (eds.), *SSSR i Germanskii vopros 1941–1949: Dokumenty iz arkhiva vneshnei politiki* 1 (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1996), 595–597.

[24] Vladislav Zubok, "The Soviet Attitude towards European Neutrals during the Cold War," in Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Die Neutralen und die europäische Integration 1945–1995* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 29–43, 32.

[25] Quoted in Hans Rudolf Fuhrer, "Neutral zwischen den Blöcken: Österreich und die Schweiz," in Manfried Rauchensteiner (ed.), *Zwischen den Blöcken: NATO, Warschauer Pakt und Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 193–252, 247. Cf. Denise Bindschedler-Robert, "Völkerrecht und Neu-

Between 1950 and 1954, in the context of the Soviet struggle against the emergence of Western blocs, such as the European Defense Community (EDC),[26] and of Soviet attempts at breaking up the Western anti-communist front, the Kremlin's assessment of neutrality began to shift. Neutrality was now seen mainly as a tool for preventing such blocs from coming into being, and it was recommended by West European communists.[27] A particularly remarkable initiative of the late Stalin years was the dictator's proposal of March 1952, which offered the reunification of Germany at the price of the country's declaration of neutrality. However, there is consensus among most experts that the offer, rejected by the West, was not meant seriously.[28] After Stalin's death and the abortive anti-communist uprising in the GDR in 1953, the idea of a neutral unified Germany (allegedly brought up again by KGB boss and Politburo member Lavrentii Beriia[29]) remained unaccepted in the Politburo.

In the case of Austria, neutrality had not yet seemed a viable option to Soviet foreign-policy makers.[30] In 1950, however, the Austrian communists joined the West European comrades in the propaganda campaign for neutral status to be adopted by their countries.[31] While Austria was not a member of the planned EDC, the debates concerning this bloc made Soviet diplomats reconsider neutralizing the country for two reasons: First, such a move would prevent Austria from even thinking about joining the Western bloc; secondly, it would send out a signal strong enough to make France and West Germany waver in their determination to

tralität aus sowjetischer Sicht," in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Außenpolitik* 5, no. 3 (1965), 144–163, 158.

[26] On the Soviet struggle against the EDC, see, e.g. Kevin Ruane, *The Rise and Fall of the European Defence Community* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000); M. Narinski, "La construction européenne vue par l'URSS de 1948 à 1953," in: Saki Dockrill, Robert Frank, Georges Henri Soutou and Antonio Varsori (eds.), *L'Europe de l'Est et de l'Ouest dans la Guerre froide 1948–1953* (Paris: PUPS, 2002), 61–72; Wolfgang Mueller, "The Soviet Union and West European Integration: From the Brussels Treaty to the ECSC and EEC, 1947–1957," in *Journal of European Integration History* 15, no. 2 (2009), 67–85.

[27] Ginsburgs, "Neutrality and Neutralism and the Tactics of Soviet Diplomacy," 538–539.

[28] Ruud von Dijk, *The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German Unification?,* Cold War International History Project Working Paper 14 (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 1996); Jürgen Zarusky (ed.), *Die Stalinnote vom 10. März 1952. Neue Quellen und Analysen* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002); Peter Ruggenthaler (ed.), *Stalins großer Bluff: Die Geschichte der Stalinnote in sowjetischen Dokumenten*, (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2007). For different opinions, see Wilfried Loth, *Die Sowjetunion und die deutsche Frage* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 101–174; idem, "German Historians and the German Question in the Cold War," in Juhana Aunesluoma and Pauli Kettunen (eds.), *The Cold War and the Politics of History* (Helsinki: Edita, 2008), 169–188, 185; and A. M. Filitov, *Germaniia v Sovetskom vneshnepoliticheskom planovanii, 1941–1990* (Moscow: Nauka, 2009), 138–173.

[29] Such claims were made after Beriia's demotion and arrest. However, there is still little evidence as to whether a neutralization of Germany was seriously proposed or who was in favor thereof. Zubok, *A Failed Empire*, 86–93.

[30] Gribanov to Vyshinskii, 28 February 1950, in AVPRF, 66/29/49/11, 25–27.

[31] Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 267.

participate. In late 1952, Soviet representatives signaled that an Austrian declaration of neutrality might be conducive to their willingness to sign the state treaty.[32] However, this did not mean that the Soviet leadership was no longer ambiguous about neutrality. On one hand, Molotov, at the Berlin conference in February 1954, reiterated the Soviet proposal for Germany's neutralization and named Austria's nonparticipation in military alliances as one of the preconditions for a conclusion of the state treaty. On the other hand, the Austrian Communist Party (KPÖ) was ordered by the Soviet leadership to abandon its neutrality campaign, because "such a small bourgeois country like Austria" would not be able to carry out a neutral policy.[33] Furthermore, it would seem "questionable if the Communist Party acts as a promoter of neutrality between blocs, of which one is fighting for the preparation of war." However, Molotov's proposal at the Berlin conference and Dulles' positive reaction had proved that the idea of making Austria neutral was acceptable to both superpowers, although the secretary of state insisted that neutrality would be acceptable only if it followed the Swiss model.[34]

Thus, it was only once the general deadlock in the global arena became obvious and the new Kremlin leadership realized that the Stalin years had ended in "a Cold War of positions" or even a "dead end,"[35] that the Soviet attitude towards permanent neutrality changed to any fundamental degree. As Soviet experts in international law recognized, an international stalemate between two or more opposing powers of roughly equal strength had often fostered a tendency to neutralize certain disputed areas.[36] Although no official Soviet statement would have applied this observation to *Soviet* policy, it was just such a stalemate that characterized the Cold War after Stalin's death. Therefore, Khrushchev started to look for new ways to get things moving again in the international balance of forces, and "peaceful coexistence" was declared as a strategy to reduce tensions while continuing the international struggle.[37]

Together with "peaceful coexistence," neutrality and nonalignment were rediscovered by the new Soviet leadership as possible, even desirable, means of détente and as a strategy to slow nonsocialist countries' integration into the Western sphere or eventually to lure them out of it. While the Austrian state treaty seems to have been

---

[32] Ibid., 220–221; Wildmann to Austrian MFA, 27 November 1952, in Alfons Schilcher (ed.), *Österreich und die Großmächte: Dokumente zur österreichischen Außenpolitik 1945–1955* (Vienna: Geyer, 1980), 158–160.

[33] Report CPSU Commission for Foreign Policy to Molotov, On the Austrian Communist Party's proclamation of neutral policy, [no later than 12 April 1954], in Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii (hereafter: RGASPI), 82/2/1121, 121–122.

[34] Stourzh, "Der österreichische Staatsvertrag," 976.

[35] "Cold War of positions": Vojtech Mastny, "The Soviet Union and the Origins of the Warsaw Pact in 1955," http://www.php.isn.ethz.ch/collections/coll_pcc/into_VM.cfm (accessed 2008), 9; "dead end": Taubman, *Khrushchev*, 242.

[36] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 7.

[37] See above, pages 16–20.

the first case in which the new Soviet attitude towards neutrality was materialized,[38] the Soviet re-evaluation of this status was the result of the international stalemate in Europe, and most likely also the integration of West Germany into NATO as a new member in 1955. Another factor was the new international dynamic triggered by the decolonization process in Asia and Africa.[39] Some of the independent states of East Asia and the Middle East had already joined pro-Western blocs, such as the South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO), which was founded in 1954, and the Baghdad Pact of 1955. In order to block the expansion of pro-Western alliances, to keep newly independent territories out of such blocs, and, at the same time, to peacefully expand Soviet influence and socialism in independent countries that were nonsocialist, either neutralization or nonalignment was promoted.[40]

Obviously Malenkov and Khrushchev grasped that the rigid concept of "two camps" had had little to offer for the many nonsocialist countries in the West or for the even larger number of emerging independent states in the South.[41] Therefore, the Soviet concept of "two camps" was transformed into one of three, with the third one consisting of the neutral or nonaligned states. This third group of states, which the Soviet Union was not yet strong enough to claim outright as a sphere of influence, was expected to be a natural ally for the USSR, to support Soviet initiatives in the international arena, and to block any further rapprochement of European, Asian, and African states with the Western camp. The Third World's anticolonialism made it likely that these countries would be critical of their former West European colonial powers, and the Kremlin seemed optimistic that it might be possible, by supporting the decolonization process and extending foreign aid, to win over the new camp, which comprised one third of the global population, as new allies, to merge the socialist and neutral camps into a "zone of peace,"[42] and thus to tilt the

---

[38] Zubok, *A Failed Empire*, 103.

[39] Roy Allison, *The Soviet Union and the Strategy of Non-Alignment in the Third World* (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 2; Ginsburgs, "Neutrality and Neutralism and the Tactics of Soviet Diplomacy," 531.

[40] Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," 219: "It is no accident that the policy of peacetime neutrality became especially widespread in the 1950s, that is, in the years when the Western powers were knocking together their reactionary military-political blocs in Europe and Asia. Since these blocs endanger peace and imperil the independence and sovereignty of new national states, the policy of neutrality can no longer be a policy of passive observation of developments which could lead the world to a devastating thermonuclear war."

[41] Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 67.

[42] "Neitralitet," in A.A. Gromyko, S.A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 392–395, 394; 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, 183; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 3; D.B. Lewin, and G.P. Kaljushnaja (eds.), *Völkerrecht* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1967), 16. Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart*, 19, avoids mentioning the neutral states and writes merely about socialist and nonsocialist states forming a "zone of peace."

international balance in favor of the Soviet side. Even if Khrushchev – as former Soviet diplomats argue – did not understand the difference between the various forms of neutrality and neutralism,[43] the new leader came to see it as a great success, regarding it as a means for weakening pro-Western forces worldwide and, in Europe, fostering "schemes of undermining NATO by building the bridges towards its smaller members."[44]

For the Soviet Union, the neutralization of nonsocialist states offered several net effects: In the international system, permanent neutrals, depending upon their location, created safe buffer zones and thus reduced the likelihood of an interbloc conflagration. Since neutrality was promoted exclusively among nonsocialist states, Western alliances and blocs were weakened by "losing" potential allies, while the neutralized state was isolated from the Western collective defense and economic integration and, thus, also weakened. The Soviet Union, however, could demand that the neutrals, their Western traditions and convictions notwithstanding, distance themselves from the West and support Soviet initiatives.[45]

Communism did not accept peacetime neutrality as something stable and eternal, but rather as something intermediary and transitory, a status between capitalism and socialism. Nonetheless, for the time being, it was, from the Soviet side, a preferred status for Western countries, preferable to their full membership in the Western bloc. In Soviet eyes, neutrality was defined a status more progressive than capitalism but less progressive than socialism, a status that actually paved the way for this optimal condition.[46] By means of ever closer political, economic, and cultural relationships with the Eastern bloc, neutrals were expected to lean towards socialism. For a socialist state, however, neutrality was not deemed a fit condition. Naturally, after socialism was reached in a certain country, Soviet ideology did not consider a return of the country to peacetime neutrality possible.[47] Therefore, unlike during the interwar period, the Soviet Union did not consider declaring itself or its satellite states neutral.

The founding of the Warsaw Pact in May 1955 seems to have been an important precondition for the Soviet re-evaluation of neutrality. The new organization would reduce the danger of an East European state misunderstanding the role of neutrality and deserting into the neutral camp. The Soviet refusal to accept the Hungarian

---

[43] Rostislav Sergeev and Ludwig Steiner, "Die österreichisch-sowjetischen Beziehungen 1953–1955 und der Weg 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), 205–213, 210.

[44] Zubok, "The Soviet Attitude," 36.

[45] George Ginsburgs, "Neutralism à la Russe," in idem and Alvin Z. Rubinstein (eds.), *Soviet Foreign Policy Toward Western Europe* (New York: Praeger, 1978), 17–39, 37.

[46] Tiunov, *Neitralitet,* 115; Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart*, 25. Cf. Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 330–331.

[47] E. Korovin, "Proletarian Internationalism in World Relations," in *International Affairs*, no. 2 (February 1958), 29. Quoted in Allison, *The Soviet Union and the Strategy of Non-Alignment*, 18.

1956 decision to leave the Warsaw Pact and become neutral[48] proved that the Soviet purpose of neutrality as it had been advanced a year earlier in Austria "was to promote the dissolution of the military organizations of the *Western* powers only."[49] Neutrality was thus recommended by the USSR only in exchange for membership in Western alliances or for young nations that had recently emerged from colonial rule. At the Geneva conference of the heads of state of the four powers, from 18 to 23 July 1955, Soviet president Nikolai Bulganin made it clear that neutrality was not for the "people's democracies," when he stressed the Soviet support for this status among Western states and their former colonies and encouraged the leading Western powers to take a similar stance:

> "It is a fact that for some time a movement in favour of a policy of neutrality, a policy of nonparticipation on military blocs and coalitions, has been gaining ground in some countries. Experience shows that some states which pursued a neutral policy in time of war were able to ensure security for their peoples and play a positive role. This was confirmed, in particular, by the experience of the Second World War, although the neutrality of some countries was not beyond reproach.

> The Soviet Government is also of the opinion that should any nation desiring to pursue a policy of neutrality and nonparticipation in military groupings, while these groupings exist, raise the question of having their security and territorial integrity guaranteed, the Great Powers should accede to these wishes. In any case, as far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it is prepared to take part in such guarantees, as it has, for instance, declared in respect to Austria.

> At this point mention was made of the countries of Eastern Europe – the people's democracies. To raise this question at this Conference, means interference in the internal affairs of these states."[50]

At the founding conference of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, on 11 May 1955, Bulganin lambasted the creation of NATO and SEATO, as well as the integration of "militaristic" West Germany into the former. However, he observed that "it would be incorrect to presume that the Austrian government is the only one adopting a position [of neutrality]"; quite the contrary, "there are a number of states, both in Europe and Asia, that are averse to joining aggressive military blocs."[51] From the Soviet point of view, this type of aversion did not apply to the Warsaw Pact, which was by definition not "aggressive." At their first meeting in January 1956, the members of the Warsaw Pact declared:

> "It is no accident that the policy of setting up aggressive military blocs is being condemned by an increasing number of countries. There is growing recognition of the desire of countries to make collective efforts in the struggle for peace, the desire of international cooperation on the basis of

---

[48] Telegram Imre Nagy to Diplomatic Missions, 1 November 1956, in Vojtech Mastny and Malcolm Byrne (eds.), *A Cardboard Castle? An Inside History of the Warsaw Pact 1955–1991* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2005), 84–87.

[49] Sven Allard, *Russia and the Austrian State Treaty: A Case Study of Soviet Policy in Europe* (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 1970), 221.

[50] *The Geneva Conference of Heads of Government 1955* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1955), 41.

[51] "Erklärung N.A. Bulganins," in *Die Warschauer Konferenz,* Beilage zu *Neue Zeit,* no. 21 (1955), 4–14, 7.

mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs of other states, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence. This aim is served by the efforts of a number of countries to pursue a policy of nonparticipation in aggressive military blocs, a policy of neutrality.

The states that are parties of the Warsaw Treaty acclaim these efforts, convinced that support for them strengthens the forces of peace and weakens the forces of war."[52]

In 1955–59, the Soviet campaign for promoting neutrality in the West and the Third World reached its highest level. The nonaligned states' Bandung conference in April 1955 was greeted enthusiastically in the Soviet media; however, after "the Khrushchev-Bulganin regime's first large experiment with neutralism,"[53] Soviet diplomats worried that the Third World might display not only too much independence from any power, but also struggle too fiercely against their internal challengers, most of them communist.[54] At the conference, criticism of colonialism could not be voiced without also referring to Soviet domination in Eastern Europe. Nonetheless, Bandung opened the door for improving Soviet relations with the South Asian regimes, which had hitherto been discarded as "semi-feudal" or "lackeys of imperialism."[55] On 23 May 1955, the Communist Party of Indonesia welcomed this rapprochement, and a few weeks later the Soviet media proudly reported that India's Communist Party was among the strongest supporters of Prime Minister Nehru's neutralistic foreign policy.[56] Similarly, the foreign policy course of both countries was positively re-evaluated by Soviet scholars. In June 1955 Nehru was welcomed in Moscow, and in October the Burmese prime minister U Nu followed suit. The new bonds to the nonaligned were strengthened by the triumphal tour of Khrushchev and Bulganin through India, Burma and Afghanistan in November and December 1955. With the aim of "attracting" such states "to our side,"[57] the Kremlin offered hundred-million-dollar loans for Egypt, Syria and Afghanistan, and concluded trade agreements with Indonesia, India, Burma and other nonaligned states. While India and Indonesia rejected Soviet offers of arms sales, Afghanistan was flooded with Soviet and Czechoslovak weapons soon after the signing of a Soviet-Afghan convention on Afghanistan's neutrality. In 1956 President Sukarno of Indonesia visited Moscow to receive Soviet loans and aid; between 1955 and 1960 Soviet-Indonesian trade grew tenfold and the Soviet bloc quickly supplanted

---

[52] Deklaratsiia gosudarstv-uchastnikov Varshavskogo Dogovora, 28 January 1956, in *Organizatsiia Varshavskogo Dogovora: Dokumenty i materialy, 1955–1975* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1976), 12–19.

[53] Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 296. On the conference, see Sinigoj, *Indien und Blockfreiheit*, 97–118; Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 99–103.

[54] Andreas Hilger, "Moskau und die Entwicklungsländer," in Stefan Karner et al. (eds.), *Der Prager Frühling: Das internationale Krisenjahr* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2008), 299–319, 303.

[55] Sinigoj, *Indien und Blockfreiheit*, 119.

[56] Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 295.

[57] Quoted in Fursenko and Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War*, 82.

the sterling area as the main trading partner of Burma.[58] In the following years, the Soviet Union was a partner in the settlement leading to the neutrality of Laos in 1962 and, in the same year, it also recognized the neutrality of Cambodia, which had been declared in 1957.[59] Egypt, Afghanistan, Mali, Burma, India, Indonesia were applauded in Soviet statements as "having a neutral policy."[60]

The Soviet re-evaluation of neutrality was also reflected in praise for the Swiss status[61] and Sweden's neutral policy,[62] as well as by the recognition of Finnish neutrality. Scandinavia in particular, with its delicate Nordic Balance between NATO members Iceland, Denmark, and Norway (the latter two without foreign soldiers on their soil), neutral Sweden, and the special case Finland, as well as its strong leanings towards nuclear disarmament, was chosen by Soviet policy to be another test case for "peaceful coexistence" and neutralization. In 1948, Finland, which had been attacked by the USSR in 1939 and fought a "Continuation War" until 1944, rejected the Soviet offer of a military alliance, but was forced to agree to a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance.[63] This treaty included three main stipulations: Finland was obliged not to tolerate foreign military bases (other than Soviet) on its soil, nor being used for aggression towards the USSR; the Soviet government recognized Finland's aspirations for staying outside the conflicts of the great powers; if unable to cope with an invasion by Germany or a state allied with it, Finland was to consult the Soviet government, which in this case would be ready to render military assistance. Both sides claimed that this treaty did not contradict Finnish neutrality, which was explicitly recognized by Khrushchev in 1956 at the twentieth congress of the CPSU.[64] For more than thirty years, Finnish neutrality, much like the status of Austria, allowed the Soviet Union to hold the respective country "on a

---

[58] Boden, *Die Grenzen der Weltmacht*, 136–140, 171; Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 306.

[59] Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," 222–226.

[60] "Neitralitet Postoiannyi," in A.A. Gromyko, S.A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 396–397, 396; Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 26–27.

[61] W. Durdenewski, "Zur schweizerischen Neutralität," *Neue Zeit,* no. 22 (1955), 28–30.

[62] The Swedish-Soviet communiqué of 3 April 1956, quoted in Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 9; 30; M. Andreyeva and K. Dmitrieva, "The Soviet Union and Swedish Neutrality in the Second World War," in *International Affairs*, no. 9 (September 1959), 66–71.

[63] Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *Containing Coexistence: America, Russia, and the "Finnish Solution," 1945–1956* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1997), 26–28; John Vloyantes, "Finland," 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), 137–159, 141–145. On Finnish neutrality, cf. Max Jacobson, *Finnish Neutrality: A Study of Finnish Foreign Policy since the Second World War* (London: Hugh Evelyn, 1968); Roy Allison, *Finland's Relations with the Soviet Union, 1944–84* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985); Max Jacobson, *Finland in the New Europe* (Westport: Praeger, 1998).

[64] Chruschtschow, *Rechenschaftsbericht des Zentralkomitees der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion an den XX. Parteitag 14. Februar 1956*, 51.

leash."[65] Even before Finland's neutrality was recognized, Khrushchev offered the Finnish president, Juho Paasikivi, who was in Moscow in September 1955, a special package that aimed at creating another showcase of Soviet generosity while securing the victory of a pro-Soviet candidate in the forthcoming presidential elections: The Finns had to sign an extension of the Soviet-Finnish treaty for another twenty years; in return, the Soviet naval base in Finnish Porkkala would be relinquished in January 1956 and Finland would be admitted into the UN. When the Norwegian, Danish, and Swedish prime ministers Einar Gerhardsen, Hans Christian Hansen, and Tage Erlander successively visited Moscow in late 1955 and early 1956, they were received with Soviet words of praise for neutrality and given the suggestion of making northern Europe a neutral "zone of peace."[66] Khrushchev revealed to Hansen that the Kremlin would "shake NATO loose with peace initiatives"[67] and in January 1956, the Communist Party of Sweden issued an appeal to the government to make Swedish neutrality internationally binding.[68] Earlier Soviet attempts to woo Norway out of NATO had also used the attraction of neutrality.[69] Iceland was offered a Soviet guarantee, if it chose to expel US forces and declare itself neutral. The initiative, which was combined with threats of the catastrophic consequences that the deployment of nuclear weapons would have for the host country, was not in vain: Denmark and Norway ruled out the deployment of such weapons on their soil, while the Icelandic parliament demanded a withdrawal of US troops and changed its mind only after the Soviet intervention in Hungary. Although the three NATO members remained firmly integrated into the alliance, the USSR, by accepting Finland's neutrality, had more leverage on the situation in Scandinavia if it did not force Finland into a closer alliance – a step that might have induced Sweden to join the Atlantic defense and its western neighbors to invite US bases onto their soil. Thus, when in the coming years the Soviet Union used pressure on Finland for communicating disagreement with perceived shifts in the strategic balance in Europe's north, it had to be careful not to try the Scandinavians' patience too far.[70]

---

[65] Hanhimäki, "The Lure of Neutrality: Finland and the Cold War," 263.

[66] Bernd Bonwetsch, "Sowjetische Westeuropapolitik II," in Dietrich Geyer (ed.), *Osteuropa-Handbuch Sowjetunion: Außenpolitik 1955–1973* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1976), 146–228, 209–215. On the return of Porkkala, cf. Jussi M. Hanhimäki, "Containment, Coexistence, and Neutrality: The Return of the Porkkala Naval Base as an Issue in Soviet-American Relations, 1955–1956," in *Scandinavian Journal of History* 18, no. 3 (1993), 217–228.

[67] Quoted in Hanhimäki, "The Lure of Neutrality: Finland and the Cold War," 266.

[68] Sven Allard, *Diplomat in Wien: Erlebnisse, Begegnungen und Gedanken um den österreichischen Staatsvertrag* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1965), 218.

[69] Martti Häikiö, "Finland's Neutrality 1944–1994," in Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *The Neutrals and the European Integration, 1945–1995* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 199–217, 205–206.

[70] Conversely, had Denmark and Norway invited US troops or Sweden moved closer to NATO, the USSR would have probably drawn Finland fully into its orbit. Seppo Hentilä, "The Soviet Union, Finland, and the 'Northern Balance,'" in Wilfried Loth (ed.), *Europe, Cold War, and Coexistence,*

In the years from 1955 till 1959, the Soviet Union promoted the adoption and exercise of neutrality not only by Austria, the Third World, and the Scandinavian countries, but also by other Western allies such as West Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and Japan.[71] All NATO members were warned of or threatened with disastrous consequences in the event of a war. In the case of Japan, Soviet proposals in 1958 and 1961 aimed at neutralizing the country and clearing it of US troops. In the case of Italy, Soviet offers were made to guarantee this country's neutrality and security – an offer that would later be extended to Austria. In order to make neutrality more attractive for West Germany, it was underlined that this status would not preclude its unification with "another state."[72] During the Berlin crisis, Khrushchev, in his struggle to rid West Berlin of the protection by the Western powers and to let the GDR "swallow" it, suggested "neutralizing" the western part of the city and replacing the Western garrison in the city with armed forces from neutral countries, thus aiming at weakening West Berlin's defense and flattering the self-esteem of the neutrals.

On as many official occasions as possible, Soviet leaders praised the benefits of neutrality: At the twentieth congress of the CPSU in 1956, the "strengthening of the amicable relations" to Asian nonaligned countries and European neutrals such as Finland and Austria was lauded as a major achievement of Soviet foreign policy.[73] The communist world conference in Moscow in November 1960 welcomed the activities of the neutral and nonaligned countries for "peace and peaceful coexistence,"[74] and at the twenty-second CPSU congress in 1961, Khrushchev commended all neutralists for "not being neutral with regard to the main question of our times, the question of war or peace," and assured them again of their unwavering Soviet support.[75]

In order to be better able to promote neutrality in the West, Soviet official and propaganda statements quickly developed a neutrality "myth." This myth under-

---

1953–1965 (London: Frank Cass, 2004), 239–257, 240. Cf. John Logue, "Sweden," 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), 71–102, 89; Raimo Väyrynen, "Adaptation of a Small Power to International Tensions: The Case of Finland," in Bengt Sundelius (ed.), *The Neutral Democracies in the New Cold War* (Boulder: Westview, 1987), 33–56, 51; Karl Molin, "Central Issues of Swedish Neutrality Policy," in Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *The Neutrals and European Integration* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 261–275, 264; Neuhold, "The Neutral States of Europe," 115.

[71] Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 21–24; 30–31; Hakovirta, "The Soviet Union and the Varieties of Neutrality," 580.

[72] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 113–116.

[73] Chruschtschow, *Rechenschaftsbericht des Zentralkomitees der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion an den XX. Parteitag 14. Februar 1956*, 51.

[74] Erklärung der Beratung von Vertretern der kommunistischen und Arbeiterparteien in Moskau, November 1960, in Schenk, *Kommunistische Grundsatzerklärungen 1957–1971*, 104.

[75] N.S. Khrushchev, *Otchet Tsentral'nogo Komiteta Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soiuza XXII s"ezdu partii* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 32, 8.

lined the moral qualities of neutrality and stressed various benefits that were al-legedly ready to be harvested by neutrals, such as friendly relations with all states, including the USSR, low defense spending, and thus the availability of more re-sources for welfare.[76] In this myth, neutrality was depicted as a status enabling the respective country to maintain "peaceful and mutually beneficial relations" with the Eastern bloc. The benefits of neutrality were contrasted with the disadvantages of membership in Western alliances by Soviet politicians and legal experts, who claimed that "life shows that those capitalist states maintaining the policy of neu-trality receive enormous political and economic benefits from it."[77] Other capitalist states, such as West Germany and Japan, it was stated, had lost their sovereignty and security and had to live under the constant threat of being transformed into the battlefield of a nuclear war. However, the threat of nuclear annihilation applied also to those neutrals that, like Switzerland, declined to abdicate nuclear weapons.[78] Similar claims were maintained by Khrushchev on many occasions. With regard to the benefits of neutrality, the leader, in an interview with an Italian newspaper cor-respondent in 1958, developed the thesis that neutrality increased the security of the neutrals and the globe, reduced international tensions and military expenditures, and raised the prestige of the neutral countries[79] – a claim that found its way into the second edition of the official *Diplomatic Handbook* of the USSR.[80] However, it was also part of the Soviet "song of neutrality" that neutrals had always to be on their guard to not be recruited by "imperialists" for their "aggressive blocs."[81] Since the neutrals had extricated themselves from the Western club, they, according to Soviet propaganda, attracted the "implacable enmity of their late overlords, whose determination to return the heretics to the fold posed a mortal threat to the survival of these seditionist regimes."[82]

[76] Speech by N.S. Khrushchev during a breakfast at the Austrian president, 30 June 1960, in *Druz-hestvennyi vizit: Prebyvanie Predsedatel'ia Soveta Ministrov SSSR N.S. Khrushchëva v Avstri-iskoi Respublike 30 iiuniia–6 iiulia 1960g.* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1960), 15–17, 16; "Im In-teresse beider Länder," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 19 (1957), 9–10; "Das Jubiläum der österreichischen Neutralität," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1965), 9; Amtsvermerk, Sowjetische Presse zum österreichi-schen Nationalfeiertag, 10 November 1971, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 105.880-6/71, Z.121.033; G. Chernikov, "Europe's Smaller Countries in the Capitalist System," in *International Affairs*, no. 1 (January 1982), 105–111.

[77] Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 24.

[78] Mikoian in a conversation with the Austrian ambassador. Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 15 July 1958, in ÖStA, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108.

[79] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "Replies to Questions Put by Giuseppe Palozzi, *Il Tempo* Correspondent, March 24, 1958," in idem, *For Victory in Competition with Capitalism* (New York: Dutton, 1960), 231–248.

[80] "Neitralitet," in A.A. Gromyko, S.A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slo-var'* 2, 2nd ed (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 392–395, 394.

[81] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 3.

[82] Ginsburgs, "Neutralism à la Russe," 21.

The Soviet theory of neutrality in the late 1950s and 1960s

The advent of "peaceful coexistence" and the changes in Soviet foreign policy regarding neutrality and neutralism in Western Europe, Asia and Africa were accompanied by the dawning of a new period in the development of the Soviet theory of international law. Early signs of these changes can already be noticed in 1955 and, in the context of the twentieth congress of the CPSU, the new theory was codified, with "peaceful coexistence" being officially adopted as a foreign policy doctrine.[83] Outwardly less revolutionary than before, the new dogma of international law, as outlined by its champion, the head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Legal Department and Soviet representative in the UN Commission for International Law, Professor Grigorii Tunkin, contained, as its main feature, the acceptance of one universal system of international law.[84] While some Western experts, as for instance Alfred Verdross, had voiced similar ideas,[85] the new Soviet thesis differed from both the predominant Western opinion, in which such a legal system could only be created if all contracting parties had a minimum of common convictions, and the hitherto valid Soviet doctrine that there were two distinct sets of international law, communist and bourgeois.[86] While the latter teachings had been appropriate in revolutionary or isolationist times, the new dogma seemed to better serve the integration of the USSR into the international system based on a lasting, albeit limited, "peaceful coexistence." In Marxism-Leninism, national law had always been seen as part of the superstructure of human societies and shaped by economic roots and the interests of the ruling classes; international law, however, Tunkin argued, was created by international custom and agreements.[87] Since such agreements had been concluded between bourgeois and socialist states, international law was characterized as being universal.[88] As in the interwar period, this change seemed to be a

---

[83] Meissner, *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht*, 57–59; Erickson, *International Law and the Revolutionary State*, 14–16; Menzel, "Vorwort," xviii.

[84] Bracht, *Ideologische Grundlagen der sowjetischen Völkerrechtslehre*, 62.

[85] Alfred Verdross, *Völkerrecht*, 3rd ed. (Vienna: Springer, 1955), iv, 11. The Russian translation appeared under the title *Mezhdunarnodnoe pravo* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo IL, 1959).

[86] Kelsen, *The Communist Theory of Law*, 156.

[87] G. I. Tunkin, *Osnovy sovremennogo mezhdunarodnogo prava* (Moscow: Vysshaia partiinaia shkola TsK KPSS, 1956). I have used the German edition: G. I. Tunkin, "Grundlagen des modernen Völkerrechts," in *Drei sowjetische Beiträge zur Völkerrechtslehre* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1969), 1–57, 3: "International law is the entirety of norms that are created by way of agreements between states, that regulate their relations in the process of war and cooperation, that express the will of the ruling classes of these states, and that are implemented by the states either individually or collectively, and, if necessary, by force." Cf. the definition by Tunkin's rival, the earlier mastermind of Soviet international law E.A. Korovin. "Begriff, Quellen und System des Völkerrechts," 1.

[88] Tunkin, "Grundlagen des modernen Völkerrechts," 7. Cf. Lewin and Kaljushnaja, *Völkerrecht*, 16–18. It should be noted, however, that the relations between socialist states were exempt from universal international law. See above, page 20.

concession to the needs of Soviet foreign policy; Khrushchev was quoted as having said: "We know very well that without respecting the norms of international law and fulfilling the assumed obligations in international relations there can be no trust; without trust, there can be no peaceful coexistence."[89]

Because achieving such coexistence had become a central task of Soviet foreign policy, it followed to agree on international norms being universal. This goal was linked with the second main feature of the Soviet theory of international law under Khrushchev's auspices, the attempt of equating the general principles of international law that had been recognized in the Charter of the United Nations (such as nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes, equal rights, the respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity) with the Soviet concept of "peaceful coexistence."[90] Since the latter comprised further obligations (such as decolonization, disarmament, a ban on hostile propaganda and others), the process aimed at making the Soviet principles internationally binding.[91] In general, the new Soviet dogma of international law combined revolutionary postulates (e.g. recognizing "wars of liberation" as legal) with traditional values (e.g. the cult of sovereignty). While the former strove at fostering a legal basis for insurrection against colonial powers, the latter was to ward off Western influence in inner-Soviet or inner-socialist affairs such as issues of human rights or self-determination.[92]

It can be argued that the new Soviet theory of international law, in particular its more flexible approach towards Western international law, made it easier for Soviet academics to deal with Western concepts such as neutrality. In any case, the new Soviet political attitude towards neutrality also triggered Soviet academic efforts to intellectually and legally substantiate the recently rediscovered status and to develop it into a genuine theory.[93] Soviet theory differentiated between wartime and peacetime neutrality, with the latter falling under permanent or "positive" neutrality: While the first was characterized as having existed since the "age of slavery," per-

---

[89] „Wir wissen sehr gut, dass es ohne Einhaltung der Normen des Völkerrechts, ohne Erfüllung der übernommenen Verpflichtungen in den zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen kein Vertrauen und ohne Vertrauen keine friedliche Koexistenz geben kann." Quoted in G. I. Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart* (Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR, 1963), 181.

[90] [Korowin,] "Begriff, Quellen und System des Völkerrechts," 1; Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart*, 25–57; 164–172.

[91] Schweisfurth, "Entwicklung und ideologische Grundlagen der sowjetischen Völkerrechtstheorie," 44; Meissner, *Sowjetunion und Völkerrecht*, 78–79; Bracht, *Ideologische Grundlagen der sowjetischen Völkerrechtslehre*, 104–105; Uibopuu, *Die sowjetische Doktrin*, 218–231.

[92] Menzel, "Vorwort," xx–xxii.

[93] Among other works, see, e.g., Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*; Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*; Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*. For an in-depth analysis of Soviet literature of the 1960s regarding neutrality, see Gerhard Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität in der sowjetischen Völkerrechtslehre – Eine Analyse," in *Österreichische Zeitschrift für öffentliches Recht* 19, no. 2–3 (1969), 215–258.

manent neutrality was seen as a product of the "age of capitalism and imperialism"; positive neutrality, the most recent phenomenon, was declared an outcome of the "age of coexistence," which was marked by the appearance of the Soviet state on the international scene.[94] It was claimed by Soviet scholars that the meaning of neutrality had changed through these different periods of time; wartime neutrality had often been misused to the aggressor's advantage and the victim's detriment and thus, only contemporary positive neutrality could be recognized as "true" neutrality.[95]

In a note on 7 March 1955 to the Netherlands, the depository country of the Hague Conventions of 1907, the Soviet Union subscribed to this international document defining wartime neutrality. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise that the contemporary Soviet interpretation of wartime neutrality was similar to that in the West. It included, among other duties: 1) nonparticipation in hostilities; 2) refusal to lend military help or military deliveries to the combating parties; 3) refusal to make the neutral's territory available for military use, including military action, military transports or recruitment of forces; 4) internment of military personnel of the combating parties; 5) equal treatment of all belligerents; 6) the defense of neutrality. A declaration of neutrality was not deemed necessary.[96] According to the contemporary Soviet interpretation, wartime neutrality did not curb the right of the neutral to, e.g., 1) maintain self-defense; 2) have its territorial integrity respected; 3) conclude agreements and conduct negotiations and trade of a nonmilitary character; 4) intern the military personnel of the combating parties; 5) allow the transport of injured personnel of the combating parties if no weapons were being carried; 6) terminate its neutrality by entering the war, if the neutrality had not been based on a legal obligation.[97] Even according to the Soviet theory, wartime neutrality did not limit the freedom of opinion or the press, nor did it oblige the neutral to abstain from conducting trade with the combating parties, with the exception of contraband.[98] The subscription to the Hague Conventions did not rule out the Soviet criticism, albeit unofficial, that in the age of "coexistence" there was no general "right to war," and thus, wartime neutrality should follow Marxism-Leninism in distinguishing between just and unjust wars and between aggressors and victims. Some scholars went as far as claiming that, due to the general ban on war, wartime neutrality would soon disappear.[99]

---

[94] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 7–18.

[95] Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 3–4.

[96] Akademie der Wissenschaften der UdSSR – Rechtsinstitut (ed.), *Völkerrecht: Lehrbuch* (Berlin: VEB Deutscher Zentralverlag, 1960), 442–443; F.I. Koschewnikow, "Die Gesetze und Gewohnheiten des Krieges," in idem (ed.), *Völkerrecht* (Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1960), 415–469, 458–459.

[97] Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 85–86.

[98] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 13.

[99] Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 103–106. Cf. 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), 46–47.

Contrary to the Western concept of neutrality, the Soviet interpretation of the late 1950s and the 1960s put a focus on peacetime obligations.[100] This was, at least in part, due to the circumstances of the Cold War under which this new interpretation of neutrality emerged, i.e. the "coexistence" of two blocs with their tense struggle for political influence over as many countries as possible, albeit in the absence of a general war. This shift from wartime to peacetime obligations was legitimized by Soviet legal experts by referring to the nuclear threat, the emergence of the United Nations Organization,[101] the changes in the international balance of forces, i.e. the rise of the socialist camp and the creation of a nonaligned one,[102] and a "general change in international law, which today not only strives at struggling against existing aggression, but also above all at preventing it."[103]

The Soviet theory of international law gradually developed its own interpretation of peacetime neutrality.[104] As we have seen above,[105] the peacetime obligations of a permanently neutral state are poorly defined in Western international law. The absence of a generally accepted international doctrine was criticized by Soviet lawyers, who took on the task of formulating a set of rules that reflected the Soviet interest in turning both neutrals and nonaligned into useful promoters of Soviet policy. Numerous articles and monographs were written by Soviet experts, including Lidiia Modzhorian, Boris Ganiushkin and Oleg Tiunov, who aimed at (re-)defining and codifying internationally binding rules for neutral policy in times of peace.[106] A major step in codifying the Soviet doctrine of neutrality and making it legally binding was made in the "Resolution on the Legal Aspects of Neutrality," adopted by the seventh conference of the Soviet-sponsored International Association of Democratic Lawyers, which took place in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 10 to 14 October 1960.[107] During the conference it was stressed that it was necessary to analyze which stipulations of classic neutrality were still valid, which had grown obsolete, and which new obligations and rights of peacetime neutrals should be codified. A commission was set up to work out a new definition of neutrality. Soviet demands[108] were hereby cast

---

[100] "Neitralitet," in A. Ia. Vyshinskii (ed.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 1st ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1950), 230–234; and "Postoiannyi Neitralitet," ibid., 439–440.

[101] Koschewnikow, "Die Gesetze und Gewohnheiten des Krieges," 469.

[102] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 9.

[103] M. I. Lazarev and V. K. Sobakin, in F. I. Kozhevnikov (ed.), *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1966), 599. Quoted in Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 224.

[104] Fiedler, *Der sowjetische Neutralitätsbegriff*, 100–105, 225–265.

[105] See above, page 42.

[106] This aim is mentioned explicitly in Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," 219; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 122; 142.

[107] International Association of Democratic Lawyers (ed.), *Legal Aspects of Neutrality: Proceedings of the Third Commission* (Brussels: International Association of Democratic Lawyers, 1960), 113–114. Cf. Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 11. For the full text of the resolution, see below, pages 327–328.

[108] The Soviet delegate, Lidiia Modzhorian, had demanded the inclusion of the following obligations: 1) nonparticipation in military blocs and pacts; 2) a formal ban against foreign bases or forces on

into legal sounding formulas and used to supplement the original stock. The end product thus emerged "as a curious mix composed in relatively equal proportions of 1) familiar principles of international law pertaining to wartime neutrality re-tooled for peacetime service and attuned to the spirit of the politics of nonalignment and 2) planks from the political platform of the movement of nonaligned countries dressed up as normative prescriptions to justify insistence upon strict compliance with their terms."[109] The result contained "traditional Western concepts, adaptation to the realities of the politics of neutrality in today's Europe, and efforts to persuade the European neutral states to support the 'peace policies' of the socialist camp."[110] This rather demanding definition concerning neutrals' peacetime obligations was published and later incorporated into semi-official Soviet publications.[111]

The teachings of the late 1950s and early 1960s distinguished between permanent neutrality (which was founded either on an international agreement or a national declaration that was recognized by other states) and "positive" or "active" neutrality or "neutral policy" (which was in the majority of cases declared unilaterally and a synonym for neutralism or nonalignment).[112] According to the Soviet theory, the differences between permanent neutrality and neutralism were mainly formal ones: While permanent neutrality was an institute of international law and the permanent neutrals were legally obliged to maintain wartime neutrality and, in peacetime, to conduct a neutral policy,[113] positive neutrality was merely a course of peacetime foreign policy, based on free will and without any legal obligations. The permanent neutral was bound "to permanently maintain neutrality, never to start a war, and to refrain from conducting a policy that might lead to war," and, therefore, "not to partake in military blocs or groupings, to ban the presence of foreign troops on their soil, and to maintain friendly relations with all states."[114] Another

---

the neutral's territory; 3) a ban on nuclear weapons; 4) good relations with all states; 5) no aid to any aggressor. *Legal Aspects of Neutrality*, 111–112.

[109] Ginsburgs, "Neutralism à la Russe," 19.

[110] Hakovirta, "The Soviet Union and the Varieties of Neutrality," 582.

[111] "Neitralitet," in A. A. Gromyko, I. N. Zemskov, and V. M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Politizdat, 1973), 373–374, 373.

[112] See, for instance, "Neitralitet Pozitivnyi," and "Neitralitet Postoiannyi," in A.A. Gromyko, S. A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961) 395; 396–397; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 15. The subject is analyzed in great detail in Fiedler, *Der sowjetische Neutralitätsbegriff*, 84–89; Scarlis, *Neutralität*, 44–53. With respect to the various ways of adopting the status of positive neutrality, Tiunov mentions the following possibilities: 1) a unilateral declaration; 2) a bilateral communiqué or treaty; 3) a multilateral conference. Furthermore, Tiunov makes the case that neutralism was in the process of transforming itself into an institute of international law and, therefore, should be codified at an international conference sponsored by the UN. Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 5–7; 124; 139–143; 156–157. This latter demand was rejected by Ganiushkin. Scarlis, *Neutralität*, 48–49.

[113] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 16, 83–84, 86.

[114] Lewin and Kaljushnaja, *Völkerrecht*, 112. Cf. Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 83–84: A permanently neutral state must "refrain from war except in self-defense and, in peacetime, follow

formal difference between permanent and positive neutrality was that the former was regarded valid only if internationally notified and recognized.[115] As in Western international law, the notification and recognition of neutrality were seen as creating a contractual relationship between a neutral state and other states: "As long and insofar the permanently neutral state fulfills his obligations, the other states are, according to international law, obliged to respect his permanent neutrality."[116]

Here, however, the differences between permanent and positive neutrality, as based on the Soviet theory, ended. Soviet politicians and publications stressed that both groups, i.e. permanent as well as positive neutrals, had to conduct a neutral policy in peacetime (one by obligation, the other by free will) and refused to see any difference with regard to peacetime obligations. Ganiushkin postulated that

> "regarding the comprehensiveness and character of the measures taken to carry out a policy of neutrality, there can be no difference between permanently neutral countries and countries that follow the path of nonalignment. However, there is a difference with regard to the fact that in general, nonaligned countries conduct a policy of nonalignment only by virtue of a unilateral declaration of intention, whereas permanently neutral states conduct such a policy on the basis of an international agreement."[117]

Since the peacetime policy of permanently neutral and nonaligned countries was subsumed under "neutral policy," the differences between the foreign policies of countries as diverse as India, Yugoslavia, Finland, Austria, and Switzerland were blurred.[118] Even more importantly, the Soviet claim that in peacetime permanent

---

neutral policies, i.e. not partake in military alliances and coalitions, not conclude agreements that might draw the permanently neutral state into a war, and strengthen the friendship with other states." Cf. Tiunov's definition: "Permanent neutrality is a status in international law of a sovereign state that is, according to a unilateral expression of will or an international contract, obliged not to participate in any war except in the case of self-defense, and, in peacetime, to conduct a policy that prevents him from being entangled in a war, i.e. not to enter military alliances, not to allow the locating of foreign military bases on its territory, not to conclude treaties that foster an economic or a political preparation for war, and not to provide its army with weapons of mass destruction, as well as obliged to struggle actively for peace and peaceful coexistence." Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 21.

[115] Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 49. While Tiunov and Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 94, deemed tacit recognition possible, the same was considered insufficient by Ganiushkin in *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 114–115. Nonetheless, Ganiushkin declares that all countries which have recognized neutrality "either explicity or tacitly" are obliged to respect it. Ibid., 127. Cf. Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 238. In any case, declaring neutrality without notification was not deemed sufficient for establishing permanent neutrality.

[116] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 16.

[117] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 113.

[118] In the East German edition of Tunkin's *Voprosy teorii mezhdunarodnogo prava* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1962), references to "neutral states" do not differenciate between nonaligned and European neutrals. Tunkin, *Das Völkerrecht der Gegenwart*, 178, 181, 190. See also "Neutrality," in A. M. Prokhorov et al. (eds.), *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* 17, 3rd ed. (New York: Macmillan, 1974), 518–519; "Neprisoedineniia printsip," in A. M. Prokhorov et al. (eds.), *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* 17, 3rd ed. (Moscow: "Sovetskaia entsiklopediia," 1974), 498–499. On the

neutrals were legally obliged to follow the same foreign policy as the nonaligned massively increased the burden laid on the permanent neutrals. This was, actually, the main feature of the Soviet neutrality doctrine and its main bone of contention for the Western neutrals, which rejected such claims.

While neutrality was defined by Soviet theory as a "means to conserve the peace," it meant not only abstention from war, but also from the Cold War.[119] This postulate was a clear example of how Soviet political demands were transformed by Soviet experts of international law into legal claims. In addition to nonparticipation in war, military alliances and closed economic blocs, as well as avoidance of any measure that might compel the neutral to join a conflict, including participation in economic embargoes or hostile propaganda against foreign powers, a neutral's international obligations, from the Soviet point of view, also comprised "neighborly" or "friendly" "peaceful relations with all other countries."[120] This concerned, in particular, the neutrals' relations to the socialist states. It aimed at obliging the neutrals to establish ties with socialist states that were not yet recognized by the West, such as the GDR and communist China, and not to partake in Western boycotts against the Eastern bloc.

In general, a neutral was not to be "passively indifferent to all occurrences in the international arena" or even "neutral in the question of war or peace," but to "actively struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence," fighting the "forces of war and imperialism" (i.e. the West), supporting the "forces of peace" (i.e. the Eastern bloc), and thus to augment a "zone of peace."[121] It was to contribute to a reduction of tensions, promote neutrality, and struggle for all-European security, in short to be "one form of peaceful coexistence."[122] The active "struggle for peace" and "friendship" was seen as the highest duty of a neutral and as "the main criterion for

---

following, see Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 225. Cf. L. A. Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1962).

[119] D.B. Lewin, "Grundprinzipien des modernen Völkerrechts," in *Drei sowjetische Beiträge zur Völkerrechtslehre* (Hamburg: Hanseatischer Gildenverlag, 1969), 59–306, 225–228; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 119; Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," 219.

[120] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 83–84; idem, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 16–17, 118–119, 127; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 5–7. Cf. Fiedler, *Der sowjetische Neutralitätsbegriff*, 88, 96–103, with further reference to Soviet international-law literature, and Heinz Fiedler, "Neutralität," in C.D. Kernig (ed.), *Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft: Eine vergleichende Enzyklopädie* 4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1971), 782–796.

[121] E.A. Korovin, "Istoriia mezhdunarodnogo prava," in F.I. Kozhevnikov (ed.) , *Mezhdunarodnoe pravo* (Moscow: Iurizdat, 1957), 24–85, 83; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet,* 3; L. Vidyasova, "An Impressive Example of Peaceful Coexistence," in *International Affairs*, no. 8 (August 1960), 11–15, 13; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 15.

[122] Zhiriakov, *SSSR – Avstriia*, 32. Cf. Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 5; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 10; G. Osnitskaya, "Neutrality and the Common Market," in *International Affairs*, no. 6 (June 1962), 52–55, 52.

evaluating it."[123] In Soviet political understanding, it was not possible for a positively or permanently neutral country to be content with its own neutrality, but it had to actively contribute, by means of its neutrality and policies, to a "relaxation of tensions."[124] Neutrality's international function was construed as a contribution towards the spreading of the "zone of peace," "a form of the struggle against the formation of blocs,"[125] and a way to "limit the sphere of action of the aggressive NATO bloc" and to weaken its cohesion. Thus, the USSR, unlike the theory of neutrality as held in the West, thought neutrality to be a "means of changing the balance of power rather than preserving it."[126]

Some accounts even claimed that, in the event of war, the neutral was not to treat the aggressor and the victim equally.[127] While such thoughts were a result of the Leninist theory of "just wars," they were hardly reconcilable with the core concept of neutrality. Similarly inconsistent with the Western theory was the Soviet claim that a neutral should join the struggle for decolonization[128] – a movement that was expected to dismantle Western bases worldwide, disrupt the flow of raw material from the colonies to Western Europe, and thus, to cripple global capitalism and Western power. While permanent neutrality meant the obligation to abstain from any war except for self-defense, in contrast, positive neutrality, in the Soviet understanding, did not comprise such obligation; the armed struggle for decolonization was, in any case, seen as justified.

Such obligations, Soviet publications claimed, were readily accepted by the neutrals:

> "Step by step, the states exercising a neutral policy came to the awareness that, in our time, one must not confine oneself to mere nonparticipation in blocs, but rather, if one seeks to conserve and foster peace, one must fight a decisive battle for peace […].

> The states that follow the road of neutrality are not neutral in questions of war and peace; they stand up for peace and peaceful coexistence, for the friendship and cooperation of large and small states, of the peoples of all lands. This is why neutrality under the current conditions is assessed as positive by the Soviet Union and other states of the global socialist community, by Marxist-Leninist parties, and by the international communist and Labor movements."[129]

---

[123] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 8. Cf. idem, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 14–15; 147; 162.

[124] Mojoryan [Modzhorian], "Neutrality in Present-Day International Law," 219, 226. See also Zhiriakov, *Sovetskii Soiuz – Avstriia*, 29: "The policy of permanent neutrality does not mean indifference regarding international developments but an appropriate contribution to the most important international problems, to the normalization of the situation in Europe, and to the increase of the mutual advantageous cooperation between European countries." Cf. Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 215–220.

[125] Zhiriakov, *Sovetskii Soiuz – Avstriia*, 39.

[126] Cyril E. Black, Richard A. Falk, Klaus Knorr, and Oran R. Young, *Neutralization and World Politics* (Princeton: University Press, 1968), 45.

[127] Koschewnikow, "Die Gesetze und Gewohnheiten des Krieges," 469; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (ed.), *Legal Aspects of Neutrality,* 114.

[128] Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 27–29.

[129] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 181–184.

In practice, the Soviet Union expected neutral countries to support Soviet or the "people's democracies'" existing initiatives on détente, arms control, nuclear nonproliferation and the banning of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the USSR, particularly after the experience of 1950 when the United Nations, against Soviet wishes, took active part in the defense of South Korea against communist armed aggression, encouraged neutral and nonaligned countries to join the UN and even its peace missions.[130] Soviet scientists cited Austria as proof that it was not longer seen as incompatible to be neutral and also a member of the United Nations. Obviously, the Soviet Union was interested not only in making neutrality more attractive by inviting the neutrals into such organizations, but also in benefiting from the neutral countries' support for the Soviet struggle within the international forums. The reason was simple:

> "The majority of nonaligned states in the UN support the peace-loving efforts of the USSR and other socialist states, and they stand up together with them. This enlarges the forces of peace in the United Nations Organization, even augments its possibilities for securing peace and security. The change of the balance of forces within the UN, which interrupts the US and other imperialistic states in using the formerly unchallenged 'voting machine,' delights all who hold peace dear."[131]

Within the United Nations, neutral states, according to the Soviet doctrine, had to obey the following rule: If the Security Council unanimously, i.e. with Soviet support, sponsored a decision, a neutral state had to follow. If the General Assembly made a decision that was against the Soviet will, the neutrals were expected to remain "neutral" and not to follow.[132]

Another duty of permanent neutrals and nonaligned as claimed in Soviet theory and practice was nondiscrimination and economic equidistance between the blocs.[133] Hence, the neutrals' participation in schemes of West European integration was ruled out. Both claims were deduced by Soviet theorists from the Hague Conventions on wartime neutrality and, without further legal basis, transferred to the list of the permanent neutrals' peacetime obligations. As far as economic equidistance was concerned, when criticizing the European neutrals' bonds with the West, Soviet experts tended to tacitly overlook the fact that many nonaligned states oriented themselves towards the Eastern bloc. This bias was justified in Soviet statements with the observation that the Eastern bloc, by definition, did not abuse economic links by using them to exert pressure. In fact, the more socialist components spotted in the neutralist's economy, the more "neutralist" it was considered in Soviet eyes.[134]

---

[130] Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 18–19; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 59–60. Cf. Alexander Dallin, *Die Sowjetunion und die Vereinten Nationen* (Cologne: Wissenschaft und Politik, 1965), 41.

[131] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 213.

[132] Bindschedler-Robert, "Völkerrecht und Neutralität aus sowjetischer Sicht," 161.

[133] Osnitskaya, "Neutrality and the Common Market," 54. Cf. Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 171; International Association of Democratic Lawyers (ed.), *Legal Aspects of Neutrality*, 114.

[134] Ginsburgs, "Neutralism à la Russe," 28.

The question of whether neutrals would be allowed or had to defend themselves in the case of war was not unanimously answered by Soviet scholars.[135] Unanimity existed regarding the demand that the neutrals' armies be moderate in size and the claim that the Swedish and Swiss armies clearly exceeded such dimensions. In addition, there was a Soviet tendency to discount small states' efforts for self-defense as futile. When Sweden, a small neutral, aimed at increasing its deterrence, Soviet propaganda criticized such efforts as obsolete and militaristic, and the Soviet navy and air force systematically violated Sweden's territorial waters and airspace, as if to demonstrate the futility of the neutral's efforts.[136] This type of policy reflected the consistently one-sided depiction of self-defense in Soviet propaganda in general: While a Soviet build-up of armed forces (including nuclear weaponry and an offensive military doctrine) was hailed as strengthening the peace, Western self-defense was attacked as being aggressive. The neutrals were positioned somewhere in the middle: Since not even TASS dared to claim that the Swedish or Austrian armies were designed to invade the USSR, it aimed at demoralizing them. The possession of nuclear weapons was deemed incompatible with neutrality, for it would increase a neutral's dependence on foreign military technology and also the risk of being destroyed in a war by a nuclear counterattack.[137] When Switzerland and Sweden, in the late 1950s and 1960s, considered introducing a program for nuclear defense, both countries were fiercely attacked by Soviet propaganda.

Even trickier than self-defense was the issue of freedom of opinion. Leaders of neutral states such as Austria's Julius Raab or Finland's Urho Kekkonen insisted that "our neutrality does not extend to political convictions."[138] Indeed, neither wartime nor peacetime neutrality, even according to Soviet theory, curbs the freedom of opinion or of the press. However, Soviet scholars insisted on a ban against "hostile propaganda" and – not without a side blow against Western ideas such as "freedom of the media" – advised the governments of both permanent and positive neutrals to take action against such behavior:

---

[135] While Durdenevskii, Tiunov and Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet,* 93–95, support the opinion that a permanently neutral state is obliged to defend itself, Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 121–127, casts doubt on whether such obligations were still valid and praises Austrian plans for full disarmament. Levin merely mentions the neutral states' right to defend themselves. Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 24; Durdenewski, "Zur schweizerischen Neutralität," 28; Lewin and Kaljushnaja, *Völkerrecht*, 112. Cf. Scarlis, *Neutralität*, 48–51; Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 236.

[136] Nils Andrén, "Swedish-Soviet Relations: An Overview," in Bo Huldt and Atis Lejins (eds.), *European Neutrals and the Soviet Union* (Stockholm: The Swedish Institute of International Affairs, 1985), 59–81, 69; 74–75.

[137] Hakovirta, "East-West Tensions," 209. Cf. "Neitralitet," in *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 2nd ed., 392–397, 396; Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 121; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 31–33.

[138] Urho Kekkonen, *A President's View* (London: Heinemann, 1982), 168.

"It is true that neutrality obliges the state as such, but not its individual citizens. It is also true – as has been mentioned – that international law does not demand that a neutral state conform to so-called ideological neutrality, the neutrality of the press, etc. However, […] this type of activity from its individual citizens does not conform to the interests of a permanently neutral state as, for example, the propaganda of war, fostering an atmosphere of hostility in relation to a certain country or its representatives, etc. As much as they referred in such cases to 'freedom of conscience,' 'freedom of thought' or other 'democratic rights,' we cannot but remember that in the past, actions of this sort by individual citizens led Switzerland into serious conflicts with other countries. Therefore, it is primarily in the own interests of a permanently neutral state to put a stop to such activities by individuals, as it may draw the neutral state into conflict."[139]

It is quite telling that the "other country," referred to by the Soviet author when recommending not criticizing foreign powers was Nazi Germany. Indeed, similar ideas had been put forward by German legal experts who had been instrumental in shaping the contemporary Swiss understanding of neutral policy.[140]

Fulfilling all these expectations and tasks (apparently believed by Soviet leaders to work to the Soviet advantage), in Western understanding, would have been interpreted as abandoning neutrality in favor of joining the Soviet "peaceful coexistence" rally. At the very least, it was considered nonalignment rather than neutrality.[141] From the Soviet point of view, however, these points were declared necessary for being neutral.

While most claims of the Soviet theory of neutral policy could be dismissed as unofficial postulates without legal basis or international relevance – some were even mutually contradictory – the growing catalog of demands was nonetheless increasingly hard to ignore and, if unchallenged by the West, bore the risk of being transformed into legal claims. This threatened to become a constant strife factor,[142] even more so, because Soviet experts on international law claimed the right of other states to evaluate the policies of each neutral and decide whether its obligations were being properly fulfilled. Only by faithfully observing the Soviet theses, we are told in Soviet statements, can a neutral guarantee that it will not be drawn into future conflicts.[143]

"If the permanently neutral state deviates from fulfilling his obligations of neutrality, then the guarantor and other interested powers may draw this state's attention to the inadmissibility of a unilateral change or the abandonment of the status that is based on a multilateral international

---

[139] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 146. Cf. ibid., 13, 118–120.

[140] Schweitzer, *Dauernde Neutralität*, 107.

[141] Scarlis, *Neutralität*, 41–42. Konrad Ginther, *Neutralität und Neutralitätspolitik: Die österreichische Neutralität zwischen Schweizer Modell und sowjetischer Koexistenzdoktrin* (Vienna: Springer, 1975), 110, asks whether such a neutrality *à la Soviétique* is neutrality at all, or rather a terminologically disguised partiality. For a comparative analysis of the European neutrals' dilemma in the East-West conflict, see Hanspeter Neuhold, "The Neutral States of Europe: Similarities and Differences," in Alan T. Leonhard (ed.), *Neutrality: Changing Concepts and Practices* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1988), 97–144, esp. 122–127.

[142] Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 133.

[143] Ginsburgs, "Neutralism à la Russe," 18–19.

agreement, and use the means at their disposal – with the exception of force or threat thereof – to prevent the status of permanent neutrality being abandoned without the consent of all interested powers."[144]

If a neutral country did these things "correctly," it was highly praised by the Soviet side and rewarded. This might include tributes in the news media, other publications, or official statements, or increases in official exchanges or trade and cultural relations. If the Soviet side felt that a neutral was on the right path, the country was encouraged to continue steps in the same direction. If it did not fulfill Soviet expectations, however, it was criticized for not living up to its "international obligations," threatened with negative consequences and told what to do. Attempts at persuasion were made by references to "popular opinion" or a "sober assessment of the facts." In most such cases, the Soviet side relied on an instrumental approach: Since neutrality was portrayed as desirable, undesired actions by neutral states were branded as being at odds with neutrality and inspired by sinister militaristic and imperialistic circles, their local "lackeys," or "unreliable and adventurous elements." Therefore, it was stated that "neutrality" did not allow neutral countries to do what the USSR did not want them to do.[145] If Soviet demands were neglected too long, reminders of its stipulations were published. Other means of "reminding" a neutral of the Soviet point of view included economic sanctions and political pressure, as were applied, for instance, by the Soviet Union against Finland during the "night frost crisis" of 1958, when the Kremlin, after a change of government in Finland and out of fear of a swing in Finnish policy towards the West, put pressure on the newly-elected cabinet, froze trade negotiations, and withdrew the Soviet ambassador.[146]

Austria's neutrality, its Swiss model, and the Soviet interpretation

Although the Austrian state treaty was one of the first results of the changed Soviet attitude towards neutrality and despite the Kremlin's paramount role in Austria's neutralization,[147] the Soviet interpretation of neutrality was not automatically adop-

---

[144] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 97.

[145] For an in-depth study of this issue, see Bo Petersson, *The Soviet Union and Peacetime Neutrality in Europe: A Study of Soviet Political Language* (Stockholm: MH Publishing, 1990).

[146] Aappo Kähönen, *The Soviet Union, Finland, and the Cold War: The Finnish Card in Soviet Foreign Policy, 1956–1959* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2006), 127–139. The crisis was resolved by Kekkonen, who toppled the coalition and formed a new government that was trusted by the Kremlin. **With the "night frost crisis," the USSR increased its say in the composition of Finnish governments.** Häikiö, "Finland's Neutrality 1944–1994," 208–209.

[147] The term has raised a certain amount of discussion. For some, neutralization means the imposition of neutrality upon a small nation by an international agreement or by more powerful countries – a process that is not legal according to international law. For others, neutralization means the process of becoming neutral. Schweitzer, *Dauernde Neutralität*, 41–42. Since Austria's neutrality *de iure* was chosen freely, de facto however imposed by the USSR, some political scientists speak adop-

ted by Austria. In order to avoid any ambiguity and not to buy a neutrality "pig in a poke," the Western powers already before signing the state treaty, had made it clear that Austria would adopt neutrality only "as it was maintained by Switzerland." And in order to convince the Austrian delegation in Moscow, which had been reluctant to mention neutrality at all, the Soviet side had proposed this definition for the Moscow memorandum.[148]

The roots of Switzerland's neutrality are usually traced back to the Old Confederacy's army's defeat in the battle of Marignano in 1515, which put an end to all Swiss ambitions to become a great power. The idea of neutrality was also fostered by the religious and ethnic diversity of the Alpine cantons – a diversity that made taking sides in the various European religious wars seem a risky undertaking, indeed a risk to the very existence of the Confederation. Squeezed in between France and the Holy Empire, Switzerland henceforth strove at remaining neutral in numerous conflicts. After the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars had affected the country, the great powers at the Congress of Vienna fulfilled a Swiss request by officially recognizing this country's permanent neutrality and guaranteeing the inviolability of its territory.[149] It was after the experience of two world wars, which in many ways challenged Switzerland's status and principles, and in the wake of a new challenge posed by the Cold War, that the Swiss Foreign Ministry, in November 1954, chose to write down the principles of permanent neutrality based on its own understanding. The internal document that was published soon afterwards defined the peacetime obligations of Swiss neutrality as having two main duties: 1) not to start a war, and 2) to be prepared for "defending [the country's] neutrality and independence."[150] Besides these main obligations, the Swiss doctrine contained the secondary duties "to do everything to avoid being drawn into a war and to refrain from anything that might draw [the neutral] into a future war." To this end, the neutral had to "maintain a neutral policy." Although the design of such policy was a "matter of [the neutral's] discretion," the doctrine drafted by law expert Rudolf Bindschedler listed the following points as obligatory: In politics and military matters, Switzerland must not

of Austria's factual neutralization. Ogley, *The Theory and Practice of Neutrality*, 2; Sigmund Widmer, "Forms of Neutrality," in Joseph Kruzel and Michael Haltzel (eds.), *Between the Blocs: Problems and Prospects for Europe's Neutral and Nonaligned States* (Cambridge: University Press, 1989), 17–28, 21.

[148] Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 434–435.

[149] Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 35–40. Cf. Edgar Bonjour, *Geschichte der Schweizerischen Neutralität* (Basel: Helbing und Lichtenhahn, 1978); Mark R. Rubin and Laurent Wehrli, "Switzerland," 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), 43–70, 44–54.

[150] The official Swiss doctrine of neutrality of 26 November 1954, in *Schweizerisches Jahrbuch für Internationales Recht* (1957), 195–199, 195. Also published in Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 113–117. See also Alfred Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität Österreichs* (Vienna: Geschichte und Politik, 1980), 38–43.

join any alliances nor allow the maintenance of foreign bases on its soil. In the economic field, the neutral must not conclude a customs or economic union with stronger partners, since such moves would compromise the country's sovereignty. The Swiss neutrality doctrine rejected the notion of "moral neutrality" or an obligation of the press or the individual to bow to concepts of this kind.

As soon became visible, the Austrian practice of neutral policy deviated in many respects from that of the Swiss,[151] in particular with regard to Austria's earlier date of joining the United Nations (1955 vs. 2003) and the Council of Europe (1956 vs. 1963), and its not creating a strong army. Suffice it here to say that in 1955 the Swiss doctrine does not seem to have been publicized in Austria. Although the Austrian-Soviet Moscow memorandum mentioned Swiss neutrality in general terms, none of the official Austrian statements of 1955 referred to the Swiss doctrine, and it was publicly discussed by Austrian scholars only from 1967.[152] The Austrian Constitutional Law on Neutrality, adopted on 26 October 1955, stipulated that Austria

> 1) "voluntarily declares its permanent neutrality. Austria will maintain and defend [neutrality] by all means at [the country's] disposal.
>
> 2) In order to secure these objectives in the future, Austria will not join military alliances nor allow military bases of foreign powers to be created on its soil."[153]

The official comments on the government's proposal for the motion explained that Austria was obliged to avoid any "relations that might draw it into a war," especially military alliances and foreign bases.[154] In addition to this, neutrality would not cause any restrictions with regard to Austria's "design of internal or foreign policy," or the freedom of its citizens and the media. In contrast to the Swiss and, still more, the Soviet doctrine, Austrian leaders in 1955 imagined neutrality merely as a status of nonaggression combined with freedom from alliances and foreign bases. No further document was published to specify the so-called secondary obligations. Chancellor Raab in 1955 claimed that neutrality would "contain no com-

---

[151] Friedrich Koja and Gerald Stourzh (eds.), *Österreich – Schweiz: Ähnlichkeiten und Kontraste* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1986); esp. Luzius Wildhaber, "Neutralität, Außenpolitik und internationale Organisationen aus Schweizer Sicht," ibid., 209–227; and Hanspeter Neuhold, "Außenpolitik, dauernde Neutralität und internationale Organisationen aus österreichischer Sicht," ibid. 229–263.

[152] Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 79, 113–117; Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 70–71. The first editions of Felix Ermacora, *Österreichs Staatsvertrag und Neutralität* (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1957), and Alfred Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik Österreich* (Vienna: Österreichischer Bundesverlag, 1958), do not contain references to the Swiss doctrine.

[153] Text in Ermacora, *Österreichs Staatsvertrag und Neutralität*, 104. On the genesis of the Neutrality law, see Gerald Stourzh, "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des österreichischen Neutralitätsgesetzes," in Thomas Olechowski (ed.), *Fünfzig Jahre Staatsvertrag und Neutralität* (Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 2006), 67–94.

[154] Text ibid., 100–103.

mitments and obligations in economic and cultural areas."[155] This fell short even of the official Swiss neutrality doctrine, with its reference to economic neutrality. With the notable exception of the social democratic party leadership surrounding Bruno Pittermann, who spoke out for this type of neutrality,[156] Raab's coalition partner, the SPÖ, like most West European social democratic parties at the time, stressed Austria's bonds to the Western world even more than Raab's own ÖVP and limited neutrality strictly to military matters. Prior to 1955, Bruno Kreisky, the social democratic state secretary in the Foreign Department, avoided mentioning neutrality and preferred instead to use the term "nonalliance" as being something Austria might adopt.[157] Despite such differences, the Austrian consensus was similar to that of Switzerland or Sweden in that the country's neutral policy included a clear refusal of ideological neutralism.[158] It was part of this consensus that neutrality bound only the actions of the government, not the right of the country's citizens or the media to state their opinions.[159]

Austrian scholars, for their part, began to develop a neutrality doctrine in the late 1950s. Their champion, Alfred Verdross, defined the following characteristics of permanent neutrality: 1) the obligation to refrain from starting a war and to maintain neutrality in future wars; 2) the obligation to defend the country's neutrality and territorial integrity; 3) not to undertake any obligations that might draw the neutral into a war; 4) neutrality can be guaranteed by foreign powers; 5) the neutral remains free with respect to its domestic and foreign policies; 6) there is no obligation for ideological neutrality.[160] Despite the fact that citizens bore no international obligations, they, in Verdross' view, had the moral duty to their own country to be moderate and honest when criticizing foreign affairs in order not to cause difficulties for the neutral country's foreign policy. The idea of economic neutrality was publicly debated in Austria only from 1959.[161]

---

[155] Quoted in Stearman, *The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria*, 172. Cf. Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität Österreichs*, 49.

[156] Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 79.

[157] Röhrlich, *Kreiskys Außenpolitik*, 119.

[158] Maximilian Gottschlich, Oswald Panagl, and Manfred Welan (eds.), *Was die Kanzler sagten: Regierungserklärungen der Zweiten Republik 1945–1987* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1989), 126; Konrad Ginther, *Österreichs immerwährende Neutralität* (Vienna: Geschichte und Politik, 1975), 19; idem, *Neutralität und Neutralitätspolitik*, 42. Cf. Alfred Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik Österreich,* 2nd ed. (Vienna: Bundesverlag, 1966), 14; Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 100. On Sweden, see Molin, "Central Issues of Swedish Neutrality Policy," 263–264; on Switzerland, the official Swiss doctrine in Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 113–117. The difference between neutrality and neutralism is exemplified using the Austrian case in Thomas O. Schlesinger, *Austrian Neutrality in Postwar Europe: The Domestic Roots of a Foreign Policy* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1972), 117–138.

[159] Schweitzer, *Dauernde Neutralität*, 140.

[160] Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik* (1958), 15–17, 29.

[161] Karl Zemanek, "Wirtschaftliche Neutralität," in *Juristische Blätter* 81, no. 10–11 (1959), 249–251.

The restrictive Austrian definition of the neutral's obligations was not approved by the Soviet side. There cannot be any doubt that the general Soviet attitude towards Austria's neutrality was positive: "Since the USSR was one of the architects of Austria's permanent neutrality, the benevolent and favorable attitude adopted by the Soviet Union towards it over the years should not come as a surprise."[162] Andrei Gromyko, the generally bland Soviet foreign minister, was truly enthusiastic when remembering Austria in his memoirs:

> "Which other country in central Europe can one consider a pillar of neutrality? The answer must be Austria […] Those across the Atlantic who do not like Austria's neutrality and who criticize it as 'amoral' are deeply wrong. The Soviet Union's relations with Austria are a compelling example of balanced cooperation between states having different social systems. In fact, if there is amorality, it lies in any attempt to make Austria repudiate her neutrality. […] Europe needs a neutral Austria, and so do the Austrian people."[163]

This description contained all the main elements of Soviet neutrality propaganda: the high moral value of neutrality, its benefits, and its sinister enemies "across the Atlantic." As we shall see, Soviet statements were not always as positive, and the Austrian practice of neutral policy was repeatedly and quite explicitly subject to Soviet critique. This kind of disagreement concerned a number of facets of the Western understanding of neutrality in general and its Austrian variant in particular, its genesis as well as the legal obligations stemming from it.

Some consensus existed between Soviet and most Austrian experts and politicians that Austria's neutrality had been established through an act of national legislation that was made officially known to and was recognized by many other states.[164] The combination of notification and recognition was generally interpreted as "creating a contractual relationship" under which Austria's permanent neutrality was based on international law; such a "relationship" could be terminated only in accordance with international law.[165] As a result, Austria – like Switzerland – was considered to be "legally bound to practice permanent neutrality and to abide by the obligations stemming from it."[166] Therefore, until the 1990s Austria was generally seen as not free to modify or abandon its status at will. In the late 1950s, legal expert Felix Ermacora doubted this doctrine, but later conceded his error.[167]

---

[162] Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," 87.

[163] Andrei Gromyko, *Memories* (London: Hutchinson, 1989), 225–226.

[164] Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik* (1958), 12; Hanspeter Neuhold, "The Permanent Neutrality of Austria," in Karl E. Birnbaum and Hanspeter Neuhold (eds.), *Neutrality and Non-Alignment in Europe*, Laxenburg Papers 4 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1981), 44–61, 48; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 127; idem, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 154; Zhriakov, *Sovetskii Soiuz – Avstriia*, 37–38.

[165] Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 5.

[166] Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," 89.

[167] Ermacora, *Österreichs Staatsvertrag und Neutralität*, 108–109; idem, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 75.

Concerning the background of the country's neutralization, Austrian experts in international law did not subscribe to the Soviet thesis that neutrality was the consequence of a shift in the international balance of forces towards socialism. In contrast, they, more traditionally, saw the neutralization of a country to be the result of, or a solution for, a stalemate between two external great powers in their struggle for influence over said country. It entailed a postponement *ad infinitum* of the struggle.[168] While Austrian official statements consistently repeated that Austria's neutralization had been a voluntary act – a claim that was correct from a purely legal point of view – interestingly, Ermacora acknowledged that this was only half of the truth, with Soviet insistence being the other side of the coin.[169] Soviet statements, however, rejected any notion of Austria having been "neutralized."[170]

Regarding other aspects of Austrian neutrality, further disagreements can be discerned. Some of them had to do with the legal value of the Moscow memorandum, which had stipulated the Soviet government's preparedness to join the Western powers in signing the state treaty and the Austrian delegation's promise to submit a declaration of neutrality to the Austrian parliament for consideration and adoption. Since the delegation had lacked the legal power to declare Austria's neutrality, and since the memorandum was not subject to ratification by the parliaments of the two countries, it was, as concurred by most Austrian legal experts, not an international agreement that was binding for anyone other than the two delegations.[171] Only a minority of Austrian experts regarded the memorandum as binding to the state of Austria, thus making obligatory a declaration, if not adoption, of neutrality. On the Soviet side, legal expert Tiunov claimed that the Moscow memorandum created an obligation for Austria to declare and maintain neutrality, and his colleague Ganiushkin argued that the Moscow memorandum had been cited by Foreign Minister Molotov at the four-power gathering on the eve of the signing of the state treaty and thus acquired "the importance of an act of international law."[172] Since the memorandum was referred to in the state treaty, the entire contents of the memorandum allegedly became a part of the international agreement. Some (even semi-official) statements, as in the Soviet *Diplomatic Dictionary*, went so far as to allege that

---

[168] Manfred Rotter, *Die dauernde Neutralität* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1981), 98; Karl Zemanek, "Austria's Policy of Neutrality: Constants and Variables," in Hanspeter Neuhold and Hans Thalberg (eds.), *The European neutrals in international affairs*, Laxenburg Papers 7 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1984), 17–24, 17.

[169] Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 15. Ermacora underlines that the USSR was the only member of the four powers to insist on Austria's neutralization. Ibid., 76.

[170] Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 126; idem, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 155.

[171] Ermacora, *Österreichs Staatsvertrag und Neutralität*, 106; Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik* (1958), 11; Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 232–233; Schweitzer, *Dauernde Neutralität*, 81.

[172] Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 153–156; idem, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 127; Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 47.

Austria's neutrality was founded or, at least, "recognized in the state treaty."[173] Andrei Gromyko, who served as foreign minister from Khrushchev to Gorbachev, in his consistently biased memoirs, even referred to "Austria, which acquired neutral status by the Vienna State Treaty, signed on 15 May 1955 by the USSR, the USA, Great Britain, France and Austria"[174] – a minor, albeit in the Austrian case substantial, distortion that can hardly be attributed to a lapse in the impeccable diplomat's memory. Other Soviet statements claimed that the four powers had to be consulted if Austria wished to modify or abandon neutrality.[175] Such claims, ultimately boiling down to creating an international obligation for Austria to declare and maintain neutrality, and a special Soviet entitlement for controlling its practice, were considered by Austrian experts to be "groundless."[176] Austrian scholars and diplomats did their best to correct such claims.[177]

Another particularly controversial issue was the question of who was entitled to define the obligations comprised by a neutral peacetime policy. Since the internationally recognized catalog of legal duties only dealt with wartime obligations, the Swiss and Austrian governments claimed that the task of defining and shaping their neutral policy in peacetime rested on the respective government alone.[178] Although the judgment of the Austrian government in this respect was accepted by the Soviet Union during Chancellor Raab's visit to Moscow, some Soviet scholars continued to declare such claims as unjustified.[179]

The main contrast between Soviet and Austrian interpretations, however, regarded the legal obligations stemming from permanent neutrality, in particular the fact that Austrian neutrality was, especially in the first years after its declaration, far from "total" (i.e. applied to politics, bilateral relations, trade, and the media), as was demanded by the Soviet side. Austria's neutral policy comprised neither re-

---

[173] "Neitralitet Postoiannyi," in A.A. Gromyko, S. A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov (eds.), *Diplomaticheskii slovar'*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1960–1964) 2, 397. Cf. Tiunov, *Neitralitet v mezhdunarodnom prave*, 38; Beletskii, *Sovetskii Soiuz i Avstriia,* 242.

[174] Gromyko, *Memories*, 225. On Gromyko's memoirs, cf. Norman Stone, "Andrei Gromyko as Foreign Minister: The Problems of a Decaying Empire," in Gordon A. Craig and Francis L. Loewenheim (eds.), *The Diplomats, 1939–1979* (Princeton: University Press, 1994), 593–608, 595.

[175] Iu. M. Prusakov, *Neitralitet v sovremennom mezhdunarodnom prave* (Moscow: Znanie, 1972), 42–43.

[176] Hafner, "Die permanente Neutralität," 231. Cf. Ermacora, *Österreichs Staatsvertrag und Neutralität*, 106.

[177] Gerald Stourzh, "Once More about Austria's Neutrality," in *International Affairs*, no. 4 (April 1962), 110; Peter Marboe, "Letter to the Editor," in *New York Times*, 22 April 1981, quoted in Johnson-Freese, "Austria," 166.

[178] Hans Mayrzedt and Waldemar Hummer (eds.), *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik 1955–1975*, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Außenpolitik Schriftenreihe 9 (Vienna: Braumüller, 1976) 1, 112; Verdross, *Die immerwährende Neutralität der Republik* (1958), 19; Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 214. For the Swiss case, see Verosta, *Die dauernde Neutralität*, 114.

[179] Zhiriakov, *Sovetskii Soiuz – Avstriia*, 37–38; Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," 90.

strictions against criticizing the Soviet Union or joining West European integration nor obligations to struggle against Western blocs or to "actively" promote peace and international understanding. The restrictive definition of a neutral's duties and the "passivity" of Austria's neutral policy were criticized by Soviet scholars as disregarding "the new character" of neutrality and limiting it to an alliance-free status.[180] Making Austria more neutral in the Soviet sense was therefore a paramount goal of Soviet policy, which sometimes even referred to Finland as a model for Austria.[181] As we have seen, Soviet statements produced their own catalog of the neutrals' obligations – a catalog that was much more demanding than the Western understanding, which, however, was quite poorly defined. Secondly, the same statements strove to make the Soviet wish list legally binding. It seems to have been the Soviet intention to make the neutrals less "Western" by such means. These two tendencies made it almost impossible for a neutral to fulfill the Soviet agenda if remaining true to its own identity as a Western state. If a neutral, however, adhered to its pro-Western posture, conflicts concerning the Western and Soviet definitions of neutrality seemed unavoidable.

The struggle for supremacy in defining the obligations of neutral Austria, and the Soviet attempts at molding the country's practice of neutral policy stretched well into the 1970s and 80s. It permeated diplomatic conversations, official statements and media reports. In order to induce or reinforce Austrian behavior as desired by the Soviet leadership and to prevent or deter the Austrian government from taking steps that ran counter to Soviet intentions, the main themes of Soviet neutrality propaganda were exploited: the claim that the Soviet interpretation of neutrality was the correct one, the need for and benefits of this kind of neutrality, the Soviet-Austrian "example of peaceful coexistence," and the distant villains who strove to dissuade Austria from its correct, i.e. neutral, path. While the general Soviet narrative of neutrality underlined the moral qualities and material benefits of this status,[182] its variant regarding Austria stressed that the country owed not only its good relations with the Kremlin, but also its economic recovery to its neutral status[183] – a recovery that hitherto has usually been attributed largely to US aid.[184] Another characteristic of neutrality, claimed by Soviet propaganda, was a good relationship with the social-

---

[180] L. Vidyasova, "An Impressive Example of Peaceful Coexistence," in *International Affairs*, no. 8 (August 1960), 11–15, 13; Ganiushkin, *Neitralitet i neprisoedinenie*, 119, 148, 160–162; Modzhorian, *Politika neitraliteta*, 8.

[181] Amtsvermerk, 14 June 1971, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 105.880-6/71, Z.113.801.

[182] See above, pages 54–55.

[183] "Im Interesse beider Länder," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 19 (1957), 9–10; Speech by N.S. Khrushchev during a breakfast at the Austrian president, 30 June 1960, in *Druzhestvennyi vizit*, 16; "Das Jubiläum der österreichischen Neutralität," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1965), 9; Amtsvermerk, Sowjetische Presse zum österreichischen Nationalfeiertag, 10 November 1971, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 105.880-6/71, Z.121.033.

[184] Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka, and Dieter Stiefel (eds.), *The Marshall Plan in Austria*, Contemporary Austrian Studies 8 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2000).

ist states. Whenever the Soviet side was interested in fostering East-West contacts, Austria was reminded of its alleged duty to maintain such relations.[185]

Among the "enemies of neutrality,"[186] Soviet propaganda identified the Western powers, which were repeatedly accused of having hampered Austria's wish for neutrality before 1955 and having continued to do so ever since; West Germany and some unidentified circles of Austrian pan-German industrialists plotting a new Anschluss; and, last but not least, Austrian Nazis and political organizations close to them, such as the Freedom Party (FPÖ). Indeed, neutrality raised the suspicion of many Western leaders, from John Foster Dulles to Konrad Adenauer and Paul Henri Spaak, who feared that the spread of neutralism in the West might undermine the consensus of the alliances they considered necessary to defend the West. And indeed, some groups and individuals in Austria were not convinced that neutrality was the correct path. However, in Soviet propaganda, these "enemies of neutrality" served as voodoo dolls to denounce tendencies affecting the neutral's political posture – tendencies that were unwanted by the Soviet Union, such as Austria's traditional mainstream allegiance to the West, the country's close economic relations with West Germany, and, although an increasingly marginal phenomenon, pan-German or neo-Nazi sentiment.

Such Soviet statements aimed at either reinforcing or readjusting the Austrian practice of neutral policy. As we shall see, some of these Soviet demands fell on fertile ground: For Austria, which since the beginning of the Cold War had been isolated from its communist neighbors and shaken by East-West tension, permanent neutrality ensured not only the withdrawal of foreign troops and the achievement of the country's full sovereignty, but also opened opportunities for making relations with the East easier and for increasing the country's security by raising its international profile.[187] Therefore, Austria was highly interested in exercising its

---

[185] "Im Interesse beider Länder"; Valeri Begischew, "Wo sich Europas Straßen kreuzen," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 14 (1974), 14–16; Igor Melnikow, "Österreich – Land mit Funktion," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 48 (1974), 25–27; G. Rozanov, "Austria: Twenty Years of Independent and Democratic Development," in *International Affairs,* no. 6 (June 1975), 66–72; R. Krestjaninow, "Positive Wandlungen," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 1 (1977), 16.

[186] *Die Kommunisten im Kampf für die Unabhängigkeit Österreichs: Sammelband* (Vienna: Stern, 1955); Sovremennik, "Österreichs Neutralität und ihre Bedeutung," *Neue Zeit*, no. 21 (1955), 7–9; "Im Interesse beider Länder," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 19 (1957), 9–10; M. Frolow, "Neutralität auf Widerruf?," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 51 (1959), 12–14; Ganiushkin, *Sovremennyi neitralitet*, 131–134; Beletskii, *Sovetskii Soiuz i Avstriia*, 253–256; Kobliakov, Kuranov, Mochalin, *SSSR v bor'be za nezavisimost' Avstrii*, 176–186; G. Nikolajew, "Die Neonazis in Österreich," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 37 (1969), 30–31; G. Nikolayev, "Foreign Capital in Austria," in *International Affairs*, no. 9 (September 1971), 93–96; N. Polyanov, "Austria, Neutrality, Europe," in *International Affairs*, no. 9 (September 1973), 82–88, 86, Juri Orlow, "BRD – Österreich: Gefährliche Liebschaft," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 46 (1977), 14–26; Wjatscheslaw Jelagin, "Fundament der Neutralität," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 45 (1978), 8–9; I. Melnikow, "nicht verharmlosen!," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 2 (1979), 14.

[187] Mayrzedt and Hummer, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik* 1, 11.

neutral policy as actively as possible. However, while some of the Soviet wishes regarding neutrality dovetailed with Austria's ambitions, some of the differences led to sharp disagreement.

2. The Post-State Treaty Honeymoon

The Khrushchev years were a rough period in international affairs. Probably the "last true believer"[1] in the global victory of communism in the Kremlin, the Soviet leader, while earthy and energetic, also somewhat unrefined and naïve, declared that the Soviet system would enable the USSR to "catch up and surpass" the United States within fifteen years.[2] His condemnation of some of the excesses of Stalinism in a secret speech at the twentieth CPSU congress 1956 and the signs of a cautious "thaw" triggered a process that, over time, not only undermined the Soviet-Chinese alliance, but also the prestige of communism in his own state and, ultimately, the stability of the Soviet empire.[3] While Khrushchev's reconciliation with Tito, his visit to Yugoslavia in May and June 1955, and the signs of superpower détente had fostered hopes for a certain relaxation in the Soviet reign over Eastern Europe, the suppression of unrest in the Baltics and in Ukraine, and the crushing of the Hungarian people's uprising signaled the limits of this liberalization.

From 1957 Khrushchev's foreign policy, although at times attenuated in the CPSU Presidium (the Politburo) by Anastas Mikoian, was executed loyally and with "doglike devotion"[4] by Andrei Gromyko, a technocrat who allegedly "played his cards so close to his chest that he paused carefully before answering a Western diplomat who asked him if he had had a good breakfast with a noncommittal 'perhaps.'"[5] He had been molded in Stalin's apparatus and was, very much like Prince Gorchakov's famous self-description, "a sponge in the hand of [his] master."[6] After Molotov's ouster and the Shepilov intermezzo, Gromyko served as foreign minister until he was retired by Gorbachev in 1985 to the ceremonial rank of head of state.

---

[1] Mastny, "Soviet Foreign Policy, 1953–1962," 317–318.

[2] Nikita S. Khrushchev, "The Task of Surpassing the U.S.A.," [1957], in Robert A. Goldwin, Gerald Stourzh, and Marvin Zetterbaum (eds.), *Readings in Russian Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), 450–463, 457.

[3] On the wave of unrest that from 1953 to 1956 flowed over from Berlin to Plzen, Warsaw and Budapest, see Jan Foitzik (ed.), *Entstalinisierungskrise in Ostmitteleuropa 1953–1956: Vom 17. Juni bis zum ungarischen Volksaufstand: Politische, militärische, soziale und nationale Dimensionen* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001); and also Mark Kramer, "The Early Post-Stalin Succession Struggle and Upheavals in East-Central Europe: Internal-External Linkages in Soviet Policy Making," in *Journal of Cold War Studies* 1, no. 1 (1999), 3–55; no. 2 (1999), 3–38; no. 3 (1999), 3–66.

[4] Taubman, *Khrushchev*, 479.

[5] Archie Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor* (Oxford: University Press, 1996), 217.

[6] Quoted in Stone, "Andrei Gromyko," 594. Cf. Aleksandrov-Agentov, *Ot Kollontai do Gorbacheva*, 72.

Khrushchev had left his international debut, the 1955 Geneva summit, "without any agreements, yet with big sighs of relief"[7] that no gaffe had been committed and that the US president was at least as afraid of nuclear war as the Soviet leadership. Some weeks later, Khrushchev received the West German chancellor Konrad Adenauer, who had, in Soviet propaganda, hitherto ranked as the right hand man of the devil, and a lively exchange of visits between Western and Soviet politicians was begun. Due to the Soviet leader's explosive temper, most of these occasions, such as Khrushchev's visits to Britain, the United States and France and the abortive Paris and Vienna summits, however, turned into platforms for ideological bickering and "verbal sparring."[8]

In the meantime, the "thaw" was overshadowed by a chain of crises. They were, if not created, at least aggravated by Khrushchev's "surprising ignorance"[9] of legal issues and his recklessness. Some historians claim that Khrushchev was determined to reach a lasting détente and did not grasp that his crisis mongering was not conducive for attaining such an objective.[10] Others state that – despite the momentous effect of Soviet thermonuclear tests, the launching of *Sputnik* in 1957, and Iurii Gagarin's 1961 space flight on US insecurity and Soviet confidence[11] – Khrushchev remained aware of US power superiority. In order to cover up this disadvantage, the Soviet leader resorted to brinkmanship, risky provocations, and a "hot-cold therapy" of "peace initiatives" and nuclear intimidation designed to increase the USSR's leverage and demoralize its opponents.[12] The Suez crisis misled Khrushchev to believe that his nuclear threat against Britain and France had convinced the two countries to retreat. The Soviet leader was prepared to repeat his bluff several more times, in particular during the Berlin crisis, which he staged, in his own words, in order to grab the West "at its balls."[13] In the following years, most West European NATO states were, on various occasions, threatened by the USSR with nuclear annihilation. By bluffing with still-nonexistent Soviet missiles, Khrushchev, however, fanned the arms race. In the meantime, the USSR embarked on a massive nuclear build-up: In March 1955, two months before the signing of the state treaty, Khrushchev approved the secret deployment of medium-range ballistic missiles in border regions of the USSR, in Bulgaria and

---

[7] Zubok, *A Failed Empire*, 107. On the Geneva summit, cf. Bischof, Dockrill, *Cold War Respite*.

[8] Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 239.

[9] Anastas Mikoian, *Tak bylo: Razmyshleniia o minuvshem* (Moscow: Vagrius, 1999), 604.

[10] Dmitri Wolkogonow, *Die sieben Führer* (Frankfurt: Societätsverlag, 2001), 219.

[11] David Holloway, *Stalin and the Bomb: The Soviet Union and Atomic Energy, 1939–1956* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 306–307.

[12] Fursenko and Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War*, 46, 414. "Hot-cold therapy" [*Wechselbad*] is a quotation from Haymerle to Kreisky, Z. 45-Pol/64, 28 April 1964, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, Pol. Berichte Moskau.

[13] Quoted in Oleg Grinevskij, *Tauwetter: Entspannung, Krisen und neue Eiszeit* (Berlin: Siedler, 1996), 24.

the GDR;[14] in 1959 the first Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile was successfully launched, and in 1962 the stationing of Soviet missiles in Cuba brought the world to the brink of nuclear war.

The establishment of friendly relations

In Soviet-Austrian relations, the first five years after the conclusion of the state treaty were a formative period. Both sides had to get accustomed to their new roles, to find their own positions and, without falling back into the behavior of the postwar decade, take steps to establish a lucid relationship. For the Austrian side, normalizing relations with the Soviet Union was not only an unwritten obligation stemming from the state treaty, as so aptly observed by international-law expert Hanspeter Neuhold,[15] but a question of survival. While international relations between the superpowers after Stalin's death, with all good intentions to avoid nuclear war and to secure a lasting settlement, were still dominated by the residual dynamics of the early Cold War, caution and mutual distrust,[16] a small neutral located at the edge of the Soviet bloc could not afford to be so cautious. For Austria, there was no alternative to making compromises: Before 1955, the country had been too weak to be an independent player, and with the Soviet military presence, there had been no chance of becoming exclusively a client of the United States or of joining other West European states in their integration efforts. Neutrality was therefore considered the only solution and an acceptable price for getting the "Russian occupation" out of eastern Austria. Once this goal was achieved, Austria, which continued to have good relations with the other three signatories of the state treaty, had to establish a *modus vivendi* with the superpower in the East.

From the Soviet side, which portrayed itself as the main architect and patron of Austria's independence and neutrality, relations to Austria were designed and presented as an "example," or even "model," for "peaceful coexistence."[17] In Soviet understanding, the Austrian state treaty and its constitutional law on neutrality of 4 November 1955 "established the real preconditions for the peaceful coexistence of the USSR and Austria."[18] On 6 December 1955 the Soviet Union officially recognized Austria's declaration of neutrality. Some divergences between the Soviet and Austrian interpretations of neutrality would soon and, thereafter, repeatedly lead to conflict. However, as long as the Soviet Union was interested in promoting

---

[14] Matthias Uhl and Vladimir Ivkin, "Operation Atom: The Soviet Union's Stationing of Nuclear Missiles in the German Democratic Republic," in *Cold War International History Project Bulletin*, no. 12–13 (2001), 299–307.

[15] Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," 92.

[16] Kramer, "International Politics in the Early Post-Stalin Era," xiv–xvi.

[17] See above, page 26.

[18] I. Zhiriakov, *SSSR – Avstriia: itogi i perspektivy sotrudnichestva* (Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia, 1985), 30.

neutrality, "peaceful coexistence" and détente, and in using Austria as its living example, the Kremlin had to refrain from voicing its critique too sharply and from publicly damaging its relations to its own "creation" and that creation's prestige. Soviet-Austrian relations were therefore presented by the Kremlin not only as positive example for "peaceful coexistence," but, as stated on countless occasions, even as a model thereof. At the twentieth congress of the CPSU in 1956, in the report on the Soviet foreign policy tasks, the "strengthening of the amicable relations to Finland, Austria, and other neutral countries" was named right after "strengthening the fraternal relations to the people's democracies" and the amicable relations to the nonaligned.[19]

From the first moment after the successful conclusion of the Soviet-Austrian state treaty negotiations of April 1955, the recently established friendly bilateral relations as well as the reliability and farsightedness of the Austrian politicians were demonstratively praised, and this repeatedly, by Soviet leaders and media. At the official dinner during his visit to Yugoslavia in May, Khrushchev received the Austrian ambassador to express his satisfaction about the signing of the state treaty and stated that "the relations between the Soviet Union and Austria are very good today and will, I hope, become even better in the future."[20] At the farewell ceremony for the Austrian delegation at the Moscow airport on 15 April, Molotov had shared with the Swedish ambassador that the Austrians seemed to be satisfied with the outcome of the negotiations; however, "we," Molotov emphasized, "are *very* satisfied."[21] During an official reception for the Yugoslav national holiday, in the presence of several diplomats, the usually laconic foreign minister made "the most pleasant compliments" concerning the abilities of Chancellor Raab,[22] and at a reception held during the visit of Khrushchev, Mikoian, and Bulganin to Bulgaria, the Austrian ambassador in Sofia was reportedly the only diplomatic representative with whom all three Soviet leaders spoke extensively – a distinction that "did not pass unnoticed" by the diplomatic corps. The honor was even higher when Khrushchev publicly characterized the Austrian chancellor an "extremely sympathetic man" and Mikoian also "found warm words about him."[23] Similar statements were made in later years, as for instance in 1958, when Khrushchev, during another reception for the diplomatic corps in Moscow, pointed at the Austrian ambassador and declared publicly: "This is Austria, a capitalist country. Its chancellor is also

---

[19] Chruschtschow, *Rechenschaftsbericht an den XX. Parteitag 14. Februar 1956*, 51.

[20] Austrian embassy Belgrade to Austrian MFA, 31 May 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 322.691–pol/55, Z. 322.691–pol/55.

[21] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 18 April 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 321.412–pol/55, Z. 312.593–pol/55. *Emphasis* mine.

[22] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 29 November 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 322.691–pol/55, Z. 326.422–pol/55.

[23] Austrian embassy Sofia to Austrian MFA, 4 June 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 323.080–pol/55, Z. 323.076–pol/55.

a capitalist, but a very decent one whom we communists hold in high regard. We remember his visit to Moscow with joy. Please send him my cordial regards."[24] Such friendliness was after a certain goal. By lauding the state treaty and Austria's neutrality and leaders, Moscow was not only depicting Soviet-Austrian relations as a positive result of *Soviet* statecraft. Raising Austria's profile on the international scene was also a means of promoting neutrality in the West.

The personal relationships between the leaders of different states are, for the most part, difficult to evaluate. In the case of Khrushchev and Raab, the successful conclusion of the Moscow negotiations in April 1955 seems to have contributed to mutual sympathy. Due to his lack of foreign experience, which he covered with boasting, bluff and bluster, the Soviet leader concentrated on personal trust rather than political issues in his relationships with foreign politicians,[25] and it is likely that in 1955 he was looking for a Western leader with whom he would be able to "do business," as Margaret Thatcher thirty years later famously described her impression after Gorbachev's first visit to Britain.[26] Since the Austrian chancellor Raab was the first Western politician Khrushchev negotiated with (and this successfully), the Soviet leader may have developed an emotional bond to the "little capitalist," as Raab had described himself during the talks. In a typically totalitarian fashion, Raab was elevated by Soviet media and his political contenders were attacked by Khrushchev. This was very similar to the Soviet treatment of the Finnish long-time president Kekkonen, who was personally depicted in Soviet statements as a guarantor for his country's neutrality and friendship with the USSR; according to Khrushchev: "Whoever is for Kekkonen is for friendship with the USSR; whoever is against him, is against friendship with the USSR."[27] Mikoian, who was familiar with Austrian affairs, even spoke of a "Raab Line"[28] – a reminder of Finland's famous "Paasikivi-Kekkonen Line." But while after Khrushchev's ouster Kekkonen managed to establish a similar cordial relationship with Kosygin, Austrian leaders failed to do so.

The new Soviet attitude was underlined by a sudden shift in the image of Austria as depicted in the media. As in many other totalitarian regimes, the Kremlin used its media not only as a means of creating images of external enemies to legitimize its own rule, but also as a means of communicating approval and displeasure about the current ongoings in the world. Whereas the Alpine country had until then been pri-

---

[24] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 28074, 11 November 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108.

[25] On Khrushchev's bargaining style in the domestic struggle for power and in the Cuban and Berlin crises, cf. James M. Goldgeier, *Leadership Style and Soviet Foreign Policy: Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev, Gorbachev* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 21–25, 52–74.

[26] Brown, *The Gorbachev Factor*, 77.

[27] Quoted in Max Jacobson, *Finnland im neuen Europa* (Berlin: Arno Spitz, 1999), 66, 69.

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

marily portrayed as a shelter for Nazism, a breeding ground of anti-Soviet conspiracies, and a country where the working masses were vegetating in poverty and being betrayed by corrupt leaders, this changed abruptly following the Soviet-Austrian negotiations of April 1955. Chancellor Raab underwent a remarkable metamorphosis from a "fascist *Heimwehrführer*" to a "statesman of great wisdom."[29] Although the Austrian Communist Party (KPÖ), despite its insignificance, was still granted a disproportionately large amount of attention by the Soviet media (a tactic that was undoubtedly conceived to convince Soviet readers of its "leading role," thus supporting the claim for a similar role of communist parties in the East), the Austrian communists' opponents ceased to be depicted indiscriminately as villains, fascists, and traitors. In addition to communicating Soviet approval or displeasure about current Austrian actions, Soviet media reports about Austria generally focused on two other themes: praise for neutrality and for Austria's growing national consciousness, both preconditions for the country to remain independent from Germany;[30] and warnings against "enemies of neutrality," in particular neo-Nazis in Austria, combined with criticism of the lax Austrian attitude in this regard.[31] Mostly designed for Soviet readers, the media contained regular "invidious reports"[32] about Austria's social, political and economic system, about the allegedly catastrophic situation of workers, or about the country's "tricky electoral system that has nothing to do with democracy."[33]

Some Soviet officials were well aware of the fallacy of such depictions. During a discussion in the CPSU apparatus, Sergei Lapin, in the 1950s Soviet ambassador to Vienna and then director of the Soviet news agency TASS, stated: "The pensioners' fate in our country is not easy. I have been living in Austria. There, the people can't wait to retire. They have a lot of time for leisure, go to cafés and bars. We only have factory clubs. Coffee is usually for young people and other purposes…"[34] Nonetheless, such claims seem to have been deemed necessary by propagandists

---

[29] Quoted in Stifter, "Das politische Österreichbild," 49, 152. Although the KPÖ after 1959 never again garnered the percentage necessary to be represented in the Austrian parliament, its leader was more often mentioned than the Austrian head of government.

[30] See, e.g., Ilja Konstantinowski, "Österreichische Impressionen," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 26 (1966), 29–32; and "Eine vernünftige Politik," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 44 (1968), 2–3.

[31] *Pravda*, 16 January 1962; "Gute Aussichten," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 48 (1966), 3–4.

[32] Eiselsberg to Kreisky, 25 September 1959, with report Hinteregger, Die Situation der österreichischen Arbeiterschaft in sowjetischer Sicht, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, Pol. Berichte Moskau. The report referred to O.V. Sal'kovskii, *Ekonomicheskoe polozhenie rabochego klassa Avstrii posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* (Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1958).

[33] Dmitri Motschalin, "Österreich nach den Wahlen," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 12 (1966), 23–24.

[34] Zapis' soveshchaniia po voprosu doklada TsK KPSS, 3 February 1971, in Sergei Kudriashov (ed.), *General'nyi sekretar' L.I. Brezhnev 1964–1982*, Vestnik Arkhiva Prezidenta: Spetsial'noe izdanie (Moscow: Vestnik Arkhiva Prezidenta, 2006), 96–113, 101. For a short biography of Lapin, who after his term as ambassador to Austria from 1956–60, served as deputy foreign minister 1962–65 and as a general director of TASS 1967–70, see ibid., 232.

to support Soviet contentions regarding the superiority of the social system in the USSR and to underline the thesis that workers in capitalist countries were poor and deprived of their rights. Despite such distortions, it seems that over the years the image of Austria that emerged among Soviet citizens was that of a Western-oriented country which was nevertheless progressive and friendly.[35]

Even in Soviet literature, which had hitherto used the dark image of a crisis-ridden, hungry and corrupt postwar Vienna as a foil for memoirs and novels,[36] the Austrian image brightened and gave way to the idyllic and light clichés of waltzes, Vienna Woods, pretty girls and plucky workers, stereotypes that had been spread in the interwar period by Il'ia Erenburg's report about the social democratic *Schutzbund's* uprising or by the US movie "Great Waltz," which became popular in the USSR.[37] However, these stereotypes were moderated, to a certain extent, by some critical undertones, such as Austrians allegedly having an inherent retrospective-ness, melancholy and nonchalance that prevented them from confronting clandestine neo-Nazis or turning the Austrian labor movement into something more Soviet-like.[38]

Almost immediately after the visit of the Austrian governmental delegation to Moscow in the spring of 1955, direct bilateral links at all levels were intensified. Any vestiges of the war and Austria's postwar status were eliminated. Prisoners-of-war and some expatriates were repatriated – a process that took several more years – although some Austrian prisoners of Soviet labor camps or other persons willing to return never made it back to their homeland.[39]

During the postwar decade, due to the Cold War, the Soviet obsession with secrecy, and the Austrian anti-communist boycott, Soviet-Austrian exchanges of delegations in the cultural, scientific, and political spheres or between trade union-ists had been limited for the most part to pro-communist propaganda activities.[40] This now changed, a change that reflected the interests of both sides. The Soviet leaders were eager to leave their isolation and, by hosting guests from a Western country and sending delegations abroad, to demonstrate that their country was not the backward and ugly prison it had seemed under Stalin. Since this exchange first took place with a neutral, it was expected to raise the prestige of neutrality in the

---

[35] Walter Wodak, *Diplomatie zwischen Ost und West* (Graz: Styria, 1976), 104.

[36] See, e.g. A. V. Sofronov, *Zarubezhnye vstrechi* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1952); G. Savenok, *Venskie vstrechi* (Moscow: Voennoe izdatel'stvo, 1961).

[37] Victor Erlich, *Modernism and Revolution: Russian Literature in Transition* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 252; Julia Köstenberger, "The Great Waltz/Bol'shoi Val's," in Karin Moser (ed.), *Besetzte Bilder: Film, Kultur und Propaganda in Österreich 1945–1955* (Vienna: Filmarchiv Austria, 2005), 303–322.

[38] Reitinger, "Österreich in den Augen der Sowjetliteratur nach 1945," 13, 162–174.

[39] Moskau, July 1958, in SBKA, Länderboxen, UdSSR 1; and Information, 20 June 1962, Zl. 231.387-12/62, ibid., File Sprechprogramm Moskau 1962.

[40] Mueller and Leidinger, "Tiefes Misstrauen – begrenztes Interesse: Die österreichisch-sowjeti-schen Beziehungen 1918 bis 1955," 105–107.

West. For Austrian leaders, as well as for leaders from other small and, in particular, neutral states, it was important on one hand to better understand what the Soviet Union expected from them and, on the other hand, to communicate as thoroughly as possible what they were willing to fulfill.

Soon after the last Soviet soldier had left Austria, a delegation of Austrian journalists traveled to Russia in October 1955; in December a group of parliamentarians followed suit, responding to a Soviet invitation that had been expressed already the previous February.[41] The invitation had been addressed to all parliaments in countries with whom the USSR had diplomatic contacts, in order to break the Soviet isolation. It was accepted, by the end of 1957, by thirty-one delegations.[42] The Austrian visit was returned by members of the Supreme Soviet in June 1956,[43] immediately after the Leningrad Symphony Orchestra had finished a much acclaimed concert tour through Austria. In the months before, pianist Emil Gilel's and violinist Igor Oistrakh had been celebrated in Vienna's largest concert hall, and Austrian opera singer Wilma Lipp had made several appearances in the USSR. Bilateral travel was made easier, at least theoretically, with the creation of a regular and direct train connection between Vienna and Moscow in June 1956.[44]

The establishment of friendly relations seemed to be the materialization of the dreams of Austria's ambassador Norbert (von) Bischoff, who had been accredited as a diplomatic representative in Moscow since December 1946.[45] A former nobleman and leftist-bourgeois enthusiast for everything Russian and Soviet, who because of his appearance was repeatedly mistaken for the French socialist Léon Blum,[46] he had, before 1955, often criticized Austria's policy as being anti-Soviet. Bischoff saw the Cold War and the division of Europe as being solely a result of *Western* policy, "even though the Soviet Union has contributed to paving the way."[47] Contemporaries and Austrian fellow-diplomats thought he tended to adopt the viewpoints

---

[41] Zhiriakov, *SSSR – Avstriia*, 35; Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 3 December 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 319.852–pol/55, Z. 326.606–pol/55.

[42] Gromyko and Ponomarjow, *Geschichte der sowjetischen Außenpolitik 1945 bis 1976*, 270.

[43] ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 511.246–pol/56, Z. 517.301–pol/56.

[44] Lobova, "Die Moskauer Perzeption," 151.

[45] Oliver Rathkolb, "Der Wiederbeginn der diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen Österreich und der Sowjetunion 1945–1947 zwischen Kaltem Krieg und österreichischer Innenpolitik," in *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 50 (2003), 157–166, 163. For a short biography of Bischoff, see Rudolf Agstner, Gertrude Enderle-Burcel, and Michaela Follner, *Österreichs Spitzendiplomaten zwischen Kaiser und Kreisky: Biographisches Handbuch des Höheren Auswärtigen Dienstes 1918 bis 1959* (Vienna: Dokumentationsarchiv des österreichischen Widerstandes, 2009), 133–135.

[46] Andrej Gromyko, *Erinnerungen* (Düsseldorf: Econ, 1989), 265. This passage is missing in the English edition.

[47] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 7 June 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ., Z. 515.753–pol/56. In 1959, Bischoff claimed that the West German chancellor Konrad Adenauer had "set a disastrous course towards the division of Germany." Bischoff to Figl, 9 May 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, Pol. Berichte Moskau.

of his host country[48] and even that he had pro-communist leanings. The ambassador's adoption of Soviet propaganda theses, his uncritical stance towards Soviet policy, and his anti-Western bias – all aspects that were probably reinforced by his twelve-year tenure in Stalinist Moscow – were mirrored in his reports to the Foreign Ministry. Carried away by propaganda slogans and (falsified) statistical data that he collected,[49] Bischoff described the USSR and its sphere of power as "a single zone of peace […] from which the Asian and African peoples can be hindered from joining only […] by the use of force"; the seven-year plan, in his eyes, would bring about the "liquidation of poverty" in the Soviet sphere.[50] Bischoff, whose reports often contained communist propaganda terms such as "*Westdeutscher Wehrmachtsminister*,"[51] had in Stalin's time already sounded so pro-Soviet that his Austrian colleagues ironically expected him, too, to be "purged" when Khrushchev expelled the Stalinists from the Soviet leadership in 1957.[52] When the ambassador, obediently following the twists of official Soviet ideology, sent a report on Khrushchev's denunciation of the "gruesome past" and of Stalin's "Caesarian delusions of grandeur" after the twentieth CPSU congress to the Foreign Ministry on Vienna's Ballhausplatz, one of Bischoff's colleagues maliciously scribbled on the margin of the page: "If anybody had dared to talk to Bischoff like that two years ago…!"[53] Indeed, some years earlier, Bischoff had argued that Stalin's terror, although killing hundreds of thousands of innocent people, had nonetheless "unmasked a fifth column" and thus strengthened the country on the eve of Hitler's aggression.[54] With Khrushchev's de-Stalinization, the Austrian ambassador, who died in 1960 shortly after leaving Moscow, considered the threat of dictatorship banned forever and the Soviet Union a respected constitutional state.[55] His naiveté about not only Soviet political intentions but also practices was well known in Vienna, and there were

---

[48] Fritz Molden, *Besetzer, Toren, Biedermänner: Ein Bericht aus Österreich, 1945–1962* (Vienna: Molden, 1980), 50; Eiselsberg, *Erlebte Geschichte*, 201. For a detailed account of Bischoff's view of the world, see Paul Ullmann, "Das Russlandbild der österreichischen Diplomatie in den ersten drei Jahrzehnten nach dem Ende des 2. Weltkrieges" (unpublished paper, Vienna, n.d.). Ullmann argues that Bischoff was impressed by the collectivist and authoritarian ideas of the 1920s and 30s, and, therefore, attracted by the USSR. Ibid., 43. A copy of this paper was given by DDr. Ullmann to the author of this book.

[49] ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, Files 104–105. On Bischoff's views, cf. Matthias Pape, *Ungleiche Brüder: Österreich und Deutschland 1945–1965* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2000), 253–258.

[50] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 4 January 1955, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 319.130–pol/55.

[51] Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 28017, 2 February 1957, ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108.

[52] Grubmayr, "In zwei Wochen gehst Du nach Moskau," 138.

[53] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 10 March 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 511.069–pol/56, Z. 512.813–pol/56.

[54] Ullmann, "Das Russlandbild," 15.

[55] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 4 April 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.606–pol/58, Z. 547.895–pol/58; 6 March 1959, ibid., BMAA, GZ. 236.076–pol/59, Z. 239.921–pol/59.

rumors among Austrian diplomats that he sent his secret telegrams, open, with his Russian housemaid to the cipher service.[56] The publication of his memoirs was, due to its containing official secrets and its pro-Soviet bias, suppressed by the Ballhausplatz.[57] Already in 1946, Bischoff had been informed by the foreign minister that the ambassador's assessment of Soviet policy did not reflect the official Austrian line.[58] Nonetheless, Bischoff, who in a memorandum in the fall of 1955 pleaded for Austria actively engaging in a dialog with Eastern Europe, seems to have had some influence on Raab's understanding of neutrality.[59] In contrast to his assessment by the Soviet and Austrian sides during his lifetime, Bischoff's "progressiveness" and "loyalty" was, after his death, acknowledged by Soviet diplomats.[60]

<div align="center">Frictions</div>

It is clear that the friendly Soviet-Austrian atmosphere, established with the negotiation and conclusion of the state treaty, did not mean, however, that no problems arose in the bilateral relations. Frictions resulted from the differing Soviet and Viennese interpretations of Austrian neutrality with regard to, for example, international communist organizations. Soviet officials complained that Austria had refused visas to Soviet functionaries of such organizations. However, the reproach was parried by Bischoff with the argument that the Austrian refusal concerned only ten of more than six hundred applications, and that the USSR certainly was also not willing to grant visa to Austrians if they declared their intention of traveling to Moscow to anti-communist gatherings.[61] When the headquarters of the communist World Federation of Trade Unions was officially expelled from Vienna in early 1956, the city's communist press, seconded on 8 February by *Pravda*, accused the Austrian government of violating neutrality.[62] A year later, the communist World Peace Council was also banned from Austria, and the move was harshly criticized by *Izvestiia* on 5 February 1957 and *Pravda* four days later.

A second stumbling block was Austria's external neutrality, i.e. the maintenance of neutrality regarding foreign military alliances. Since the late 1940s, Austria had become accustomed to Western troop transports passing through Tyrol between West Germany and Italy. While this had not, prior to 1955, violated any Austrian

---

[56] Grubmayr, "In zwei Wochen gehst Du nach Moskau," 134.

[57] [Gutachten Verosta, 21 January 1959,] in Österreichisches Institut für Zeitgeschichte (hereafter: ÖIZG), NL 72 Fuchs, DO 842, File 111. Cf. Hinteregger, *Im Auftrag Österreichs*, 41.

[58] Ullmann, "Das Russlandbild," 6.

[59] Manfried Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei: Die Große Koalition in Österreich 1945–1966* (Vienna: Bundesverlag, 1987), 320–322.

[60] Dölling to Ulbricht with Amtsvermerk, 12 July 1960, in Bundesarchiv Berlin, Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR (hereafter: SAPMO), NY 4182/1320, 8–10. I am grateful to Mag. Maximilian Graf for granting me access to his copy of this document.

[61] ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 322.691–pol/55, Z. 325.503–pol/55.

[62] Merhaut-Gurevitsch, "Die Innen- und Außenpolitik Österreichs," 76–81.

obligations, after its declaration of neutrality, the problem was trickier: In peace-time such transports could be allowed, in wartime not. But since Austria, on one hand, had learned to perceive the United States as a trusted friend and protector, and on the other, did not have the means to prohibit flyover troop transports, the neutral country continued to tolerate such actions and was, indeed, rather generous in permitting the US air force to use its airspace. Foreign Minister Leopold Figl asked US Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson in 1956 only to make sure that the flights would be undertaken at high altitudes and under weather conditions that would not enable the flights to be monitored from the ground.[63] Military personnel traveling overland had to be in civil clothing.[64] However, the Soviet Union was not a watch-dog to let such shenanigans pass unnoticed. On 22 February 1956, *Izvestiia* accused NATO of violating Austrian neutrality by transferring troops between Germany and Italy through Austria,[65] and on 20 March, *Pravda* charged Austria with letting US organizations use its territory for covert activities and ignoring its obligations as a neutral country.

A few weeks later, Soviet criticism eased. The transports were over, and Moscow could only hope that the neutral had learned its lesson. In April, *Pravda* stated that Austria's neutrality constituted a major setback for NATO, and it was for this reason that the Atlantic bloc was trying to undermine it. Despite such attempts, the relations between Austria and the "people's democracies" would continue to develop positively, as diagnosed by the CPSU organ and the May issue of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's periodical *Mezhdunarodnaia zhisn'*. The "true Austrian patriots," the Soviet press stated, would resist all temptations to give up neutrality.

Soviet-Austrian relations were not even strained by the Austrian failure to obtain the international guarantee for its territorial integrity that had been conceived by Austrian diplomacy and foreseen in the Moscow memorandum.[66] Despite Soviet reminders, such as those published on the occasion of the first anniversary of the memorandum's conclusion, that Austria's status should be guaranteed by the four powers, no progress was achieved. The Western powers, after two world wars in which guarantees for Belgium and Poland had not helped to prevent aggressors from entering these countries, remained reluctant to guarantee the neutrality of Austria, a country that was considered by many a "military vacuum."[67] Since the risks of such a guarantee, such as reducing Austria's own efforts to defend

---

[63] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 184.

[64] Angebliche Verletzung der österr. Souveränität durch Amerika, 21 March 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 512.757–pol/56, Z. 512.786–pol/56.

[65] Malicek, "Die Beziehungen," 53.

[66] On the genesis of the idea see Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 354–356, 568–574.

[67] Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei*, 324–330; quotation ibid., 329. Rauchensteiner, ibid., 514, points out that in 1955 Kreisky – in contrast to his later depiction of the event – supported the idea of obtaining a territorial guarantee issued by the four powers. Bruno Kreisky, *Zwischen den Zeiten: Erinnerungen aus fünf Jahrzehnten* (Vienna: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1988), 469–470.

itself and opening a door for Soviet intervention, seemed to outweigh the benefits, British diplomats decided to "kill the project" through "masterly inactivity."[68] After repeated attempts to receive the desired declaration, the Austrian government finally acquiesced and concluded that it was better to do without a guarantee, than letting all four powers claim the right to decide whether Austria's neutrality had been violated or not. Despite such issues, Soviet-Austrian relations could generally be described as satisfactory, when they were exposed to their first serious test in the fall of 1956. As a consequence they cooled down noticeably, indeed to the "absolute low point" since 1955.[69]

---

[68] Quoted in Michael Gehler, "'to guarantee a country which was a military vacuum.' Die Westmächte und Österreichs territoriale Integrität 1955–1957," in Manfried Rauchensteiner (ed.), *Zwischen den Blöcken: NATO, Warschauer Pakt und Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 89–134, 109–116.

[69] Haymerle, "Die Beziehungen zur Großmacht im Osten," 163.

3. …and Its Sudden End

The conclusion of the Austrian state treaty and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria had not gone unnoticed in neighboring Hungary. Both events, which were connected to the Austrian declaration of neutrality, were widely welcomed in the socialist state and left a deep impression on its population and on some leaders. The fate of Austria undoubtedly inspired Hungarian hopes for freedom and neutrality of its own. When, in connection with the unrest in Poland in the summer and autumn of 1956, the Hungarian revolution started, Austria was affected in a number of ways. The Austrian population, media and political representatives expressed their solidarity with the Hungarian people; Austria became, at least temporarily, refuge for thousands of Hungarians; and last but not least, Austria, as the only capitalist neighbor state of Hungary, was chosen as one of the "natural" scapegoats in Soviet propaganda and blamed for tolerating the infiltration of Hungary by the "fascist groups" and "Western agents" that were allegedly responsible for the "reactionary counterrevolution."[1]

The Hungarian revolution

On 24 October, TASS accused "reactionary underground organizations" and similar "foreign forces" with having inspired the Hungarian revolution. The night before, following the request of the Hungarian communist government, the first intervention of Soviet troops in Hungary had started. Within days, thousands of Hungarians fled their homeland to neighboring Austria. Both developments as well as the perceived threat that Austria might also fall victim to a Soviet intervention led to anxiety in the Austrian population, but also to a wave of solidarity with the Hungar-

---

[1] On the Hungarian revolution, see, e.g. Csaba Békés, Malcolm Byrne, János M. Rainer (eds.), *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution: A History in Documents* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2002). On Austria and the Hungarian revolution, see Andreas Gémes, *Austria and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. Between Solidarity and Neutrality* (Pisa: Edizioni Plus, 2008); Johanna Granville, "Neutral Encounters of the Paranoid Kind: Austria's Reactions to the Hungarian Crisis of 1956," in Günter Bischof, Michael Gehler, and Anton Pelinka (eds.), *Austrian Foreign Policy in Historical Context*, Contemporary Austrian Studies 14 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2006), 143–169; Ibolya Murber and Zoltán Fónagy (eds.), *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna: Czernin, 2006); Erwin A. Schmidl (ed.), *Die Ungarnkrise 1956 und Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2003); Michael Gehler, "The Hungarian Crisis and Austria 1953–58: A Foiled Model Case?" in Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka, and Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Neutrality in Austria*, Contemporary Austrian Studies 9 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2001), 160–213. See also the journalist account in James A. Michener, *The Bridge at Andau* (New York: Random House, 1957).

ian freedom fighters and the incoming refugees. On 28 October, shortly before the cease-fire in Hungary went into effect, the Austrian government publicly appealed to the Soviet Union "to contribute to a termination of the hostilities and bloodshed." Although the memorandum underlined Austria's neutrality, it also expressed the hope that "the restitution of freedom with regard to human rights would strengthen peace in Europe."[2] This unique and "courageous appeal"[3] was even more remarkable in light of the fact that the United States, until then, had only expressed its regret about the disaster, and had called for a meeting of the UN Security Council but refrained from publicly addressing the Soviet Union directly. The Austrian government was fully aware that its appeal would not be well received by the Soviet leadership. Nevertheless, Raab considered it necessary that "we have the guts to refer to our special status and to say that we do not agree with these events or the use of tanks."[4] Such convictions were shared by other European neutrals as well. While the Swiss president Max Petitpierre regarded Austria's response "admirable but not worth imitating,"[5] in Zurich hundreds of students took to the streets in solidarity with the Hungarian uprising and the prime minister of Sweden, Tage Erlander, cited the revolution as proof that "dictatorships, no matter how strong they may appear and how effective the may organize the surveillance and oppression of their citizens, bear nevertheless within themselves the seed of their own destruction."[6]

The Austrian government and its mission in Budapest considered there to be no immediate danger of a Soviet invasion into Austria. Such an act, in fact, would have meant a failure of the Soviet policy vis-à-vis Austria. Nevertheless, the Austrian army was put on alert. The Austrian-Hungarian border, which in the summer of 1956 had been cleared of Hungarian mines,[7] was closed on 24 October, and the *Bundesheer* was ordered to disarm all people crossing it. While in October only a few Hungarian refugees fled to Austria, starting with 4 November after the second Soviet intervention, a wave swept over the border. Help for refugees and the wounded was organized by the authorities; aid and medication was sent to Hungary by charitable organizations. The former noncommunist Hungarian prime minister,

---

[2] Text in Heinrich Siegler, *Österreichs Weg zu Souveränität, Neutralität, Prosperität* (Bonn: Siegler, 1959), 111. Cf. Michael Gehler, *Der lange Weg nach Europa: Österreich von Paneuropa bis zum EU-Beitritt: Darstellung* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2002), 165; Granville, "Neutral Encounters," 145–146.

[3] Rainer Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen. Das Verhalten Österreichs während des Ungarnaufstandes 1956 und der tschechoslowakischen Krise 1968* (Vienna: Herold, 1981), 34.

[4] Council of Ministers, Protocol 12a, 28 October 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP.

[5] Quoted in Johanna Granville, "Of Spies, Refugees and Hostile Propaganda: How Austria Dealt with the Hungarian Crisis of 1956," in *History* 91, no. 1 (2006), 62–90, 66.

[6] Quoted in Molin, "Central Issues of Swedish Neutrality Policy," 262.

[7] Manfried Rauchensteiner, *Spätherbst 1956: Neutralität auf dem Prüfstand* (Vienna: Bundesverlag, 1981), 22. Cf. Erwin A. Schmidl, "Die österreichische Reaktion auf die Ereignisse in Ungarn 1956 und der Einsatz des Bundesheeres an der ungarischen Grenze," in Ibolya Murber and Zoltán Fónagy (eds.), *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna: Czernin, 2006), 93–115.

Ferenc Nagy, who had lived in exile since 1947 and, during the uprising, had come to Austria, was asked to leave the country in order to prevent any cause for discussion about the Austrian role and its efforts to help the refugees.

No Soviet public statement concerning Austria was issued until 30 October, when Ambassador Bischoff was confronted in Moscow with charges that the uprising had been orchestrated by Hungarian émigré organizations in Austria and West Germany with American support.[8] On 1 November, after the Hungarian prime minister Imre Nagy had declared his country's neutrality and the second Soviet intervention started, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations repeated these accusations.[9] *Pravda*, *Izvestiia*, Radio Moscow and numerous other Soviet media – referring to the Austrian communists' *Volksstimme*, which since 27 October had fiercely attacked the Austrian government for supporting the "counterrevolution" – joined in and accused Austria of not observing neutrality carefully enough, helping the insurgents and serving as a military base for them. The propaganda reported alleged US covert activities in Austria that supported Hungarian "fascist" fighters, ongoing flights between Austria and Hungary, and the smuggling of weapons and ammunition, secret service agents and saboteurs from Austria to Hungary.[10] The Soviet effort to depict the Hungarian anti-communist revolution as the result of a plot organized by "fascist" and "reactionary" groupings based in Austria and supported by the United States was aimed at de-legitimizing the revolutionaries and legitimizing Soviet intervention. This policy, as assessed by the Austrian Foreign Service, was designed "to create, by incessantly repeating such claims, a legend that the events in Hungary had been orchestrated from abroad."[11]

Having become a scapegoat of Soviet propaganda tactics, the Austrian government rejected all allegations. In a radio speech on 3 November, Raab stated that all Soviet accusations were invented "from A to Z," and Figl filed an official protest about the accusations with the Soviet ambassador. On 4 November, the issue of the *Volksstimme* which had printed the invented allegations was confiscated by the Austrian authorities. The military attachés of the four powers were invited to inspect the border zone, and the Hungarian government was assured that Austria would not tolerate any intrusion of émigrés into Hungary.[12] Ambassador Bischoff in Moscow filed a protest with the Soviet Foreign Ministry. However, when he stated

---

[8] Rauchensteiner, *Spätherbst 1956*, 52.

[9] Békés, Byrne, Rainer, *The 1956 Hungarian Revolution,* 332; Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 45.

[10] Renáta Szentesi, "Anschuldigungen gegen Österreich von Seiten der Sowjetunion und der KPÖ während der Ungarnkrise von 1956 anhand österreichischer Quellen," in Ibolya Murber and Zoltán Fónagy (eds.), *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna: Czernin, 2006), 243–282.

[11] Besuch Mikojans, 17 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.864-pol/57, Z. 219.187-pol/57.

[12] Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 42–43.

it would be better if the false accusations against Austria were terminated, Deputy Minister Valerian Zorin replied that it would be better if Austria's "activities" were terminated.[13] The Soviet deputy minister called upon Austria to carefully observe neutrality and stated that "any lack of foresight would be exploited by others in order to weaken neutrality."[14]

The Austrian position was strengthened by the United States' declaration of concern about Soviet troops near the Austrian border and by two statements made on 3 and 6 November stating that any attempt to violate the territorial integrity and inner sovereignty of Austria would be considered a "grave threat to peace."[15] Although some Czechoslovakian and East German leaders and even the Soviet minister of defense, Marshal Georgii Zhukov, are said to have demanded the reoccupation of eastern Austria by Soviet troops,[16] Soviet units, during most phases of the intervention, stayed away from the Austrian border. When the border was violated, Raab called Soviet Ambassador Sergei Lapin to receive the Austrian protest.[17] Two weeks later, two Soviet soldiers who had chased Hungarian refugees were caught on Austrian territory, and one, M.P. Lopatin, was shot to death when trying to flee. Four days later the Soviet embassy delivered a formal note of regret stating that the USSR was determined to respect Austrian territory.[18]

With the second Soviet invasion, which reached Budapest on 4 November, claiming more than 3,000 lives and causing about 20,000 casualties, Austrian anger towards the Soviet Union and the pro-Soviet Austrian Communist Party reached a still higher level. The Austrian press published drastic and critical reports about the brutal crackdown on the uprising. In Vienna the police had to protect the Soviet army's monument, erected in 1945 in the center of the city, from being attacked by angry demonstrators;[19] communist party offices were stormed and destroyed by Austrian citizens.[20] The dimensions of the Hungarian disaster and the flight of almost 200,000 refugees to neighboring Austria left a deep mark on the public consciousness. Most Austrians, who, as the Foreign Ministry later as-

---

[13] Iz dnevnika V. A. Zorina: Priem posla Avstrii, 3 November 1956, in RGANI, 89/45/21, 1.

[14] Quoted in Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 164.

[15] Quoted in Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 44.

[16] Manfried Rauchensteiner, "Sandkästen und Übungsräume: Operative Annahmen und Manöver des Bundesheeres 1955–1979," in idem (ed.), *Zwischen den Blöcken: NATO, Warschauer Pakt und Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 253–322, 258; Malicek, "Die Beziehungen," 60.

[17] Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 50.

[18] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 92.

[19] Schlesinger, *Austrian Neutrality in Postwar Europe*, 42.

[20] Manfred Mugrauer, "Zwischen Erschütterung, neuer Offenheit und „Normalisierung": Die KPÖ, der 20. Parteitag der KPdSU und die Ungarn-Krise 1956," in Wolfgang Mueller and Michael Portmann (eds.), *Osteuropa vom Weltkrieg zur Wende* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 257–298. See also A. S. Stykalin, "XX s"ezd KPSS: otkliki v Vengrii i Avstrii," in G.G. Litavrin, T.V. Volokitina, and R.P. Grishina (eds.), *1956 god: Sbornik statei* (Moscow: Institut Slavianovedeniia Rossiiskoi akademii nauk, 2008), 220–235.

sessed, felt historically "connected by countless bonds" to the Hungarian people, were thrown into "horror and shock" by the crushing of the revolution.[21] Even the Soviet-friendly Bischoff claimed: "Never in history has anything similar taken place, and nobody should be surprised if such an unprecedented phenomenon has created psychological consequences, consequences that nobody regrets more than I, but which were, however, unavoidable."[22] The leadership of the Austrian-Soviet Friendship Society ÖSG (which had been established on Soviet initiative in May 1945, and in the following years been systematically taken over by the Austrian communists) tried to justify the Soviet bloodshed in Hungary and declared that the society's activities would not be touched by the events.[23] This outraged its newly gained noncommunist members and the public in general, and led the society back to the isolation of the pro-Moscow communist ghetto it had left only a short time earlier. When State Secretary Franz Grubhofer of the conservative People's Party, with an eye on the USSR, called for the introduction of a neutrality protection law that would oblige citizens and the media not to do things that might cause difficulties in observing neutrality,[24] he was forced, because of the fierce reactions, to drop his proposal. The Austrian Federation of Trade Unions appealed to its Soviet counterpart to exert its influence on the actions in Hungary and to mediate. It called on Austrians for solidarity, collecting more that sixteen million schillings for aid, and organized a strike to protest the forceful oppression of the Hungarian resistance.[25]

On the international theater, Austria supported the UN resolution proposed by the United States on 4 November that demanded the Soviet army's withdrawal, the formation of a Hungarian government reflecting the people's will, the right of entry for UN observers, and organizing humanitarian help for the Hungarian people. Austria thus made it clear that it was not adopting a neutralistic stance towards freedom and democracy.[26] However, Austria also supported an Indian motion for cancelling all references to the political background of the Hungarian disaster in a US draft, but did not support an Italian resolution calling for free elections in Hungary. The latter abstention was ostensibly due to the lack of new elements in the document. However, the true reason seems to be that Austria did not consider the Italian draft acceptable to the Soviet Union and wanted to avoid further alienation of the USSR before bringing forward its own proposal.[27] The Austrian draft,

---

[21] Mikojan-Besuch, 9 March 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.864-pol/57, Z. 217.544-pol/57.

[22] Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 21 February 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.033-pol/57, Z. 217.176-pol/57.

[23] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 99.

[24] Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 96–97.

[25] Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 71.

[26] Wolfgang Strasser, *Österreich und die Vereinten Nationen: Eine Bestandsaufnahme von 10 Jahren Mitgliedschaft* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1967), 88–89.

[27] Text in *Archiv der Gegenwart*, 6090, 9 November 1956. On UN aid for Hungary, see Georg Kastner, "Hilfsaktionen der Vereinten Nationen für die Volksrepublik Ungarn," in Ibolya Murber and

focusing exclusively on an initiative for humanitarian aid, did not touch on political questions and won sixty-seven yes-votes with eight abstentions and no refusals – until then the highest level of support ever reached for a proposition in the UN General Assembly. The abstentions came mainly from the Soviet bloc, whereby Yugoslavia and even Poland voted in favor of the Austrian initiative. Concerning the NATO countries' boycott of Soviet diplomatic representations in response to the violent Soviet crackdown in Hungary, the Austrian conduct was not consistent: whereas the Austrian ambassador in Rome did not show up at the Soviet embassy on the USSR state holiday, Bischoff visited the reception in the Kremlin.

In the meantime, however, the Soviet propaganda campaign against alleged Austrian toleration of American and Hungarian revolutionary activities on Austrian soil did not cease. The attacks were even intensified; the number of Soviet newspaper articles concerning Austria published in 1956 almost reached the all-time high of 1955, and was three times more than the annual average of the following years.[28] After the crackdown on the uprising, the new pro-Soviet Hungarian government joined in. Although covert American actions, such as the sending of propaganda balloons by Radio Free Europe over Austrian territory,[29] could not be denied, it seemed clear that no Austrian official authorities were involved in such activities. Therefore, all allegations were rejected as unjustified by Raab in a radio speech on 11 November, in which the Austrian chancellor very bluntly criticized all oppressors of freedom and stated that "the domination over foreign nations and the oppression of free speech will never bring blessings."[30] Three days later and again in the December issues, the Soviet Foreign Ministry's organ *Mezhdunarodnaia zhisn'* and the *Literaturnaia gazeta* attacked Raab and stated that Austria had failed the first test of neutrality.[31] In late November, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations and the *Komsomolskaia pravda* accused Austria and its embassy in Budapest of having provided handguns to the insurgents,[32] and in Moscow, Defense Minister Zhukov charged the neutral with having allowed US military flights from Munich to Vienna.[33] When Ambassador Bischoff investigated further details in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Gromyko appeared to be uninformed.

      Zoltán Fónagy (eds.), *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna: Czernin, 2006), 187–206.

[28] Merhaut-Gurevitsch, "Die Innen- und Außenpolitik Österreichs," 11.

[29] Andreas Gémes, "Schade, schade, immer Spionage!," in Ibolya Murber and Zoltán Fónagy (eds.), *Die Ungarische Revolution und Österreich 1956* (Vienna: Czernin, 2006), 207–242, 212–220.

[30] Quoted in Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 47–49.

[31] Malicek, "Die Beziehungen," 64–65.

[32] Szentesi, "Anschuldigungen gegen Österreich," 252; Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 3 December 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Pol. Berichte.

[33] Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 28099, 4 December 1956, ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108.

In mid-December the propaganda concerning the neutral's involvement in the uprising was scaled back;[34] however, *Izvestiia* and *Pravda* continued to publish a series of communist horror stories about Austrian maltreatment of Hungarian refugees, particularly about children been kept in Austria behind barbed wire and sold into slavery in the United States.[35] The Austrian Foreign Service felt particularly indignant about the Soviet accusations.[36] Bischoff tried to counteract by sending a copy of an official note to the Soviet Foreign Ministry, in which the Hungarian government thanked Austria for its charitable activities,[37] but the campaign did not cease before mid-February. The propaganda about alleged Austrian violations of neutrality seemed to be aimed at creating an external scapegoat for the uprising, destroying the attractiveness of neutrality for the East European peoples, and at warning the Austrian government and its citizens not to go too far in its solidarity with the Hungarian uprising. However, it soon became clear that the USSR was not interested in actually discrediting Austrian neutrality.

The recovery

It was noted that the Soviet leadership, even before the unfriendly agitation ended, had begun to send out signals that it did not want Soviet-Austrian relations or Austria's international reputation in the West to be damaged. When the Austrian ambassador visited the Soviet president to give condolences for the Soviet soldier who had been shot on Austrian territory on 23 November, he noticed that "no critical words were said from the Soviet side concerning the implementation of our neutrality."[38] At a Kremlin reception in the honor of the Bulgarian delegation, Bulganin and Khrushchev, after criticizing Austria for allegedly letting "counterrevolutionaries" enter Hungary, tacitly acquiesced with Bischoff's reply that such foreign activists – if they had existed at all – were of no importance in comparison to the hundreds of thousands of Hungarian insurgents and refugees.[39] At a similar event on 1 December, Khrushchev welcomed Bischoff with the words: "Greetings to the neutral Austria!" When the Romanian ambassador implicitly questioned the neutral's impartiality, the Soviet leader openly assured the Austrian representative that his words had been meant sincerely and honestly.[40] A few days later, Austrian-

---

[34] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 15 December 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Pol. Berichte.

[35] Merhaut-Gurevitsch, "Die Innen- und Außenpolitik Österreichs," 102–110.

[36] Mikojan-Besuch, 9 March 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.864-pol/57, Z. 217.544-pol/57.

[37] Austrian embassy Moscow to Shepilov, 4 December 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Pol. Berichte Moskau.

[38] Quoted in Szentesi, "Anschuldigungen gegen Österreich," 253.

[39] Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 21 February 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.033-pol/57, Z. 217.176-pol/57.

[40] Quoted in Lobova, "Die Außenpolitik Österreichs aus der Sicht der UdSSR," 901.

Soviet negotiations concerning a delivery of 100,000 tons of Austrian oil to the USSR to be substituted with goods were concluded successfully.[41]

Not even Chancellor Raab's speech of 20 January 1957, which advocated the adoption of neutrality by Hungary, disrupted the upturn in the relations. Deputy Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who was in Vienna in January for Austrian president Theodor Körner's funeral, is said to have – unsuccessfully – tried to press Raab to eliminate some passages.[42] In a report of the Committee of Information of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Raab's speech is depicted as an indication of growing "tendencies in Austrian foreign policy, in response to the plans of the Western powers and the Vatican, to use Austria for detaching the people's democracies from the socialist camp."[43] As further evidence for these plans, the report charged the Austrian deputy foreign minister Kreisky with having offered Austrian loans to Poland in order that it "not become dependent upon the USSR" and the social democratic foreign policy expert Karl Czernetz with calling for "full independence of the East European states." Although Raab's proposal of neutrality for Hungary was later denounced as "unacceptable interference in Hungarian affairs" by the Soviet press, it seems not to have hindered the Soviet-Austrian détente.

Neither did Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov's speech at the sixth session of the Supreme Soviet on 12 February 1957; it contained criticism of "certain actions of the Austrian government that hardly conform to Austria's chosen status of neutrality," such as "the use of Austrian territory by imperialistic forces during the counterrevolutionary plot against […] Hungary" or "the prohibition of international democratic organizations being seated in Austria." However, the foreign minister also underlined that the USSR still "supported Austrian neutrality and independence" and was determined to "henceforth develop the amicable relations to this country."[44]After the bilateral Soviet-Hungarian declaration of 28 March 1957, issued on the occasion of the new Hungarian communist leader János Kádár's visit to Moscow, Austrian-Hungarian relations remained strained for some time.[45] The communiqué repeated the accusations against the West in general and Austria in particular, accusations that were as well known as they were invented: According to the communiqué, "aggressive circles of the West" had overseen the "counterrevolutionary putsch" of the previous fall and taken part in it; Austria had allowed

---

[41] Eger, *Krisen an Österreichs Grenzen*, 51.

[42] Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei*, 352–353. For extracts from the speech, see Mayrzedt and Hummer, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik* 1, 110.

[43] Committee of Information to Suslov, Shepilov, Ponomarev, 27 February 1957, in RGANI, 5/30/224, 49–52.

[44] Rede des sow. Außenministers, 16 February 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.014–pol/57, Z. 216.660–pol.

[45] Andreas Gémes, "Austria and Hungary," in Arnold Suppan and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *Peaceful Coexistence or Iron Curtain? Austria, Neutrality, and Eastern Europe in the Cold War and Détente, 1955–1989* (Vienna: Lit, 2009), 301–327, 312–314.

its territory to be used for activities "obviously hostile towards Hungary" – a policy that was "hardly in accordance with neutrality as declared by Austria."[46]

Soviet-Austrian relations soon recovered. A symbol of this relaxation was the visit of Soviet leadership member Anastas Mikoian to Vienna from 23 to 27 April 1957. With hindsight, it seems safe to claim that it was "not a coincidence," as Russians might say, that the first visit of a Soviet statesman to the West (Finland excluded) after the violent crackdown on the Hungarian uprising went to Austria. Mikoian's trip, which had been scheduled for November 1956 and postponed by the Kremlin[47] at the height of the Hungarian crisis, became proof that the Soviet Union was interested not only in restoring Soviet-Austrian relations and receiving some assurance that Austria had learned its lesson, but also in showing its intention to improve East-West relations after the crises of 1956. Mikoian's words carried even more weight since the Soviet envoy, after Molotov's dismissal from the leadership, functioned as number two of the party and as foreign-policy curator of its Presidium (the former Politburo).

On the Austrian side, the Hungarian revolution and the Soviet campaign against the neutral scapegoat loomed large in the Foreign Ministry's preparations for the visit. In Vienna, it was well understood that neither the Soviet nor the new Hungarian government "wants to admit that the cause for the events in Hungary in the previous autumn lay within Hungary itself."[48] Nonetheless, rejecting the groundless Soviet accusations against Austria's maintenance of neutrality was vital for keeping the country's international status from becoming stained.

In his conversations with the Austrian government, Mikoian, albeit in a very moderate tone, mentioned "forces struggling to dissuade Austria from observing neutrality and to disturb Austrian-Soviet relations"[49] and the "strange parallelism" of Austrian statements in the fall of 1956 with statements by NATO members. After expressing his appreciation of Austria's adoption of neutrality in 1955 and underlining that he did not want to interfere in Austrian affairs, Mikoian criticized "certain words and deeds of Austria in the last period" with which "we are not content,"[50] particularly the promotion of the Austrian policeman who had shot a

---

[46] *Keesing's Archiv der Gegenwart*, 1 April 1957, 6363.

[47] In November 1956, the Austrian MFA dicussed the inappropriateness of Mikoian's visit under the current conditions. A few days later, the USSR asked the visit to be postponed due to "lack of time" for preparations. A.A. Fursenko et al. (eds.), *Prezidium TsK KPSS 1954–1964*, 1 (Moscow: Rosspen, 2003), 970. After the death of the Austrian president Körner, the Kremlin offered to postpone Mikoian's visit once more in order to avoid any collision with the election campaign. Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 14 March 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 217.823–pol/57.

[48] Besuch Mikojans, 17 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 215.864-pol/57, Z. 219.187-pol/57.

[49] Quoted in Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 97–98.

[50] Besprechung im Bundeskanzleramt, 24 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 222.278–pol. For the full protocol of the conversation, see pages 287–293.

Soviet soldier on Austrian territory, and the ban of the World Federation of Trade Unions and the World Peace Council. By stating that "we cannot understand which interest Austria might have in meddling into Hungarian affairs," he also implied that the neutral may have interfered in its neighbors' politics. Nevertheless, he underlined Soviet interest in Austrian neutrality, "because Austria's role as a neutral state is more useful for peace than anything else." When Raab complained about the propaganda attacks of the new Hungarian government against Austria, Mikoian encouraged Raab to re-establish friendly relations with Austria's communist neighbor states and even to contact the new Hungarian leaders (and thus, to help them out of their international isolation).

The Austrian chancellor did not give in to Mikoian's criticism and stated that Austria had never violated neutrality, that the country was interested in friendly relations with its neighbors and the USSR, and that it was not Austria who had erected the Iron Curtain. He also did not let Austria be instrumentalized for Soviet initiatives. When preparing for the Mikoian visit, the Austrian Foreign Ministry had emphasized that it would be necessary in the negotiations to stick to a "purely Austrian" position, as "flattering" the Soviets would undermine Western trust in Austria.[51] With this in mind, the Austrian delegation refused to include any reference to the Soviet proposal for an all-European security system in the communiqué.[52]

On the bilateral level, Mikoian's visit contributed to a noticeable warming in the relations. The Soviet leader expressed the interest in consolidating "all the good that has been reached in our relations" and in endeavoring "to overcome all obstacles and prejudices that hinder the friendship between the Soviet and Austrian people." This did not mean, however, that he granted Austria its desired Soviet approval of a reduction in the Austrian oil deliveries stipulated by the state treaty[53] (this "carrot" was held back by the Kremlin to get Raab to visit Moscow). Nevertheless, the "friendly relations" established in 1955 were, as stated in the joint communiqué, "again approved." Both sides underlined the importance of the preservation of peace, of disarmament, and of Austria's neutrality. In the communiqué, neither the Hungarian crisis nor Soviet-Austrian disagreements were mentioned. Only the reference to "open" talks hinted at Soviet disapproval of Austria.[54]

The most important aspect of Mikoian's visit to Vienna, however, was, as contemporary commentators from Poland to Italy and the United States agreed, that Austria had helped the Kremlin to leave the international isolation into which it

---

[51] Mikojan-Besuch in Österreich, 9 March 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 217.544–pol/57.

[52] Schöner to Matsch, 30 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Z. 219.707–pol/57.

[53] The Austrian Foreign Ministry had considered it unlikely that the question would be solved during the visit. Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 14 March 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 217.823–pol.

[54] Aus dem sowjetsch-österreichischen Kommuniqué, 28 April 1957, in *UdSSR – Österreich*, 105–106.

had fallen after its brutal invasion of Hungary.[55] In the words of the head of the Swiss Political Department, Fritz Gygax, "the visit of Mr. Mikoian to Vienna was one link in a chain of efforts to make the Soviet Union fit again for international society [*wieder international hoffähig zu machen*] after the events in Hungary, and to send some messages to the West from Vienna." Austria, the diplomat stated, was chosen for this visit of "extraordinary importance" as a sounding board for these messages, in order "to demonstrate the good intentions and the good will of the USSR towards all European states that were keeping out of military blocs and nuclear armament."[56]

Indeed, it soon became clear that Mikoian primarily used his stay in Vienna to "speak out of the window" to the West.[57] The Soviet intention to invite not only Austria, but the West in general to a new start of détente was not to be misunderstood. "Everything," Mikoian explained, even the crises in Egypt and Hungary, which could have been used to incite a world war, had "good effects": now both the East and the West knew that the other side did not want war.[58] This assessment was not to be underestimated, since some years earlier the Soviet Union, in the words of an Austrian official, had been convinced of the aggressive intentions of the United States. Mikoian's second message was even more important. He expressed his optimism about the possibility of getting international disarmament, which had gotten stuck, moving again and of even coming to an agreement. The Soviet Union, Mikoian stressed, had unilaterally reduced its army by 1.8 million men, and it advocated a nuclear test stop and the destruction of all nuclear weapons.[59] He welcomed the Western decision to drop the Baruch Plan for a complete ban on nuclear weapons and advocated a nuclear-weapons free zone 800 kilometers east and west of the Elbe River (similar to the Rapacki Plan, which was launched in October by the Polish foreign minister[60]). However, any ideas of creating a "neutral belt" in Europe were discouraged by the Kremlin.[61] Raab's proposal for a neutral

---

[55] Austrian embassy Warsaw to Austrian MFA, 24 May 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 220.913–pol.

[56] Austrian legation Bern to Austrian MFA, 8 May 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 220.117–pol.

[57] Schöner to Matsch, 30 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Z. 219.707–pol/57.

[58] Besprechung im Bundeskanzleramt, 24 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z.222.278–pol. For the full protocol of the conversation, see pages 287–293.

[59] Ibid. On Khrushchev's troop cuts, cf. Matthew Evangelista, *"Why Keep Such an Army?" Khrushchev's Troop Reductions,* Cold War International History Project Working Paper 19 (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 1997), 4–5.

[60] On the Rapacki Plan, see Piotr Wandycz, "Adam Rapacki and the Search for European Security," in Gordon A. Craig and Francis L. Loewenheim (eds.), *The Diplomats, 1939–1979* (Princeton: University Press, 1994), 289–317; and Wanda Jarczabek, *Hope and Reality: Poland and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 1964–1989*, Cold War International History Project Working Paper 56 (Washington, DC: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2008), 4.

[61] Schöner to Matsch, 30 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Z. 219.707–pol/57.

Hungary was rejected and the uniqueness of Austria's status underlined. When on 10 May the Austrian *Neue Tageszeitung* claimed that Mikoian's visit had showed that the USSR was ready to give up the GDR, the Soviet ambassador asked for an official correction.[62]

With Mikoian's trip, which left a "generally favorable impression" in Austria,[63] the ice at the official bilateral level was broken. It must be noted, however, that it took much longer for the Soviet Union to regain acceptance among the general Austrian population after the bloodshed in Hungary. When the Viennese *Eisrevue*, an ice skating company that was later taken over by the United States' Holiday on Ice, traveled to Moscow in April 1957, its members were fiercely attacked in the Austrian media as "traitors." Similar reactions were published when the Austrian minister of justice followed a Soviet invitation to Moscow in July. The Austrian press criticized that Otto Tschadek, who was the first Western justice minister to accept a Soviet invitation, thus helped the "infamous Russian judiciary" to gain prestige equal to the Western one.[64]

While the Soviet image remained, in the Austrian public opinion, linked to the brutality of the Stalin era and that of 1956, Austria, in the eyes of its pro-Soviet ambassador in Moscow, seemed to be "one of the most-liked Western countries" among the Russians. All thirty-five performances of the *Eisrevue*, Bischoff claimed, were sold out. Whereas this success could also be attributed to a lack of variety in the Soviet capital's entertainment program, there might be some truth to Bischoff's assessment that "for average Muscovites, Austrians today are not 'the evil people who sent weapons to the Hungarian fascists,' and not even 'the wise people who kept out of NATO and declared neutrality,' but they are 'the people who gave the world Mozart and Johann Strauß and now sent their *Eisrevue* to us.'"[65]

The Soviet media, indeed, repeatedly called attention to Soviet-Austrian affinities with regard to culture, particularly high culture.[66] This had been a stock theme of Soviet propaganda in Austria in 1945, and was used now in support of the current tendency in Soviet foreign policy towards Austria. However, in order that Austria not become too attractive as a model for Eastern Europeans and the Soviet people, the communist media kept up a certain medium-level criticism with regard to, on one hand, "political circles" attempting to derail Austria's neutral course, and, on the other, unjust social and economic conditions in Austria as a capitalist country. A generally positive report about Austria in the youth magazine *Ogonek* on 18 August

---

[62] Artikel in der Neuen Tageszeitung, 12 June 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 222.136–pol.

[63] *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1958–1960, IX: Berlin Crisis, Germany, Austria* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1993), 768.

[64] Presseangriffe, 2 July 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 221.442–pol/57, Z. 221.795–pol/57.

[65] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 14 May 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.633–pol/57, Z. 220.793–pol.

[66] Stifter, "Das politische Österreichbild," 142.

1957 was embellished with pictures of beggars and homeless on Viennese streets, and in the following months, several publications appeared featuring the allegedly poor living conditions of Austrian workers.[67] However, once *Pravda*, on 27 August 1957, praised the idea of neutrality, which had "taken strong roots in Austria" and enabled the country to "exert a great deal of positive influence on international developments," nobody could doubt that Soviet-Austrian relations had been restored following the most severe test they had as yet undergone.

---

[67] Cf. Austrian embassy Moscow to MFA, 25 September 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 248.423–pol/59.

4. Starting Anew: After the Hungarian Revolution

In the meantime, Soviet diplomacy tried to strike the Austrian iron while it was hot: After Soviet Premier Bulganin had presented his "peace notes" of 10 December 1957 and of 8 January 1958 to the member states of the United Nations plus Switzerland,[1] a document that proposed a nonaggression treaty between the two blocs and a conference of world leaders to end the Cold War, he, in a "personal message" to Chancellor Raab, called on Austria to support the initiative. The Bulganin notes, one of the most comprehensive Soviet disarmament proposals until that time, had come only after the Soviet decision to withdraw from the UN disarmament negotiations in Geneva;[2] the notes were aimed at projecting a more peaceful image of the USSR,[3] re-engaging the West in negotiations, and angling for a summit. Promoting the Rapacki Plan, they were likely to frustrate NATO plans for tactical nuclear rearmament in Western Europe, which was deemed indispensable by Western leaders for balancing the quantitative superiority of Soviet conventional forces in Europe. In Bulganin's proposal, a special status of "nuclear neutrality" was offered to all NATO states that gave up their launching sites. In the long run, the proposals, if accepted, were to create a Soviet preponderance in Europe by eliminating nuclear weapons from the Western parts of the continent and to undermine the US presence in Europe by expelling all "foreign troops" from Germany. Although the notes admitted that no quick success was likely to be reached at a summit, such a meeting was considered essential for building trust and also for fostering economic ties between the East and West. The participation of neutral and nonaligned states was welcomed explicitly.

By claiming that Austria, by virtue of its status, "must be interested" in securing peace and "could make a special contribution," Bulganin, in his personal message, encouraged Raab to take on the responsibility for proposing the conference as well as disarmament ideas to the West, while mobilizing Austria against the creation of

---

[1] *Keesing's Archiv der Gegenwart*, 11 December 1957, 6809; 10 January 1958, 6836. For the text of the letter to US president Eisenhower and other Western leaders, 10 December 1957, see *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik III/3, no. 3: 1957*, bearb. von Ernst Deuerlein, Gisela Biewer und Hansjürgen Schierbaum (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1967), 2030–2042; the follow-up letters to the West German chancellor Adenauer and to other Western leaders, and the Soviet proposal, 8 January 1958, in *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik III/4, no. 1: 1958*, bearb. von Ernst Deuerlein und Gisela Biewer (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1969), 21–81.

[2] John van Oudenaren, *Détente in Europe: The Soviet Union and the West* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 50–52.

[3] Veljko Mičunović, *Moskauer Tagebücher 1956–1958* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982), 392.

nuclear launching sites in Italy. The letter contained pleasant compliments about the possibilities and also the responsibility carried, in Bulganin's eyes, by neutral Austria for relaxing tensions and "restoring confidence in international relations."[4] Such advances were part and parcel of a Soviet campaign for a new détente, the neutralization of Western Europe, and the dissolution of the European-American alliance, a campaign that combined relaxing measures, such as Soviet conventional troop reductions, with a Soviet nuclear build-up and nuclear threats against Western countries, among them the United States, Britain, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Greece, Turkey, and Israel.[5] Like most of the numerous Soviet proposals in the years 1955 to 1958, it found little resonance abroad and was soon overshadowed by new crises.

In March 1958, Nikita Khrushchev encouraged the Austrian government to support his recent initiative for a nuclear test ban, and in July, Austria, among other countries, received a Soviet invitation for preparing the conclusion of an all-European treaty on friendship and cooperation.[6] Even earlier, Chancellor Raab had been invited to come to Moscow, and signals were sent to Vienna that the USSR would be appreciative of Austria's good services in the German question.[7]

Concerning Bulganin's "peace initiative" and the Rapacki Plan, the chancellor's cautious answer, namely, that Austria appreciated both blocs' efforts to disarm and that he was ready to support any initiatives leading to détente,[8] was greeted in both the East and the West. In the case of Germany, Raab, who, erroneously, was convinced that both parts of the country would be granted and willing to accept a status similar to Austrian neutrality, launched an initiative to found an interallied commission on Germany with the task of investigating the conditions necessary

---

[4] Correspondence Bulganin – Raab, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 227.665–pol/57, Z. 227.678–pol/57 and GZ. 544.297–pol/58, Z. 544.588–pol/58. The full text is published on pages 293–297. In his message to US president Eisenhower dated 4 February 1958, Bulganin proposed a summit meeting dealing with a suspension of nuclear tests, an abandonment of nuclear weapons, and a nonaggression treaty between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. TASS, 4 February 1958.

[5] On the troop cuts, see Evangelista, *"Why Keep Such an Army?"*, 4–6. On the nuclear build-up, see Holloway, *Stalin and the Bomb,* 324–335; idem, "Nuclear Weapons and the Escalation of the Cold War," in Melvin Leffler and Odd Arne Westad (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War I: Origins* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010), 376–397. Cf. Frank Umbach, *Das rote Bündnis: Entwicklung und Zerfall des Warschauer Paktes 1955 bis 1991* (Berlin: Links, 2005), 105–106.

[6] Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei*, 381–382. On the Soviet proposal, see Bernhard Schalhorn, "Sowjetische Westeuropapolitik I," in Dietrich Geyer (ed.), *Osteuropa-Handbuch Sowjetunion II: Außenpolitik 1955–1973* (Cologne: Böhlau, 1976), 61–145, 93–95; on further initiatives for disarmament, see ibid., 86–99. The text of the Soviet note and proposal, 15 July 1958, is published in *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik III/4, no. 2*, 1464–1469.

[7] Michael Gehler, "Neutralität und Neutralisierungspläne für Mitteleuropa? Österreich, Ungarn, Tschechoslowakei und Polen," in Dominik Geppert and Udo Wengst (eds.), *Neutralität – Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005), 105–131, 111–115.

[8] Verbalnote Bundeskanzleramt, Zl. 544.441-pol/58, 21 January 1958, Ministerratsprotokoll 64, 21 January 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, MRP.

for its reunification and for free all-German elections (similar to what had been proposed by the Western powers between 1952 and 1954 but turned down by the Kremlin).[9] The Soviet proposal for solving the problem by talks between the FRG and the GDR was characterized by Raab as "absurd" and "illusory."[10]

It soon became clear that Raab's idea had no chance of realization and was dropped. Nevertheless, a few days before Khrushchev staged the second Berlin crisis by attempting to expel the Western powers from West Berlin and rid the city of its protection, Gromyko chose the Austrian ambassador, Bischoff, to convey secretly to the West German representative in Moscow, Ambassador Hans Kroll, the message that "the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany could lead to the resolution of the entire German problem."[11] In return, the West German government was to renounce nuclear weapons and recognize the "people's democracies" plus the GDR. Bischoff expressed his conviction that the USSR sincerely wanted to open the way to German unification – as it turned out, a serious misunderstanding on the Austrian ambassador's side. Though Bischoff fulfilled the request, it did not lead to the goal the Kremlin had hoped for: After the Soviet ultimatum to Berlin, there was no longer any basis for fruitful negotiations. In a conversation with Khrushchev on 11 November 1958, Bischoff looked into how the USSR would react if the West rejected the Soviet proposal about Berlin. The day before, Khrushchev, in a reception for the Polish delegation, had rebuffed any Western rights in West Berlin.[12] The Soviet leader replied coolly: "In that case, our missiles are ready and aimed at the right targets. We only need a few of them."[13] Obviously Khrushchev again counted on Bischoff to pass this message on to Bonn.

An effort by Bruno Kreisky to arrange a meeting between Berlin mayor Willy Brandt and a "high ranking Soviet representative" in the spring of 1959 also failed after Brandt withdrew.[14] During Khrushchev's visit to Austria, Gromyko asked

---

[9] Matthias Pape, "Die Deutschlandinitiative des österreichischen Bundeskanzlers Julius Raab im Frühjahr 1958," in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 48, no. 2 (2000), 281–318. Cf. Report on Raab's interview with *Industriekurier,* 26 April 1958, in *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik III/4, no. 2: 1958*, bearb. von Ernst Deuerlein und Gisela Biewer (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1969), 1057–1058.

[10] Quoted in Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 106.

[11] Fursenko and Naftali, *Khrushchev's Cold War*, 205, 207, 211. Cf. Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, Z. 73–pol/58 and Z. 74–pol/58, 23 November and 1 December 1958, in SBKA, Länderbox UdSSR, 1; Bischoff to Figl, 28080, 26 November 1958, ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108; Pape, *Ungleiche Brüder,* 499–500, 618–620. An extract of Kroll's memoir is published in *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik IV/1, no. 1: 10 Nov. 1958–31 Jan. 1959*, bearb. von Ernst Deuerlein und Hannelore Nathan (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1971), 121–122.

[12] Gerhard Wettig, *Chruschtschows Berlinkrise 1958 bis 1963: Drohpolitik und Mauerbau* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006), 25.

[13] Bischoff to Austrian MFA, 28073, 11 November 1958, ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 108.

[14] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 200, 204. Cf. Martin Kofler, "Kreisky – Brandt – Khrushchev: The United States and Austrian Mediation during the Berlin Crisis 1958–1963," in Günter Bi-

Kreisky to contact the West Germans and pass on a Soviet proposal, dated 2 July 1960, on the transformation of West Berlin into a "free city." Although Secretary of State Christian Herter asserted that the Soviet memorandum contained "nothing new,"[15] Brandt and Adenauer were informed. However, information was leaked to the press, and the initiative did not bear any fruit. In 1959 and 1962, Khrushchev used his conversations with Kreisky and other Austrian representatives to repeat his threats against West Berlin.[16] The Soviet leader indicated that he was concerned about a possible nuclear rearmament of West Germany and was prepared to sign a separate treaty with the GDR; while he ruled out German reunification any time soon, Khrushchev claimed West Berlin as part of East Germany and threatened to "cut [it] off." Despite their fruitlessness, these communications show, on one hand, the Soviet strategy of using the neutral not only for conveying Soviet messages to the West Germans, but also for repeatedly reminding the latter of the privileged status they could attain if they were ready to abandon their alliance with the West. On the other hand, these episodes prove that Austrian leaders were only too ready to offer their services (not just to improve their standing in the Kremlin, but also out of their sincere aspirations to help their friends in Germany). However, according to Brandt, neither Raab nor Kreisky seemed to grasp the differences between the Austrian solution of 1955 and the Soviet attitude towards Germany.[17]

The Raab visit and the Lebanon crisis

With Mikoian's trip to Vienna, a series of regular mutual visits at the high and intermediary political levels was taken up again. On the Austrian side, such visits were much more frequent with the USSR than with any other signatory power of the state treaty.[18] The year 1958, with thirty-six Soviet and thirty-one Austrian delegations, marked an all-time high in the exchange. The Austrian chancellor's journey to the land of the soviets, which the Kremlin had encouraged in 1957, was particularly important to the Soviet side, since Raab was the first Western statesman to visit the USSR after the Hungarian disaster of 1956. While the Soviet invitation

schof, Michael Gehler, and Anton Pelinka (eds.), *Austrian Foreign Policy in Historical Context*, Contemporary Austrian Studies 14 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2006), 170–185. Kreisky later claimed that Brandt had expressed the wish to meet a high ranking Soviet politician. Bruno Kreisky, *Im Strom der Politik: Der Memoiren zweiter Teil* (Vienna: Kremayr & Scheriau, 1988), 10–22. For a critical assessment, cf. Röhrlich, *Kreiskys Außenpolitik*, 186–187.

[15] Martin Kofler, "Eine Art „Nabel der Welt": Österreich und der Chruschtschow-Besuch 1960," in *Zeitgeschichte* 26, no. 6 (1999), 397–416, 409. Cf. Egon Bahr, *Zu meiner Zeit* (Berlin: Siedler, 1996), 127–129.

[16] Conversation Khrushchev with Kreisky and Schärf, 13 October 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 236.711–pol/59, Z. 249.552–pol/59. For the full text of the conversation in 1959, see pages 298–300. For the conversations in 1962, see below pages 302–303, 310–312, 321–325.

[17] Willy Brandt, *Erinnerungen* (Berlin: Siedler, 1999), 174.

[18] Neuhold, "Austria and the Soviet Union," 95; Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 114.

clearly aimed at demonstrating to the world that "peaceful coexistence and friendly relations between states of different social systems" were possible and even mutually beneficial,[19] the Austrian government's goal for its trip from 21 to 28 July 1958 was much more down-to-earth: Raab wanted to test the sincerity of these slogans at a practical economic level, seeking solely a reduction in the Austrian oils debts to the Soviet Union.

The circumstances of the visit were not easy. In June, the political trial and execution of Imre Nagy brought back dark memories of the Soviet crackdown on the Hungarian uprising two years earlier. On 15 July, the Soviet leadership launched its proposal for a "peace pact" between all European states and the United States, and it was anticipated that the Kremlin would press its Austrian guests to publicly endorse the initiative. The Ballhausplatz had warned already in June that, "due to the lacking political content of the visit and the absence of bilateral problems," the Austrian delegation might well be "exploited for propaganda statements in the contemporary Cold War in favor of the Soviet stance."[20]

Last but not least, Raab's trip to Moscow was overshadowed by the beginning of the Lebanon crisis, a pro-Egyptian Muslim rebellion against the country's Christian pro-Western president, who called on the United States for help. From 16 to 18 July, about a hundred US aircraft passed over the Alps on their way to the Near East. Austria, responding to a request by the US State Department, had given verbal permission for some thirty-two overflights. However, this number was exceeded considerably by the flights that had started before the official permission was received. When Austrian communist newspapers began to report the incident, the Austrian government, which was obliged to observe neutrality but did not have an air force to prevent foreign planes from flying over its territory, had to react officially. The Austrian dilemma – on one hand, to fulfill its obligations and, on the other, not to alienate its traditional patron, the United States – led to a double game. The Austrian government filed a protest with the US embassy in order to assuage the Soviet side, which was trying to pressure the Austrians into observing their neutrality more comprehensively. Therefore, the Kremlin itself also protested with the US government, and later even offered the Soviet air force to protect Austrian air space. At the same time, Foreign Minister Figl unofficially reassured US representatives that his protest was "just for the record." On 19 July, the State Department issued a press release stating that, as requested by the Austrian side, the US air force would henceforth respect Austrian neutrality.[21] However, no official regret was expressed.

---

[19] Haymerle, "Die Beziehungen zur Großmacht im Osten," 164–165.

[20] Vorbereitung des Besuches, 20 June 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 550.368–pol/58.

[21] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 184–186; Walter Blasi, "Die Libanonkrise 1958 und die US Überflüge," in Erwin A. Schmidl (ed.), *Österreich im frühen Kalten Krieg: Spione, Partisanen, Kriegspläne* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2000), 239–259. On the Soviet protest, see Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei*, 385.

When the Austrian chancellor, vice-chancellor, minister of foreign affairs, and state secretary, bearing an original letter by Karl Marx and a film about Vienna's Spanish Riding School as gifts, arrived in the Soviet capital, banners with the motto "Long live Austrian-Soviet friendship" were hung above Moscow's main streets. On 21 July *Pravda* praised Raab and Austria's "international authority," which had risen as a consequence of the country's neutrality, applauded the Austrian protest against the US flights and expressed its wish that "the amicable relations between the Soviet Union and Austria will be strengthened." The claim that "by means of the Austrian example, the idea of neutrality has become popular among other West European peoples," hinted at the intentions Soviet diplomacy was pursuing in the bilateral relationship. At the airport, in the presence of a reception committee consisting of countless Soviet ministers, deputy ministers and ambassadors,[22] a committee large enough to welcome the UN secretary general or the pope, Khrushchev personally praised the "statesmanlike wisdom" of his Austrian guest, which had made the successful conclusion of the state treaty possible. Raab took up this reference to the leitmotiv in Soviet-Austrian relations and thanked his host-country for its efforts, "owing to which preeminently the treaty was concluded"[23] – a statement that was neither historically fully correct nor well received in the United States.[24] Both sides paid tribute to Austria's neutrality as a contribution to international peace. In his speech in the Kremlin on the next day, however, Khrushchev warned the guests of "groups, intent on getting Austria off its neutral path."[25]

The negotiations, which according to the communiqué were conducted in an "atmosphere of friendship and cordiality," demonstrated the "good relations reflecting the national interests of both countries" and contributed to the "strengthening of peace in Europe," resulted in Austria's wish being fulfilled: its remaining obligation of delivering seven million tons of oil in the following seven years, as stipulated by the state treaty, was cut by 50 percent.[26] An invitation to come to Austria was extended to Khrushchev and Mikoian, who was repeatedly referred to by Raab and Khrushchev as a "friend of Austria" or even as "Austrian." On their side, the Soviets were pleased to learn that Austria, as the first Western state and despite Western misgivings, declared itself ready to become a member of the Danube Convention of 1948 – a move that was perceived as a slap in the face of the West, which had condemned the founding document of this organization as a violation of interna-

---

[22] Vizit Avstriiskoi pravitel'stvennoi delegatsii, 21–28 July 1958, in AVPRF, 66/37/72/13, 15–19. Cf. Kreisky, *Im Strom*, 104–105.

[23] Reden, 29 July 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 552.245–pol/58

[24] *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 771.

[25] *Daily Review of the Soviet Press*, 23 July 1958.

[26] Schlusskommuniqué, 24 July 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 552.061–pol/58. Cf. Mayrzedt and Hummer, *20 Jahre Österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik* 2, 138–140.

tional law and a means of enforcing Soviet control in Eastern Europe.[27] The West had been assured by Foreign Minister Figl that Austria would not join the Belgrade Convention.[28] Since the organization was entitled to make majority decisions about the free transport of any goods (including, e.g. arms) on the river, membership for a neutral state was deemed by legal experts to be at least problematic in the case of war.[29]

In the negotiations on the communiqué, the Soviets pressed the Austrian delegation to include a paragraph stating that the USSR was ready to defend Austrian neutrality – an attempt that was refused by the delegation from Vienna.[30] Nevertheless, Soviet diplomacy succeeded in advancing a paragraph stating that Austria had been informed about "all steps being taken by the Soviet government aiming at détente in international relations and at reducing the threat of a nuclear war." Austria would be ready "to contribute to a consolidation of peace – with respect to Austria's [limited] possibilities." For the first time, "peaceful coexistence" was mentioned in an Austrian-Soviet communiqué – a break of a diplomatic taboo, since the term, due to its communist connotation, was still rejected by the West. The statement was watered down, however, by the Austrian delegation, who added the words "as defined in the twelfth general assembly of the UN."[31] The Austrian delegation avoided qualifying recent Soviet "peace initiatives" and – in general words only – welcomed "all measures contributing to a consolidation of peace and to the reduction of the nuclear threat." While the Kremlin was interested in using the communiqué for promoting its political initiatives, it was particularly important for the Austrian government to draw this fine line and avoid becoming solely an instrument of Soviet propaganda.[32] Khrushchev had emphasized the Soviet thesis that neutral states should actively contribute to the reduction of tensions, pressing Austria to be more active in this matter so as to become a "major force in the preservation of peace." The Austrian government, however, was interested in not alienating the Western powers and, therefore, only joining an initiative once it was clear that it would gain the approval of both blocs.

---

[27] Stephan Verosta, "Außenpolitik," in Erika Weinzierl and Kurt Skalnik (eds.), *Österreich: Die Zweite Republik* (Graz: Styria, 1972), 295–343, 328.

[28] *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 780.

[29] Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 100.

[30] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 186.

[31] Aus dem sowjetisch-österreichischen Kommuniqué, 24 July 1958, in *UdSSR – Österreich*, 107–111. The resolutions of 15 December 1957 and 10 December 1958 of the UN General Assembly had avoided using the term, at that time primarily a Soviet expression, and referred instead to "peaceful and good neighborly relations." Cf. "Mirnoe sosushchestvovanie," in A.A. Gromyko, S. A. Golunskii, and V.M. Khvostov, *Diplomaticheskii slovar'* 2, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1961), 297–300.

[32] Richtlinien für die Ausarbeitung eines österr.-sow. Kommuniqués, 19 July 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 552.250–pol/58.

The Soviet reticence from pressing the delegation more strongly to make propagandistic statements, and the Austrians' ability to walk the fine line between complimenting the Soviets and insulting the United States, between advancing their country's international role and being put at the top of the Soviet propaganda chart, were recognized in Western media. On 25 July the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* acknowledged that there had been "no Russian attempt to express wishes or demands that would embarrass the Austrians," and the Danish *Finanstidende* wrote on 15 August: "The Austrians took note of the incense offered to them without letting it go to their head." From the US State Department, some critical remarks on the Austrian failure to consult with the Western powers about the Danube Convention and on the Austrian excessive praise of the Soviet merits in concluding the state treaty were communicated via diplomatic channels.[33] With regard to the Austrian invitation to Khrushchev, the US ambassador in Moscow criticized Austria's "unfortunate display of callousness" in inviting the Soviet leader "within few weeks of execution of [Hungarian leaders Imre] Nagy, [Pál] Maléter, et al. under Soviet orders."[34]

In Moscow, Raab's visit left, as Khrushchev, Mikoian and Zorin unanimously pointed out to the Austrian ambassador, "the best and most pleasant impressions."[35] *Pravda* characterized the Soviet-Austrian relations as a "convincing example of peaceful coexistence" and on 26 July *Izvestiia* praised the "further strengthening of mutual understanding, trust and cooperation" that had been achieved, as its editors had predicted. Both papers expressed their conviction that the example of amicable Soviet-Austrian relations could and should be followed by every good-willed Western country. In an internal report, the Soviet embassy in Vienna also assessed the results of the Austrian visit in Moscow positively.[36] The position not only of Austria's neutrality, but also of Austrian circles advocating a rapprochement between the two countries was strengthened. The report continued by stating that in the People's Party, as among the social democrats, Raab was celebrating a comeback as the unquestioned leader. There had even been recent Austrian calls to improve the country's relations with the "people's democracies,"[37] a move that until that point, the Soviet embassy guessed, had been kept at a low level in order to placate the West for the cordial Austrian-Soviet relationship. As a result of the warm reception for the Austrian delegation, the USSR and the KPÖ had regained a certain degree

---

[33] Austrian embassy Washington to Austrian MFA, 6 August 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 553.023–pol/58.

[34] *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 772–773.

[35] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 30 July 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 544.163–pol/58, Z. 553.075–pol.

[36] Soviet embassy Vienna to Soviet MFA, 9 September 1958, in AVPRF, 66/37/72/13, 31–40.

[37] These Austrian calls, which were stimulated by the Soviet-West German agreements of 1958, squared with Soviet demands. Amtsvermerk, Conversation Kreisky with Gromyko, 14 October 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 236.711–pol/59, Z. 249.384–pol/59; Soviet embassy Vienna on Austrian reactions with regard to the Soviet-West German agreement, 13 May 1958, in AVPRF, 66/37/72/16, 32–35.

of popularity in the Austrian population. As proof for the overwhelmingly positive impact of the trip on the bilateral relations, the daily *Neues Österreich* was quoted as stating that "the strained relations between the Soviet Union and Austria after 1945 are over now."

Once Raab had broken the international boycott against the Soviet Union that was a result of the events of 1956, further Austrian and Western guests followed. The Austrian minister of defense Graf traveled to Moscow still in 1958, and in October 1959, the Austrian president Adolf Schärf became the first Western head of state to visit the USSR after the Hungarian uprising.[38] In the communiqué, once again, bilateral relations were praised for developing "in friendship and mutual understanding and cooperation."[39] It is not unlikely that, as was the opinion of the Soviet embassy, the demonstratively welcoming reception of Austrian delegations in Moscow as well as the Soviet economic concessions had had an impact on the public attitude towards the Soviet Union.[40] Austrian media coverage on Soviet technical developments and economic progress, on *Sputnik* and the seven-year plan, also improved, although the anti-communist editor of the social democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, Oscar Pollak, remained cautious in the face of any signs of overly benevolent attitudes towards the Soviet Union. Contrary to earlier occasions, however, after an incident of the paper being too critical of the USSR, the social democratic party leadership apologized in a conversation with the Soviet ambassador.[41]

Cultural relations and the World Youth Festival

Meanwhile, cultural relations between the two countries, which had been badly damaged by the Soviet intervention in Hungary 1956, began to revive. In the dealings between liberal democratic societies and their communist counterparts, cultural relations played a special role. While between open societies, in general, a free flow of ideas, contacts, and even individuals is possible and liberal states usually consider it unnecessary to regulate this exchange, this is not the case in closed systems, in which personal contacts as well as private and mass communication are under strict control and any exchange with foreign institutions is impossible without official permission. Despite this, communist leaders considered some sort of exchange necessary to gain prestige both nationally and internationally and to prevent their countries from falling into intellectual isolation and economic backwardness. While the travel of Western artists to communist countries remained

---

[38] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 115; Schärf to Voroshilov, 20 September 1958, Russian translation, in AVPRF, 66/37/72/13, 43–45; Conversation Khrushchev with Kreisky and Schärf, 13 October 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, II-Pol, GZ. 236.711–pol/59, Z. 249.552–pol/59. For the full text of the conversation, see pages 298–300.

[39] Quoted in Haymerle, "Die Beziehungen zur Großmacht im Osten," 166.

[40] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 115–118.

[41] Conversation Lapin with Pittermann, 24 July 1957, in AVPRF, 66/36/68/10, 23–25.

controlled, sending Eastern musicians abroad was considered by Soviet leaders as a fine tool for promoting their own culture and fostering détente. For this reason, communist governments proved quite eager to form new regulations for cultural relations, which were endorsed in solemn and formal intergovernmental agreements. This held true particularly for the Soviet Union, which strove at reinforcing its status as a beacon of progress and culture, as well as the leader of the "world communist system." As historian Vladislav Zubok has aptly observed, "In no other regime in modern history, aside from Nazi Germany, did the promotion of culture (*kultura*) preoccupy the political leadership to this degree or involve such large expenditures."[42] However, most Western governments did not share the totalitarian approach towards culture nor the eagerness of such regimes to establish the ritualized promotion of culture abroad. In addition, they did not want to contribute to the prestige of communist governments by formalizing bilateral exchanges of delegations, especially if it did not offer the opportunity of fostering the freedom of ideas in Eastern societies.

Here again, Austria was chosen by the Kremlin to serve as an icebreaker. In order to build a legal framework for cultural relations with Austria, Soviet diplomats in 1956 resumed pressuring for the signing of a cultural agreement, an agreement that Moscow and the Austrian-Soviet Society had already been advocating since the 1940s.[43] After the conclusion of the state treaty, this pressure was intensified by the USSR, which, at that time, had almost no cultural contacts with Western countries.[44] The Soviet Union aspired to concluding new cultural agreements with Western states in order to promote "peaceful cooperation" in an area of East-West relations that was relatively unproblematic. As a neutral country with a well-reputed high culture and due to its weakness and vulnerability to Soviet pressure, Austria (in addition to Belgium, Britain, France, and Norway, with which Soviet agreements were signed in 1956–57[45]) seemed a natural target for this initiative. In the spring of 1956, a cultural agreement became, in the words of an Austrian diplomat, the "favorite subject" of the Soviet embassy in Vienna, which raised the issue often, sometimes twice a week, and presented two agreement drafts to the Austrians.[46] That autumn, deputy foreign ministers Smirnov and Zorin took an interest in these matters and deplored the – allegedly politically motivated – Austrian

[42] Zubok, *A Failed Empire*, 165.

[43] Mueller and Leidinger, "Tiefes Misstrauen," 106.

[44] In the wake of the 1955 Geneva conferences, the USSR had re-established cultural ties with Britain and France. Walter L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945–1961* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1998), 108.

[45] Yale Richmond, *Cultural Exchange and the Cold War: Raising the Iron Curtain* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 15. Another Soviet-French agreement on cultural exchange was concluded 1963. Loth, *Overcoming the Cold War*, 90.

[46] Beziehungen zur Sowjetunion, 1 March 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 512.215–pol/56, Z. 512.215–pol/56; Abschluss eines Kulturabkommens, 29 June 1956, ibid., GZ. 512.215–pol/56, Z. 516.031–pol/56

reluctance to react to the Soviet overtures.[47] However, both the Ballhausplatz and the Ministry for Education denied any political concerns and agreed between themselves that "the agreement will remain on paper, in which case it is worthless, or it will be implemented, in which case we cannot afford the associated obligations."[48] Increasingly under pressure, both from Soviet diplomatic circles and Austrian communists, Ambassador Bischoff, in order to defend the Austrian position, prepared an explanation stating that the four cultural agreements in effect between Austria and other countries were only remnants of the interwar period. Austria's reluctance to conclude a new culture treaty, Bischoff explained, was motivated by fears of pressure from the FRG to sign a West German-Austrian agreement.[49] It was only in 1968 that Austria conceded to Soviet pressure and signed a cultural agreement.[50]

Without an official basic regulatory document, a major part of cultural relations depended, on one hand, upon nongovernmental organizations, and on the other, the openness and level of proactiveness each side displayed. Therefore, during Raab's visit to Moscow in 1958, a Soviet-Austrian Society, corresponding to the society already in existence in Austria, was founded under the presidency of composer Dmitri Shostakovich. It included several "corporate members," such as the Leningrad University and numerous Moscow theatres. Its aim was to "spread information about Austria" by organizing concerts, lectures, and exhibits and to receive Austrian guests in the USSR. The matching task in Vienna was taken over by the Austrian-Soviet Society, which "as a consequence of the Hungarian events had suffered great difficulties," and in 1957 took pains to reintensify its efforts.[51] On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the October Revolution in 1957, the ÖSG organized more than three hundred events, including a film festival, twenty lectures (mostly by Austrian communist speakers), and concert tours of renowned classical and folk musicians. These efforts, the Soviet Foreign Ministry noted with satisfaction, were duly supported by the Austrian authorities, who "proved their loyalty with regard to these measures."[52] This was even more remarkable as the society, due to its communist and pro-Soviet leanings, had been boycotted by Austrian authorities until the early 1950s. In 1956, the Austrian-Soviet Society ran forty-one libraries, the largest of which containing more than 14,000 Russian books.[53] Since

---

[47] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 4 September 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 512.215–pol/56, Z. 518.908–pol/56; Conversation with Zorin, 12 October 1956, ibid., Z. 518.397–pol/56.

[48] Einsichtsbemerkung Braunias, 27 March 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 512.215–pol/56, Z. 512.631–pol/56; Entwurf eines österr.-sowjetischen Kulturabkommens, 3 August 1956, ibid., Z. 517.086–pol/56.

[49] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 4 September 1956, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 512.215–pol/56, Z. 518.908–pol/56.

[50] See below, page 193.

[51] Informatsiia o provedenii merov v Avstrii, 4 January 1958, in AVPRF, 66/37/72/13, 2–6.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Zhiriakov, SSSR – Avstriia, 60.

the 1940s, courses in Russian language and literature were offered at a number of Austrian high schools; in 1957, 86 schools taught 2,373 students who had chosen Russian either as a major or as an elective.[54] A Soviet-Austrian agreement on film exchange, concluded in 1956, enabled Soviet citizens to experience Austrian kitsch (*Reich mir die Hand, mein Leben*), and confronted Austrians with Socialist Realism (*Letiat zhuravli*). In 1959, thirteen Soviet movies were seen by 600,000 Austrians; however, they could not live up to the competition from Hollywood. In addition to these more serious types of cultural exchange, a year earlier, the soccer teams of the Soviet and Austrian armies had met for a friendship match.

It soon became clear that with regard to cultural exchange the Soviet side was much more proactive than the Austrian, and that Soviet regulations were still much more restrictive for foreigners than vice versa. Thus, until the early 1960s Austrian activities in the USSR remained rare. In the meantime, Soviet exhibitions on "The Peaceful Application of Atomic Energy in the Soviet Union" and other contemporary Soviet high-tech achievements were sent to Vienna; the *Eisrevue* tour of 1957, with its ice-breaking effect, was answered the same summer with several performances of the Soviet musicians David and Igor Oistrakh at the Salzburg Festival and, in 1959, by an overwhelmingly successful run of performances of the Soviet state circus, which was visited by more than 450,000 Austrians. The Moiseev folk-dance company and a visit by Armenian composer Aram Khachaturian followed in 1961–62.[55]

The largest Soviet-sponsored event in Vienna, however, did not have anything to do with bilateral relations. In July 1959, the World Youth Festival took place for the first time in a noncommunist country. Two years earlier, a similar mass event had been organized in Moscow. For the seventh such festival, with its cultural performances, sport competitions and political meetings, the motto "Struggle against Imperialism" had been chosen. The Austrian government reluctantly gave in to Soviet pressure and consented to host the event, under the condition that the organizers would respect Austria's neutrality and that any sort of political display such as parading in uniforms, or any measures that might strain Austria's relations to other countries would not occur. Chancellor Raab had rebuffed his ministers' doubts by declaring in the cabinet meeting that "we want something from the Russians."[56] While several Western ambassadors filed their protests against the holding of the communist festival with the Austrian government, the Soviet side seemed to use its influence on the organizers to find a compromise and to agree with the Austrian conditions. In any case, the international youth committee organizing the event was no match for the experienced Ballhausplatz diplomats and conceded to their de-

---

[54] Information Russischunterricht, BMAA, Z. 616.265–Kult/58, July 1958, in SBKA, Länderbox UdSSR 1, File Moskau Juli 1958.

[55] Zhiriakov, *SSSR i Avstriia v 1945–1975 gody*, 134–137.

[56] Ministerratsprotokoll 63, 14 January 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP.

mands.[57] When the festival opened with several thousand visitors in Vienna's biggest stadium, Raab had sent a welcome address. But conservative and social democratic Austrian organizations had prepared discussions and leaflets on the crimes of communist regimes and organized excursions from Vienna to the Iron Curtain at the Austrian-Hungarian border.[58]

Although hand fighting between communist and anti-communist youth could not be avoided altogether during the week-long festival, in the end most parties involved seemed content. The organizers were clever enough to pass over all problems in silence and to praise the hospitality of neutral Austria – without forgetting to mention that "some circles" had attempted to wreck the festival. Western observers who had been critical of Vienna hosting the event were increasingly convinced by the Austrian argument that it was better to have the festival organized in a neutral country, thus being able to control it to some extent as well as to confront the participants with Western societies. They furthermore lauded the strategy, promoted by the social democratic *Arbeiter-Zeitung* and followed by all Austrian noncommunist media, to turn a deaf ear on the festival.[59] The Austrian government, last but not least, was also happy for it had avoided getting into trouble with either the East or the West. In the same year, Vienna hosted the fourth World Congress of Women. Although Soviet and Austrian communist propaganda praised the success of the World Youth Festival highly,[60] the Kremlin seems to have assessed the event more critically. After the Moscow gathering of 1957, during which the appearance of young Americans, Europeans, and Africans had involuntarily contributed to undermining the enemy image of the West as seen in Soviet propaganda as well as the state-sponsored xenophobia of the USSR,[61] the Vienna festival was seen as likely to sow doubt among Soviet and East European youth about the superiority of their system. It remained the last such event ever held in a Western country (except Finland) for the rest of the Cold War.

With the exception of this kind of mass events, travel between the USSR and Austria during the 1950s increased only slowly. In 1955 the Austrian Foreign Ministry issued 599 visas to Soviet citizens,[62] two years later it was 718.[63] Of 154 Austrians who were registered in the USSR in 1959, eleven had already died, ten had

---

[57] Protokoll über eine Besprechung mit Vertretern der Ständigen Kommission des Vorbereitungskomitees für die Weltjugendfestspiele, 1 July 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 236.097–pol/59, Z. 244.387–pol/59.

[58] These countermeasures were inspired by a small group of Austrians, including Fritz Molden (a former anti-Nazi resistance member, liberal journalist, and ex-son-in-law of CIA Director Allen Dulles) and Bruno Kreisky. Molden, *Besetzer*, 275–303.

[59] Runderlass, 6 August 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 245.731–pol/59.

[60] See, e.g. Bruno Frei, "Die Bilanz von Wien," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 32 (1959), 6–7.

[61] Zubok, *A Failed Empire*, 175.

[62] ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 322.691–pol/55, Z. 325.503–pol/55.

[63] Reiseverkehr, 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Sektion II-Pol, Liasse USSR-2, ad. Z. 574.091–GS/58.

returned to their homeland, and eighty-seven were unaccounted for.[64] Some of these had come to Soviet Russia in the interwar period and had fallen victim to Stalin's terror; others had been kidnapped from Austria by the Soviet secret police in the postwar years and deported to slave labor camps; one was even a prisoner-of-war who had been captured in World War I and sent to Central Asia.[65] In February 1959, a consular agreement was signed.[66] A month earlier, state-owned Austrian Airlines (AUA) had, as the first Western company after Finair, inaugurated a regular direct connection to Moscow. In the first year, this flight was hit by a terrible disaster, when an AUA plane crashed a few kilometers from Sheremetevo airport with many passengers and crew members dying.[67]

The Khrushchev visit

While it had been possible at the World Youth Festival in 1959 to prevent the communist guests in Vienna from straining the host country's relations with the West, not the same could be said with regard to Khrushchev's trip to Austria from 30 June to 8 July 1960. It was his second visit to Austria, the first having been some fourteen years earlier. Once again, the international atmosphere with respect to the Soviet visit was not unproblematic, since the general secretary's journey was his first visit to the West after the failure of the Paris summit and it was undertaken in the middle of the Berlin crisis. When Khrushchev arrived in Vienna, he was accompanied by a grand entourage including his wife Nina and family, the dry Gromyko, Aleksei Kosygin, and Ekaterina Furtseva, the attractive minister of culture ("the Austrian" Mikoian was in Norway at the time, where he praised Austria as a "model for healthy coexistence"[68] and recommended that Norway choose neutrality instead of its traditional NATO membership). On his way from the airport, Khrushchev was confronted, as Western media reported, by a "frigid" or even "the coolest" public reception he had experienced in the West to date. Only a few communists and bystanders, far fewer than the numbers of policemen, stood on the streets to greet him, forming a ridiculously meager line. Catholic bishops had called on their flock not to express any empathy for the chieftain of the dark,[69] the papal nuncio had left the city in haste, priests had reminded Austrians of the suppression of the Church in communist countries, and Catholic youth organizations had distributed anti-Soviet

---

[64] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 4 February 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 237.049–pol/59, Z. 238.925–pol/59.

[65] Hinteregger, *Im Auftrag Österreichs*, 32–35.

[66] Zhiriakov, *SSSR i Avstriia v 1945–1975 gody*, 40.

[67] Hinteregger, *Im Auftrag Österreichs*, 44–47.

[68] Quoted in Kofler, "Eine Art „Nabel der Welt"," 400. Cf. Bonwetsch, "Sowjetische Westeuropapo-litik II," 219.

[69] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 130.

leaflets.[70] The delegation could also not expect any mercy from Austria's social democrats, whose leaders had for decades been defamed by Soviet propaganda as the "revisionist lackeys of imperialism." The presence of Khrushchev's old nemesis, Molotov, in Vienna, where he had been dispatched as the Soviet representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency, also did nothing to contribute to a warm reception. Chancellor Raab tried to better the tone for the visit by calling on his anti-Soviet fellow citizens "not to forget that our guest is the head of a friendly great power."[71] However, he could not prevent the social democratic president of the Trade Unions' Federation Franz Olah from making a truly Freudian slip of the tongue at a reception ceremony, in which he publicly lauded the Soviet "struggle against freedom."[72] Obviously, the 1956 Soviet crackdown on Hungary had left a deep mark in Austrians' minds.

From its first day, Khrushchev's journey by bus across Austria developed a dynamic of its own, the guest's behavior often living up to its usual bizarre and unpredictable manner. The official program included visits to the State Opera as well as to farms, negotiations with politicians, and meetings with factory workers. Many events were used by Khrushchev to stress Soviet economic, social, and technical achievements as proof of communism's superiority and to reiterate his claim that the USSR would soon catch up and surpass the United States economically. An impulsive orator as well as a cordial and down-to-earth guest, Khrushchev was clever and able to impress his audience. A former worker, he was careful to use socialist rhetoric when he addressed his Austrian "comrades," and coxed their national pride with compliments on their cultural heritage, the natural beauty of their country, and their wisdom in choosing neutrality. He also made humorous allusions to his friendship with their leaders, such as the "little capitalist" Raab or the popular socialist minister of the nationalized industries, "Karl Karlovich" Waldbrunner, who had spent the interwar years as an engineer in Soviet Russia.[73]

In his many confused speeches, the Soviet leader, who was trying to convince Austrian politicians to be more active with regard to détente, praised Austrian neutrality and Soviet-Austrian relations as a "convincing example of peaceful coexistence"[74] and sometimes went as far as announcing that the USSR "won't remain inactive, if someone violates Austrian neutrality."[75] This seemed to be some sort of unilateral Soviet guarantee for Austria, something the West had been afraid

---

[70] Kofler, "Eine Art „Nabel der Welt"," 401. Cf. *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 828–830.

[71] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 136.

[72] *Rheinischer Merkur*, 8 July 1960; *Christ und Welt*, 7 July 1960; *Stuttgarter Nachrichten*, 6 July 1960; and other newspaper reports, in SBKA, Länderboxen, UdSSR 1.

[73] *Sowjetunion heute* 6, nos. 28–30 (1960).

[74] *Druzhestvennyi vizit: Prebyvanie Predsedatel'ia Soveta Ministrov SSSR N.S. Khrushchëva v Avstriiskoi Respublike 30 iuniia–6 iiulia 1960g.* (Moscow: Gospolitizdat, 1960), 10.

[75] *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Außenpolitik* 1, no. 1 (1960–61), 75. Cf. Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 111–112.

of since 1955. A similar pledge had been given by Mikoian during his visit in 1957.[76] Khrushchev's oath raised Austrian fears that the Soviet Union would claim the right to decide whether the country's neutrality had been violated and intervene militarily in such a case. Although he frequently stressed that he did not want to influence Austrian-German or Austrian-Italian relations, Khrushchev vigorously attacked NATO, the United States, Italy, and West Germany for their policy of maintaining army bases and deploying missiles around Austria's periphery. This kind of assault was not unusual for the fiery Cold Warrior from the Kremlin; on his famous trip to India in 1955, he had even accused the United States of having started World War II against the USSR.[77] The recent attacks voiced in Austria were part of the Soviet offensive against deployments of nuclear missiles in Western Europe, an offensive that was launched exactly when the Soviet leader started stationing Soviet missiles in East Germany.[78] During visits to the Nordic neutrals in 1958, Soviet guests had aired the thesis that NATO missiles launched from Norway were a violation of the neutrality of Sweden and Finland,[79] in November the Soviet government opined that if a missile were shot from an Italian launching site towards the north-east, this would violate Austria's neutrality,[80] and in April 1959 Soviet notes of protest against Italian launching sites were sent to the Italian and Austrian governments.[81] During his visit to Austria, Khrushchev repeated the allegations against Italian missiles – thus attempting to mobilize Austria against the Italian bases and implicitly threatening to hold Austria responsible for others' actions.[82]

Even in his speech at the Mauthausen Nazi concentration camp memorial, Nikita Sergeevich lashed out against "revanchist circles" among West German politicians, calling Konrad Adenauer a reincarnation of Hitler and warning against West German "militarism" and a new Anschluss.[83] After having received two breeding bulls ("*Komponist*" and "Gustl") as welcoming gifts and talking to farmers in small towns along his route as well as workers at the Linz steel plant, the Soviet leader retabled his proposal for neutralizing the FRG and stripping West Berlin of its Western protectors, combined with threats of signing a separate treaty with the GDR if the Western allies refused to meet his conditions.

While the Austrian authorities became more and more embarrassed by their uncontrollable guest behaving like a loose cannon, something unexpected happened:

---

[76] Rauchensteiner, *Die Zwei*, 357–358.

[77] Dallin, *Soviet Foreign Policy*, 309.

[78] On the anti-NATO missiles offensive, see Bonwetsch, "Sowjetische Westeuropapolitik II," 214–215; on the stationing of Soviet missiles, see Uhl and Ivkin, "Operation Atom," 299–307.

[79] Frei, *Dimensionen neutraler Politik*, 143.

[80] Bischoff to Figl, Z. 71-pol/58, 15 November 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, AVA, NL E/1770: Bischoff, File 126.

[81] Beschlussprotokoll 116, Council of Ministers, 5 May 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP; 3726-PrM/59, ibid.

[82] Kofler, "Eine Art „Nabel der Welt"," 402.

[83] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 205–212.

the "traveling circus Nikita" began increasingly to attract Austrians. The longer his tour lasted, the more people stood along the streets, curious to see the short, rotund grandfather-like man with a bald head, said to be one of the most powerful men in the world, who shook his fists furiously against "the imperialists," sang Russian folksongs, and frequently invoked God while displaying un-statesman-like vulgarity. The charismatic leader's strange attraction and his natural instinct to interact with ordinary people helped him to win over many Austrians. When he was greeted in Salzburg by anti-communist demonstrators who booed and whistled, he confronted the crowd, raised his short arms and roared: "Peace, Friendship!" This was much less aggressive than the energetic leader's reaction to a similar incident at the abortive Paris summit,[84] and it seems to have had the wanted effect. The stunned demonstrators could not but answer, "Peace, Friendship!," and the satisfied Khrushchev veered off and continued his tour towards the Kaprun Alpine power plant, where he declared that before the end of his lifetime, he would see the red flag flying over the entire world (including the Austrian Alps).[85]

In the meantime Raab came increasingly under pressure from the Austrian media, Western diplomats, and even his own foreign Minister, Bruno Kreisky, not to let Khrushchev attack Western countries and leaders while on Austrian soil. Raab, who wanted to repeat his negotiating success of 1955 in order to stabilize his ailing position in Austrian politics, left the impression with his staff that he "could not care less" about the porcelain broken by Khrushchev.[86] During a cabinet meeting, the social democratic foreign minister, who was supported by his conservative colleague Heinrich Drimmel, strongly opposed the Austrian communists' wish to have the Soviet guest's abusive speeches transmitted by loudspeaker on Vienna's Heldenplatz, where Adolf Hitler had been cheered by a crowd in the wake of the Anschluss. While Kreisky's and Drimmel's concerns were brushed off by Raab, who repeated his "we want something from the Russians,"[87] the US and the West German ambassadors filed their protests with the Austrian government and gave Raab a curtain lecture.[88] In a late-night private meeting which casts a bit of light on Khrushchev's personal relationship to Raab, the Soviet leader agreed to cut his adventurous *tour d'Autriche* short and also to reduce Austria's oil debts by one million tons.[89]

The bilateral communiqué was shorter than usual. Austrian-Soviet relations were described as "based on the principles of peaceful coexistence" (for the first time with-

[84] Wolkogonow, *Die sieben Führer*, 225.

[85] Newspaper reports, in SBKA, Länderbox UdSSR 1.

[86] Kofler, *Kennedy und Österreich*, 22.

[87] Verhandlungsschrift 42, Council of Ministers, 28 June 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP.

[88] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 213–214. However, it seems unjustified to characterize the US ambassador's behavior as "*erpresserische Großmachtallüre*" as in Kofler, "Eine Art „Nabel der Welt"," 411.

[89] Grubmayr, "In zwei Wochen gehst Du nach Moskau," 142.

out any qualifying clause) and as having "developed in a mutually satisfactory way." The visit was characterized as "an important contribution to peace" and as having "consolidated the amicable relations between the Austrian people and the peoples of the USSR."[90] However, no agreement was reached on several passages.[91] Austria not only refused Soviet drafts about the Kremlin's right to protect Austrian neutrality, it also wanted to distance itself from certain statements made by Khrushchev. The latter point was declared unacceptable by Gromyko. The main focus of the dispute, however, was a Russian proposal stating the Soviet wish for peace. Austrian diplomats demanded the paragraph to include an acknowledgment that Western countries also wanted peace. Only after Kreisky threatened not to publish a communiqué at all, did the Soviet side accept Raab's proposal to cancel the entire paragraph.[92] After the signing of the communiqué, Khrushchev, who was apparently trying to play Austria's two governing parties off one another, charged the social democrat Kreisky with being an "ally of the West," while he called the "little capitalist" and conservative leader Raab his "friend." The atmosphere in the negotiations had been further impaired by Gromyko's dogged attempts to talk Austria out of signing a trade agreement with the United States, an attempt that was rebuffed by Kreisky with the words: "We won't let anybody deny us this. We can conclude treaties with whom we want."[93]

After a television address to the Austrian people and a last call on the Western powers to accept Soviet proposals, the guest left. During the departure press conference, the quick-witted Khrushchev refused to elaborate on how the USSR would react to a violation of Austria's neutrality, but reiterated his accusations against Adenauer and the United States, his threats against West Berlin, and his claims about the ultimate victory of communism. Boos from the audience were answered in a way that had already become customary: by stating that the booers were apparently Nazis who had escaped their death in Stalingrad.[94] In his last speech during the Khrushchev

---

[90] Gemeinsames Kommuniqué über den offiziellen Besuch des sowjetischen Ministerpräsidenten in Österreich, 8 July 1960, in Mayrzedt and Hummer, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik* 2, 140–142.

[91] Haymerle, "Die Beziehungen zur Großmacht im Osten," 167–169. The Russian draft also stated that Austria was ready to enter into "friendly relations with all states" – a notion that might have obliged Austria to recognize the GDR. Gemeinsames sowjetisch-österreichisches Kommuniqué, Entwurf, Inoffizielle Übersetzung, Russischer Gegenentwurf, überreicht von Gromyko, 7 July 1960, in SBKA, Länderboxen, UdSSR 1.

[92] Kommuniquéverhandlungen, July 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 70033–6/60, Z. 79965–6pol/60. The following quotations are from Gedächtnisaufzeichnung, 14 July 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 79.950–pol/60, Z. 80.202–6pol/60. This unofficial protocol reveals Khrushchev's bickering and the tense atmosphere.

[93] Aufzeichnung über die Unterredung Kreisky – Gromyko, 7 July [1960], in ÖIZG, NL Fuchs, File 22.

[94] *Druzhestvennyi vizit*, 153–164. For a German version of the press conference, 8 July 1960, see *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik IV/5: 1 Jul.–31 Dec. 1960*, bearb. von Gunther Holzweißig (Frankfurt am Main: Metzner, 1973), 28–32; for an English version, see *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* XII, no. 27 (3 August 1960).

visit, given on 8 July at the airport, Raab reserved Austria's right to interpret and to defend its neutrality itself and denied such rights to any foreign power.[95] He also stated that Austria did not share Soviet views with regard to the leaders of Western nations, and that it rejected any kind of dictatorship as well as any restrictions of free speech. However, another speech two days later, in which Raab underlined his friendship with Adenauer and his gratitude towards the United States, was needed to appease the infuriated German chancellor and the disapproving US ambassador.[96] Despite this, however, the affair created the third deep rift in US-Austrian relations in three years, after the Lebanon crisis and Raab's behavior in Moscow, relations that were already strained by bilateral negotiations regarding compensation for US oil rights in Austria.[97] Regarding Khrushchev's pledge to become active if Austria's neutrality were violated, the Austrian government officially stated that this announcement was not in accord with neutrality. The government reserved the right to define whether and when the country was endangered and how to react.[98]

In the face of the trouble Khrushchev's trip created for Austria, the East European press published enthusiastic reports about the neutral in general and the visit in particular – probably the friendliest articles that had been published until that time about a noncommunist country.[99] The Soviet news agencies and media set the tone by repeatedly praising Austria from mid-May until mid-July, lambasting US policy for alleged attempts of torpedoing the visit and bringing Austria off its straight path of neutrality, and by celebrating the event as "proof of a humiliating defeat of the US 'policy of strength.'"[100] During the Soviet visit to Austria, *Pravda* published its reports about Austria on the first page, reports that on 2 July lauded the "good-neighborly relations" and Austria's "good example for peaceful coexistence," and on 11 July stressed the "conformity" between Austria and the Soviet Union with regard to disarmament and the "approval by the Austrian people of the peace-loving Soviet foreign policy." The Soviet Union published a semiofficial account[101] and Khrushchev shared his personal recollections in a speech on 9 July at the all-Union congress of Soviet teachers, in which he stressed his cordial reception, the friendliness of the bilateral talks, and their conduciveness to "peaceful coexistence" and to

---

[95] *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Außenpolitik* 1 (1960–61), 76–77.

[96] *Dokumente zur Deutschlandpolitik IV/5*, 34–39, 44–49.

[97] Oliver Rathkolb, *Washington ruft Wien. US-Großmachtpolitik gegenüber Österreich 1953–1963* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1997), 164–172; Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 212–218.

[98] Report Kreisky, Annex B, 43th Session of the Council of Ministers, 12 July 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP. Cf. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Außenpolitik* 1, 77.

[99] Austrian legation Sofia to Austrian MFA, 15 July 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA GZ. 70033–6/60, Z. 80921–6.

[100] L. Vidyasova, "An Impressive Example of Peaceful Coexistence," in *International Affairs*, no. 8 (August 1960), 11–15, 11. Cf., e.g. "N.S. Chruschtschow in Österreich," in *Neue Zeit* 18, no. 27 (1960), 1–2; L. Bezymenski, "Die Ergebnisse der Österreichreise Chruschtschows," in *Neue Zeit* 18, no. 29 (1960), 4–6.

[101] *Druzhestvennyi vizit*.

an intensification of the bilateral relations. He emphasized that "Austria is a neutral country and its government maintains neutrality that we respect and value," and stated that "There are no unresolved problems between the two nations."[102] This harmony was passed off by the Soviet leader as international recognition and proof of the correctness of the Soviet system and of Soviet foreign policy:

> "What was particularly evident in all these statements and talks, was that the Austrian people, welcoming and supporting, as they do [sic], our policy of peaceful coexistence, do justice to the greatness of our country, to the gains of our revolution and to the historic victories which the peoples of the Soviet Union have scored during the years of Soviet government. This was a recognition and approval of the Soviet foreign policy of peace and, thereby a voluntary or involuntary recognition of the greatness of our revolution, of our Socialist system, and our ideas on the basis of which so great an advance of the economy, culture and the living standards of the Soviet people, and of the might of our country was achieved within so historically short a period of time."[103]

Such claims, politically shrewd albeit fuzzy and tinted with ideology, reflected Khrushchev's quest for the Soviet Union to be recognized as a communist superpower on both the national and international stages. The 1960 visit was therefore celebrated – as had been the state treaty of 1955 – by Soviet propaganda as "another triumph for the Soviet state's Leninist peaceful policy."[104] But in order to keep Austria, as a capitalist country, from appearing too attractive to his Soviet audience, the orator did not refrain from mentioning alleged plotting of certain Western and reactionary Austrian Catholic, or even fascist, circles against the Soviet-Austrian rapprochement. These, however, were doomed to failure in the face of the "peace-loving Soviet policies," their alleged appeal to the broad masses of the Austrian people, and the sincerity of the Soviet leaders.

Economic relations

From an economic viewpoint, Khrushchev's visit, particularly his consent to a reduction in the Austrian oil deliveries to the USSR, was advantageous for Austria. Bilateral economic relations had been induced mainly by the Austrian deliveries of oil and goods to the USSR that were stipulated in the state treaty, and the Soviet sell-off of former German, then Soviet, enterprises and oil fields in eastern Austria. These enterprises had already created an economic link between Austria and the Soviet Union in the years before 1955, when their goods were primarily produced for the Soviet and East European market.[105] The state treaty in 1955 had set de-

---

[102] *Daily Review of the Soviet Press* VI, no. 164 (10 July 1960), 2–13, 2. Cf. *Druzhestvennyi visit*, 178–208.

[103] Ibid., 6.

[104] Vidyasova, "An Impressive Example of Peaceful Coexistence," 13.

[105] On the Soviet enterprises in Austria, see Otto Klambauer, "Die sowjetische Wirtschaftspolitik in Österreich," in Andreas Hilger, Mike Schmeitzner, and Clemens Vollnhals (eds.), *Sowjetisierung oder Neutralität? Optionen sowjetischer Besatzungspolitik in Deutschland und Österreich* (Göt-

liveries to the USSR at a lump sum of 2 million dollars plus 150 million dollars in goods over six years, and ten million tons of crude oil within ten years. In the following bilateral negotiations, which were finalized in Moscow on 11 July 1955, the Austrian government had achieved its goal of reaching consensus that Austria was entitled to export goods of higher-added value instead of oil; furthermore, the Soviet request to control the production process in Austria was rejected.[106] In 1958, Raab gained Soviet approval to cut the remaining seven million tons of oil in half (by Soviet re-deliveries of half a million tons per annum); two years later, Austria's oil debts were reduced a second time, the Soviet re-deliveries were stopped and the end of Austrian deliveries was set for 1964. Altogether Austria delivered six instead of ten million tons of oil.[107]

While the deliveries of goods resulting from the state treaty helped Austria to gain a lead over other Western states in the East European market,[108] other remnants of the past did not have such a positive impact on Austrian-Soviet economic relations. When Austria, on the basis of article 27 of the state treaty, explored its chances of receiving Soviet compensation for the Austrian economic assets in the USSR that had been confiscated by the Soviet government, including real estate, company shares and mining rights, the Kremlin agreed to negotiate but at the same time tabled its own claims for the repatriation costs of Austrian prisoners-of-war.[109] Since the Soviet claims, totaling seventeen million dollars, exceeded the estimated value of Austrian assets, and neither land nor resources could be used as compensation under Soviet law, the Austrian negotiators concluded that the Soviet side would not accept a negative balance and shifted to tactics of protraction.[110]

In the meantime, both sides showed an interest in developing bilateral trade.[111] The Kremlin was interested in purchasing machinery and equipment for its industry, and consumer goods for the Soviet people; Austria needed raw material. The Austrian chancellor Raab took a particular interest in the *Osthandel* and expected the

---

tingen: Vandenhoeck, 2006), 435–450. On the Soviet oil industry in Austria, see Walter Iber, *Die sowjetische Mineralölverwaltung in Österreich (SMV), 1945–1955* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2010).

[106] Andreas Resch, "Der österreichische Osthandel im Spannungsfeld der Blöcke," in Manfried Rauchensteiner (ed.), *Zwischen den Blöcken: NATO, Warschauer Pakt, und Österreich* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010), 497–556, 517–518.

[107] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 148.

[108] Andreas Resch, "Die Außenhandelsbeziehungen zwischen dem RGW-Raum und Österreich in der Nachkriegszeit," in Gertrude Enderle-Burcel, Dieter Stiefel, and Alice Teichova (eds.), *Zarte Bande: Österreich und die europäischen planwirtschaftlichen Länder*, MÖSTA Sonderband 9 (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2006), 39–72, 44.

[109] Vortrag BMAA an Ministerrat, 31 August 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 218.211–pol, Z. 225.062–pol.

[110] Amtsvermerk, 10 July 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 218.211–pol/57, Z. 223.432–pol/57; Information für den Herrn Bundesminister, 26 September 1958, ibid., GZ. 550.045–pol/58, Z. 554.708–pol/58.

[111] Protocol 97, 10 June 1957, in Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS* 1, 258; 1008.

USSR to deal with Western Europe via Austria.[112] On 17 October 1955, one five-year agreement on trade and shipping and another on the exchange of goods and payments were signed by the Soviet and the Austrian ministers of trade. These agreements granted both sides most-favored nation status (as was stipulated by the state treaty) and foresaw deliveries of 650 million Austrian schillings per annum, respectively.[113] The most-favored nation status was soon to create problems on both sides. Nevertheless, in 1959 the limit had been surpassed and in 1960, a new trade agreement for five years was concluded. In this agreement, the Soviet side accepted 60 percent of Austrian deliveries stipulated by the state treaty to be part of the volume as agreed upon in the new contract. In response, Austria agreed to increase the trade volume.[114]

In these five years, Austrian-Soviet trade that had developed within the framework of bilateral clearing had increased almost ten times. Austrian imports from the USSR grew from 4.1 (1955) to 40.3 million dollars and the total share of Soviet goods imported to Austria had risen from 0.5 to 2.8 percent. Austrian exports to the USSR, in the same period, rose from 5.6 to 39.2 million dollars; the Soviet share of Austrian exports had risen from 0.8 to 3.5 percent, figures that do not include Austrian deliveries resulting from the state treaty. If these were included, the Soviet share of Austrian exports in 1960 amounted to 5.5 rather than 3.5 percent. The 1958 "dent" in bilateral trade statistics was due to falling Austrian imports of Soviet grain.[115]

Table 1: Soviet-Austrian trade 1955–1960

	Austrian exports	Change from previous year	Share of Soviet imports	Soviet exports	Change from previous year	Share of Austrian imports
1955	145.6	284.2	1.2	107.8	200.3	0.5
1956	362.6	149.0	1.8	186.4	72.9	0.7
1957	711.9	96.3	1.7	557.1	198.9	1.9
1958	526.3	–26.1	1.4	569.0	2.1	2.0
1959	874.3	66.1	1.6	768.3	35.0	2.6
1960	1,020.6	16.7	1.4	1,049.0	35.5	2.8

Source: Butschek, *Statistische Reihen*;[116] *Vneshniaia togovlia*[117]
Exports in millions of Austrian schillings; changes and shares in percent.

[112] Gehler, *Österreichs Außenpolitik*, 180.
[113] **Abkommen über den Warenaustausch; Abkommen über den Zahlungsverkehr zwischen Österreich und der UdSSR; Vertrag über Handel und Schifffahrt zwischen Österreich und der UdSSR,** all 15 October 1955, in Mayrzedt and Hummer, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralitäts- und Europapolitik* 2, 130–138.
[114] Glasneck, "Die Sowjetunion und Österreich," 158. Cf. J. M. Bartsch, "Der sowjetische und der österreichische Außenhandel und ihre beiderseitigen Beziehungen" (PhD Thesis, Graz, 1958).
[115] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 17 March 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 236.711–pol/59, Z. 239.920–pol/59.
[116] Felix Butschek, *Statistische Reihen zur österreichischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Vienna: WIFO, 1999).
[117] *Vneshniaia togovlia SSSR za 1959–1963 gody* (Moscow: Vneshtorgizdat, 1965), 12.

Given this positive development in absolute numbers and from the perspective of Austrian trade statistics, it may seem surprising that from the Soviet perspective, the importance of Austria as an import source fell. Due to the sale of the Soviet enterprises in Austria and an increase in Soviet imports in general, the Austrian share dropped from 2 percent in 1950 to 1.4 in 1960, while the Western share of Soviet imports rose from 16 to 20 percent, and the West German share from 0 to 4 percent.[118]

Nevertheless, in Austrian eyes, the USSR was a huge market waiting for Austrian goods. At the Austrian industrial exhibition in Moscow in May 1959 (the first industrial exhibition by a Western democracy in the postwar USSR[119]), 240 Austrian companies presented some 4,000 products, which were seen by 300,000 visitors including Anastas Mikoian and even Nikita Khrushchev.[120] The Soviet government had embarked on an initiative to boost trade with Western countries; among the European states that were approached next was Italy, which was invited for a similar exhibit in 1962.[121] In the second half of the 1950s, Austrian deliveries to the Soviet market included above all finished and semi-finished investment goods, such as machinery, turbines, electric generators and electrical equipment, furthermore iron and steel, locomotives, excavators, barges, ships, cable, as well as consumer goods, such as shoes and textiles. The first list of products to be offered by Austria for export to the USSR in 1955 contained, among other things, two tugboats, twelve hydraulic turbines, some generators, forty-five diesel locomotives, and industrial machinery.[122] Within a few years, the Soviet Union became Austria's most important customer for equipment, machinery, and cable. In some sectors, trade with the USSR was extremely important for the Austrian economy, as, for instance, in the shipbuilding industry, in particular the Korneuburg dockyards. However, Austrian attempts to export high-tech machinery and even entire steel plants to Eastern Europe, were frustrated by the United States and CO-COM.[123] When Anastas Mikoian visited Vienna, the Ballhausplatz was prepared to explain that Austria had to respect the Western embargo as otherwise Austria itself would fall under the restrictions.[124] Similarly, the provincial government of Lower Austria chose to withdraw an application to the Soviet government for a twenty-year loan of 500 million schillings, after US diplomats had expressed their

---

[118] Harald Hauke, "Handelspolitik und Außenwirtschaftsbeziehungen der Sowjetunion von 1945 bis 1991" (PhD Thesis, Vienna, 1994), 76, 81. According to other statistics, the FRG's share was 3.6 percent. Cf. below, page 243.

[119] Hinteregger, *Im Auftrag Österreichs*, 51.

[120] Zhiriakov, *SSSR – Avstriia*, 50–51.

[121] Bonwetsch, "Sowjetische Westeuropapolitik II," 182.

[122] Resch, "Der österreichische Osthandel," 520.

[123] Oliver Rathkolb, "Austria's Ostpolitik in the 1950s and 1960s: Honest Broker or Double Agent?" in *Austrian History Yearbook* XXVI (1995), 129–146, 138–139.

[124] Aktenvermerk, 24 April 1957, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 215.864–pol/57, Z. 219.394–pol/57.

concern and made it clear that this deal would make receiving US loans difficult in the future.[125]

In the 1950s, 80 percent of Soviet exports to Austria consisted of agricultural products (grain, corn and cotton), raw materials (such as coal, asbestos, manganese and iron ore), and steel. Although the Soviet deliveries of coal grew tenfold, from 60,000 tons in 1956 to 897,000 tons in 1964, they still could not fully satisfy Austrian demands.[126] However, when in 1958 the USSR offered to export more wheat, Austrian traders reacted reluctantly and complained about its allegedly poor quality. In 1960, bilateral trade exceeded two billion schillings.

---

[125] Lower Austria had applied for 350 million schillings for railroad reconstruction and 150 million for investment into the tourism infrastructure. Kargl to Il'ichev, 25 October 1955, in Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS, 1954–1964,* 2 (Moscow: Rosspen, 2006), 111–112. The Soviet government decided to react positively. Protocol 169, 16 November 1955, in Fursenko, *Prezidium TsK KPSS* 1, 63; 903. On the US reaction, see Oliver Rathkolb, "'Austria – Sieve to the East:' Austria's Neutrality during the East-West Economic War 1945/1948/1989" (Paper presented at the IEHC, Helsinki, 2006), 4.

[126] Austrian embassy Moscow to Austrian MFA, 11 February 1959, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, GZ. 236.711–pol/59, Z. 237.679–pol/59.

5. Summary: Soviet "Thaw" and the Making of a Neutral

The second half of the 1950s was the heyday of the Soviet campaign to undermine NATO and other pro-Western blocs by promoting neutrality among its members or aspirants. The neutralization of Austria was one of the most prominent results of this policy, and the Kremlin was determined to present Austria as an "example" for the benefits a Western state might reap from becoming neutral and experiencing "peaceful coexistence" with the Kremlin. That the Austrian model of 1955 was not repeated in Western Europe was at least in part due to the Soviet actions after the Hungarian declaration of neutrality: Only "few in the West would doubt after November 1956 that peaceful coexistence was a strategy not a goal; that for Khrushchev and others neutrality was merely a vehicle for undermining the unity of the free world."[1] While Khrushchev, in his struggle against UN secretary general Dag Hammarskjöld, maintained that there were neutral nations but no neutral men,[2] the 1958 Soviet "night frost crisis" against Finland revealed the dark side of being neutral and exposed to Soviet pressure and interference in internal affairs.

During the first half decade after the signing of the state treaty and the declaration of Austrian neutrality, the communist superpower and the small neutral managed to lay the groundwork for a special relationship. This relationship, based on Austria's need to normalize its relations with the most difficult signatory of the state treaty, and on the Soviet determination to make Austria a showcase of neutrality and "peaceful coexistence," weathered the Hungarian hurricane of 1956. After a number of months of fierce propaganda, the relations were re-established, as cordial as they had ever been. Despite the setback that political relations received in connection with the Soviet intervention in Hungary, Austrian-Soviet relations, for the most part, developed on a friendly basis and quite intensively in the first five years after the signing of the state treaty. Each country was host to visits from the other, the guests including members of the Soviet leadership, the Austrian chancellor and president, as well as countless ministers and delegations, and these visits led even to the establishment of personal relationships.

Neutrality provided the Soviet Union a lever and the Kremlin was determined to use it, despite its limitations, to shape Austria's foreign policy and assign the neutral country a special role. When Austrian leaders did not behave as desired by the

---

[1] Hanhimäki, "The Lure of Neutrality," 268.
[2] Michael R. Beschloss, *Kennedy v. Khrushchev: The Crisis Years, 1960–63* (London: Faber, 1991), 213.

Kremlin, such as during the Hungarian crisis, they were fiercely attacked by the Soviet media for allegedly violating neutrality; otherwise they were highly praised for having chosen this status. They were welcomed in Moscow and were fine hosts to visit. They were treated with friendliness, given economic discounts, and invited to support Soviet initiatives in order to make them more acceptable to the West. They were reminded of what a neutral country, according to the communist doctrine, should do and what not, and exposed to repeated Soviet calls for an intensification of Soviet-Austrian and Austrian-East European relations. Soviet armed forces were offered to defend Austria's neutrality, as was put forward after the Lebanon crisis and during Khrushchev's *tour d'Autriche*. If things went as planned by the Soviets, the neutral state would not only help the Kremlin to attain a friendlier image and move out of its post-1956 isolation, but would also promote the transition of other Western states to neutrality. If they did not and the Soviet-Austrian relationship was tainted by international or bilateral crises, the Kremlin was prepared to pressure Austrian politicians and to restrain the neutral's attractiveness by turning on the anti-Western propaganda machinery. In this relationship, the Soviet side had nothing to lose.

For Austria, the relationship was riskier. A balancing act had to be carried out between irritating the East and annoying the West. Overwhelmed by a rain of Soviet advances, the Austrian Foreign Ministry began to fear a Soviet tendency "to detach countries like Austria and Finland from the Western world and to lead them into neutralistic fairways à la India and Egypt."[3] Although nothing like this even nearly occurred during the 1950s and although the Austrian government seemed to be on guard when Khrushchev attempted to make Austria "some sort of protectorate,"[4] the intense Soviet advances left their mark. Austria's neutrality was young and, therefore, moldable, and Austria's understanding of neutral policy was shaped by the steady stream of Soviet propaganda, criticism and encouragement. Events such as the brutal display of Soviet military might in Austria's neighborhood also had a serious impact. Indeed, the Soviet crackdown on the Hungarian revolution made a quantum leap in molding Austria's neutrality; it was an event that reminded the neutral's leaders that the post-state treaty harmony did not rule out armed violence forever. It is clear that within only four years after the Soviet intervention in Hungary, the Austrian interpretation of neutral policy had shifted significantly in the direction of that of the Soviets.[5] While in 1955 neutrality had been conceived by the Austrian side primarily as a means for getting "the Russians out" of the country and as a purely military and formal matter of staying out of NATO while being part of

---

[3] Betrachtungen zum Besuch der öst. Regierungsdelegation in Moskau im Lichte der derzeitigen internationalen Lage, 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BMAA, Sektion II-Pol 1958, Liasse USSR-2.

[4] Chancellor Raab in the 43th Session of the Council of Ministers, 12 July 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP. Cf. Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit*, 603.

[5] Michael Gehler, "From Non-Alignment to Neutrality: Austria's Transformation during the First East-West Détente, 1953–1958," in *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7, no. 4 (2005), 104–136.

the West, this attitude gave way to a more comprehensive understanding of neutrality and the growing feeling that the country should maintain equidistance between the two blocs and superpowers.

As a consequence of the Soviet's close watch on its foreign policy conduct, Austria rescinded its liberal policy with regard to military transports through Tyrol, protested the US overflights, and praised the Soviet contribution to the state treaty as having been the most vital. Chancellor Raab's "Soviet-friendly" course found its expression in his readiness to fulfill Russian wishes (e.g. by supporting Moscow's candidature for the World Exposition 1961) while trying to disregard Western ones (e.g. compensation for Jewish claims). When Austria, following Soviet encouragement, announced its intention to join the Belgrade Convention, the decision had not been sanctioned by the Western powers, but concerns that joining the Convention might contradict neutrality were readily ignored by Raab. Loudly praising the reduction of the Austrian "reparations" to the USSR, Khrushchev's "little capitalist" brushed aside the fact that the United States had not only abstained from claiming any reparations at all, but also handed over former German property rights in Austria to the Vienna government without compensation and even sponsored the country's reconstruction with the Marshall Plan. In fact, in the postwar decade the US had poured roughly as much money into Austria as the USSR had taken out. When Kreisky reminded the chancellor that "the littlest we receive from the West is more than [the USSR] can give us," Raab rebuffed him by claiming that "the Western powers haven't made gifts for us either."[6] As a result of these convictions and his well-known "antipathy towards the Americans,"[7] the chancellor was instrumental in putting the decisions through to host the communist World Youth Festival in Vienna and to allow Khrushchev to address an audience on the city's Heldenplatz. His party colleague Secretary Grubhofer, in 1960, asserted that Austria had not protested US overflights clearly enough, and the social democratic state secretary for defense, Otto Rösch, caused an uproar among Western diplomats by declaring that Austria's neutrality was endangered more by NATO than by the East.[8] While Kreisky disagreed with these opinions, the social democratic party leader, Vice-Chancellor Pittermann, claimed that "the Austrian people are beginning to say [...] that the Soviet [Union] has given Austria ten million dollars (through the recent, dubious oil deal), whereas the United States is taking away five million dollars for the persecutee Jewish claimants [i.e. victims of the Nazi regime]."[9]

---

[6] Verhandlungsniederschrift 42, Council of Ministers, 28 June 1960, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP.

[7] Report by the West German ambassador to Vienna, Carl Hermann Mueller-Graaf, to the West German MFA, 4 August 1958, quoted in Kofler, *Kennedy und Österreich*, 15.

[8] Kofler, *Kennedy und Österreich*, 37–38; Röhrlich, *Kreiskys Außenpolitik*, 125.

[9] *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 783. An internal fact sheet stated that the US gave Austria at least 1.4 billion dollars in aid since 1945. Ibid., 786.

Despite such disagreements, Kreisky, too, declared that he considered Khrushchev's "peace initiative" genuine[10] and later went as far as adopting the Soviet expression for Austria, a good "example for coexistence." It is not yet clear to what extent this was an intentional strategy or the result of simply adopting Soviet propaganda vocabulary, as seems to have been the case in the negotiations for the bilateral communiqué of 1960. In addition, Raab and Kreisky began to grasp that neutrality and "coexistence" opened several opportunities to break the diplomatic isolation Austria had suffered before 1955, to create a new identity for their country, as well as raise its prestige, wealth, international profile and, thus, security.[11] In just these years Raab and Kreisky conceived their own *Ostpolitik* with the intention of establishing, by means of travel diplomacy, ties to the USSR and later to the "people's democracies." This also dovetailed with Soviet claims that Austria, as a neutral, was obliged to develop friendly relations with all states, including the socialist camp.

In contrast to earlier Austrian declarations that neutrality would be limited to the military sphere and affect neither freedom of speech nor the individual citizen, the Soviet calls for a wide-ranging interpretation of neutrality seem to have been not fully in vain: State Secretary Grubhofer's abortive proposal, made as a result of Soviet propaganda, to require the individual citizen to abide by neutrality reflected this development, as did Chancellor Raab's call on Austrian citizens during Khrushchev's visit not to forget that the USSR was a "friendly power." While it had been claimed in 1955 that neutrality would not affect Austria's external economic relations, a similar "broadening" of the Austrian understanding of neutrality was reflected by the thesis, launched by SPÖ representatives such as Kreisky and Pittermann[12] and then formulated in 1959 by the expert in international law Karl Zemanek, that Austria was not entitled to commit itself to any economic obligations in peacetime that might make neutrality in wartime difficult.[13] This was relevant particularly with regard to Austria's intentions to join the European Coal and Steel Community. In view of the negative reaction of the Soviets, such plans were increasingly considered by Austrian officials as unwise and contradictory to neutrality, and they were finally modified.

These developments in Austria's official understanding of neutral policy and Raab's and Pittermann's lopsidedness did not pass unnoticed by a growing number of people. Within Austria, Günter Nenning broke a taboo by publicly stating in 1959 that Austria's neutrality had not been voluntarily declared but rather forced

---

[10] Bruno Kreisky, *Neutralität und Koexistenz: Aufsätze und Reden* (Munich: List, 1975), 122.

[11] Schlesinger, *Austrian Neutrality in Postwar Europe*, 87; Paul Luif, "Austria's Permanent Neutrality – Its Origins, Development, and Demise," in Günter Bischof, Anton Pelinka, and Ruth Wodak (eds.), *Neutrality in Austria*, Contemporary Austrian Studies 9 (New Brunswick: Transaction, 2001), 129–159, esp. 139.

[12] Ermacora, *20 Jahre österreichische Neutralität*, 123.

[13] See below, pages 140–141.

upon the country by Soviet insistence. The journalist also claimed that Austria was entitled to abandon its Neutrality Law or to join the EEC.[14] Such claims were fiercely attacked by Soviet media[15] and rejected by Austrian officials and experts as legally and historically incorrect. According to them, neutrality was not "a rabbit, produced by a Soviet magician out of his top hat,"[16] but had actually been part of the Austrian government's deliberations for a long time. Even earlier, in a press conference after his return from Moscow in 1958, Raab had felt the need to deny "rumors" about the shifting Austrian understanding of neutral policy. In this conference the chancellor underlined that such reports were incorrect, and that "the character and content of our neutrality, as adopted by parliament in 1955 in a clear and unambiguous manner, did not change in any way, nor did the Soviet Union demand such a change."[17] As is often the case, however, denying the correctness of the allegation made it appear even more likely.

A shift regarding Austria's relationship to the superpowers was noticeable as well. Social democratic publicists claimed that the neutral did not take its financial obligations to the West seriously; it was criticized that "since the Russian was dangerous and threatening, he got his unjustified share of our oil and products; since the West was correct and friendly, it still has to wait."[18] US diplomats deplored Austria's "increasing tendency to try to avoid taking definitive stands on certain East-West issues and, in some cases, to adopt an attitude which, in effect, would put the US and the USSR on the same moral plane."[19] And the British ambassador remarked critically that "Austria is often prepared to avoid angering the Russians at the expense of irritating her Western friends."[20] Such developments, together with Raab's excessive praise for the Soviet contributions to the state treaty, Austria's *Alleingang* to the Belgrade Commission, the government's foot-dragging regarding the compensation for Jewish victims of the Nazi regime, and last but not least Khrushchev's attacks against the West during his visit to Austria, led to a growing distance between Austria and its traditional patron, the United States.[21] As a con-

---

[14] Günther Nenning, "Die Neutralitätslegende," in *Heute*, 31 October 1959, 1; "Das 'Freiwillige' unserer Neutralität," ibid., 7 November 1959, 4; "Österreich will, was es muss," ibid., 14 November 1959, 4; "Neutralität auf Widerruf," ibid., 21 November 1959, 4; "UNO-Beitritt verletzte die Neutralität," ibid., 28 November 1959, 4; "Neutralität und EWG-Beitritt," ibid., 5 December 1959, 5.

[15] M. Frolow, "Neutralität auf Widerruf?," in *Neue Zeit*, no. 51 (1959), 12–14.

[16] Gerald Stourzh, "Zur Geschichte der österreichischen Neutralität," in *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur* 5, no. 6 (1961), 273–288, 275. See also Gerald Stourzh and Peter Jankowitsch, "Wie steht es mit unserer Neutralität?," in *Heute*, 12 December 1959, 6.

[17] **Ausführungen des Herrn Bundeskanzlers in der Pressekonferenz, Beilage 1 zu Ministerratsprotokoll 88, Council of Ministers, 29 June 1958, in ÖStA, AdR, BKA, MRP**

[18] *Heute*, 14 February 1959, 1

[19] *FRUS, 1958–1960,* IX, 775.

[20] Quoted in Kofler, *Kennedy und Österreich*, 38.

[21] Rathkolb, *Washington ruft Wien*, 132.

sequence, the US froze payments from the ERP counterpart funds for two years. Distancing Austria from the US was not among the least of the Soviet objectives. In the 1960s, this trend, as well as the amicable Soviet-Austrian atmosphere, continued. However, new burdens were put on the bilateral relationship.