Searching for an Alternative Austrian Cultural Diplomacy: Wolfgang Kraus with Heinrich Drimmel

Michael Burri

German Studies Review, Volume 44, Number 1, February 2021, pp. 67-86 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1353/gsr.2021.0003

Searching for an Alternative Austrian Cultural Diplomacy: Wolfgang Kraus with Heinrich Drimmel

Michael Burri

ABSTRACT

The Cold War is marked by a growing convergence of state and culture, a convergence recalled by Willy Brandt's 1970 declaration of culture as a "third column" of foreign policy. This essay explores the resistance among Austrian elites to such a convergence, as manifested by the Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur—in particular, the three literature congresses organized by its director, Wolfgang Kraus, in Vienna from 1965 to 1967. A project of Heinrich Drimmel, the conservative Minister of Education and himself an influential voice against the expanding jurisdiction of the state, the Gesellschaft and Kraus envisioned these literature congresses as a nonstate response to the modern discord of East versus West, and they presented literary intellectuals as the new emissaries of a foreign cultural diplomacy unencumbered by state reason.

Seeing It Like a State

In his annual presentation of the Foreign Office Activity Report to the press in June 1967, German Foreign Minister Willy Brandt famously declared that, together with diplomacy in the narrow sense and foreign trade, "foreign cultural diplomacy has become the third pillar of modern foreign policy."[1] Today, Brandt's declaration recalls the ambitious rethinking of "culture" in the context of foreign policy that took place during the 1960s.[2] For German foreign policy, this rethinking demonstrated an elevated attention to public awareness and accountability. The "Guiding Principles for Foreign Cultural Diplomacy," the first such public articulation of principles, issued by the German Foreign Office in 1970, is an expression of this new attitude of awareness and accountability.[3] But such rethinking and new attitudes had also begun

German Studies Review 44.1 (2021): 67–86

to take hold elsewhere. In March 1967, for example, Austrian Minister of Education Theodor Pfiffl-Perčević called upon a broad cross-section of Austrian media, cultural, parliamentary, and other government elites "to help redefine Austrian foreign diplomacy."[4] During a live two-day event, his Ministry of Education formally recorded and responded to the advice of thirty speakers and registered the written contributions of twelve others. With his striking metaphor of culture as a "third column," Brandt made officially visible a trend that had already begun to shape policy discussions, one whose influence continues to the present.[5]

But the suggestion that culture constitutes a "third column" of foreign policy also underscores a more banal reality, namely, the growing convergence of the state and culture during the Cold War. Indeed, Brandt's own *Ostpolitik*, including the escalation of his cultural diplomatic efforts toward the DDR, is a product of this convergence.[6] State political elites increasingly treated culture as a potential form of intervention in foreign relations. With respect to the Cold War, this cultural intervention found a riveting case study in the activities of the American Central Intelligence Agency. Through its centerpiece, the Congress for Cultural Freedom (CCF), as Frances Stonor Saunders first documented in detail, the CIA covertly funded cultural front organizations across Western Europe, aiming to diminish the influence of Marxism and Communism while casting the "American way" in the best possible light.[7] Few in this vast CCF network of cultural "pipers," which operated between 1950 and 1967, knew who paid for their song.

Expanding upon and occasionally revising the work of Saunders, subsequent research on individual organizations and initiatives within this network has helped to clarify the role of culture during the Cold War. Here, issues of the purpose and effectiveness of the operation have taken center stage.[8] Thus, Giles Scott-Smith has underscored the close coordination between American foreign policy objectives and cultural interventions, while Hugh Wilford has emphasized that "the CIA might have tried to call a particular tune . . . but the piper did not always play it, nor the audience dance to it."[9] Of less concern to this research has been the consequences brought about by the broader convergence of state and culture via, for example, the direct intervention in culture taken by government ministers, such as Brandt and Pfiffl-Perčević and their ministries. But this convergence did have impacts. At the political level, it blurred the traditional distinction between state and nonstate workers. At the personal level, it compelled those individuals who worked for state-sponsored, but nominally independent, private organizations—what Hans Magnus Enzensberger called the "consciousness industry"—to act as cooperative agents of the state.[10] In the 1960s, political leaders were increasingly learning to see culture like a state. But were those who worked in the promotion of culture, allied with the state by subvention, prepared to learn to see like a state?

In this essay, I argue that in the newly independent Austria that followed the

1955 State Treaty, they were not. The primary focus of my attention is Wolfgang Kraus (1924–1998), a figure who, until his death in 1998, occupied an authoritative position in Austrian cultural politics for over three decades.[11] During these decades, Kraus often seemed to have a large hand in everything, a fact that did not pass unnoticed. Writing in the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* in 1992, for example, the literary scholar and author Thomas Rothschild remarked that "the concentration of power and its misuse in the Austrian literary scene was personified in Wolfgang Kraus."[12] But it is neither the scope of Kraus's engagements, nor the evolution of his power that is of primary interest here. The focus of the present essay is, rather, the early and transformational years of his career during which Kraus played a notable role in what W. Scott Lucas has called the state-private network of the Cold War.[13] These years mark the first phase of Kraus's leadership of the Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur (hereafter Gesellschaft), an organization that he founded in 1960 with the backing of the Ministry of Education. Though Kraus remained its director until 1994, the Gesellschaft exercised its greatest influence in the 1960s, and its activities during that period have acquired the status of legend.

Among these activities was the presentation of a younger generation of Austrian writers, such as Herbert Eisenreich, Jeannie Ebner, and Gerhard Fritsch, together with the re-presentation of Austrian exile writers, such as Max Brod, Elias Canetti, and Erich Fried, who had been shunned by Austrian officials and the government since 1945. The Gesellschaft also contributed to new forms of institutional recognition, including what is known today as the Austrian State Prize for European Literature, first awarded in 1965 to the Polish poet Zbigniew Herbert. But perhaps its most enduring claim to international renown is its organization of three literature congresses, held in Vienna from 1965–1967. Intended as a kind of cultural summit, where writers from the West and the East bloc would meet to exchange ideas, these congresses were widely covered by media abroad.[14] In 1966, Kraus also published *Der fünfte Stand*, a treatise on intellectuals in the East and the West, and his most acclaimed book.[15]

A revealing detail concerning the efforts of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in the 1950s and 60s is that CIA funding enabled its recipients to present a convincing rejection of the CIA. Thus, among CCF front organizations, as Hugh Wilford has shown, a pro-American stance was mildly discouraged, while the use of anti-American sentiments was understood to be wise politics.[16] The second focus of my attention is Heinrich Drimmel (1912–1991) who, from 1954 to 1964, was the Austrian Minister of Education. A conservative intellectual who held a vast ministerial portfolio, Drimmel delivered the authoritative backing and the subsidies that Kraus required to lead the Gesellschaft. And though a state minister, the committed Catholic Drimmel openly questioned the growing power of the state in Second Republic Austria, especially its expanding monopoly over leadership in culture and education.[17] While he plays a lesser role here, Drimmel was an indispensable figure for Kraus, both institutionally

and intellectually. In looking at Wolfgang Kraus, the figure of Drimmel both explains and relativizes Kraus's own strategies for disavowing the role of the state.

Emil Brix has argued that foreign cultural diplomacy played a "disproportionately larger role [for Austria] than other European countries," because the domestic and international diplomacy had been compromised by WWII and by the occupation.[18] That experience of a discredited state, no doubt, influenced the passion of Wolfgang Kraus for the purpose of foreign cultural diplomacy. But it is also true that although the state's successful management of the growing economy in early Second Republic Austria, provided a compelling legitimation for an ongoing expansion of its services, many individuals questioned this expansion and these services. Writing of Kraus and his relationship with the state, Michael Hansel and Stefan Maurer have argued that in his activities on behalf of the Gesellschaft, Kraus largely reenacted the officially neutral position of Austria in the Cold War. With the Gesellschaft, Kraus created a third way between the two superpowers, and thus challenged the binary structure of Cold War discourse.[19] But I believe that during these early years Kraus functioned in a condition of conflict with the state itself and that this condition explains much about his self-presentation, his writings, and the foreign cultural diplomacy of the Gesellschaft. Kraus operated in a field of tension, fixed at one end by his de facto employment by the state, and fixed at the other by his deep aversion for that state. Exploring this field of tension suggests both the extent to which the postwar state continued to establish new state-private networks for itself, but also how state actors could mobilize personal, intellectual, and institutional strategies to challenge their own role in those networks.

The Hour of the Amateur

Tony Judt once described the period of the Cold War between 1956 in Budapest and Prague in 1968, as the "great era of revisionism in both Eastern and Western Europe." Revisionism, according to Judt, brought new perspectives on both sides. It "gave rise to the illusion in the East that a certain amount of carefully negotiated space for dissent was possible and worth achieving," while in the West, it suggested that one could be a dissenting communist.[20] And yet, with respect to the subsidized cultural organization, it might also be said that in the era of revisionism the great hour of the amateur had arrived. After all, the characteristic profile of the Cold War intellectual does not include experience in government. Like Raymond Aron in France, Arthur Koestler, or the American philosophy professor Sidney Hook, Wolfgang Kraus hardly had a background running anything. In Kraus, the detachment of the nonprofessional merged with an earnest commitment to the task at hand. Endre Kiss, the Hungarian scholar, once said that the behavior of Kraus recalled the cinematic portrayal of Pimpernel Smith by Leslie Howard, the *faux naïf* who uses this cover to trick the Nazis.[21] But this self-presentation mattered, because if Kraus's years of greatest influence on

the East-West dialogue coincided with the period when the Austrian state brought foreign cultural diplomacy into alignment with its own aims, Kraus himself always seemed not to be part of that alignment. Franz Schuh, an early and perceptive critic, once suggested that the power broker Kraus largely understood himself as someone who wrote books and articles, and just happened to have a few day jobs.[22] Indeed, Kraus discouraged the idea that he worked for anyone.

This air of detachment around Kraus and his activities with the Gesellschaft always conveyed a claim to sovereign action. That claim was echoed in the preamble of the founding speech delivered on December 18, 1961, in which Kraus presented a ten-point program that would guide the organization's work. The Gesellschaft, Kraus emphasized, is not a "new association of authors but rather a society *for* literature" (emphasis in original). Further, as point eight informed the audience, a task of the Gesellschaft would be to "enter into contact with open-minded authors from the wider region of the former Danube monarchy."[23] For Kraus, in other words, the Gesellschaft stood as a nonprofessional advocate for literature, independent by design, and part of its work would involve engaging writers from the Eastern bloc.[24] Yet from its founding, the Gesellschaft was fashioned in connection with a broader effort by the Austrian state and Heinrich Drimmel, its Minister of Education, to mobilize new networks in foreign cultural diplomacy. In 1955, for example, Drimmel initiated the creation of the Austrian Cultural Institute in New York, which opened in 1963.[25] Together with similar cultural institutes in Paris (1954) and London (1956), this meant Austria had established cultural representation in the centers of the three Western powers that occupied it until 1955.[26] But a role was also envisioned for literary activities and literature. In 1955, Drimmel provided financial and organizational support for the early postwar literary journal *Wort in der Zeit*.[27] In 1957, Drimmel backed the launch of the quarterly *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur*. His essay on "Austria's Historical Mission in the Danube Region," which opened the second issue, may be seen as setting the agenda for that journal.[28]

It was also the Drimmel ministry that first recruited the Grillparzer Society to promote Austrian literature at home and "especially abroad" in 1956.[29] Activities for this promotion were contracted through the creation of an administratively distinct Grillparzer Institute whose work would be, as the official letter of agreement put it, "conducted in constant agreement with the Section 8 of the Federal Ministry of Education."[30] The institute would, for example, help strengthen the periodical *Wort in der Zeit*, while also distributing Austrian literary works to German departments in foreign countries, and work to intensify the professional study of Austrian literature by Germanists outside Austria. Located in Vienna but with a target audience abroad, the Ministry of Education envisioned the Grillparzer Institute "becoming a kind of central Austrian institute."[31] Coordination between the ministry and the Grillparzer Institute proved difficult to achieve, however, and had ceased by 1959. This was unfortunate,

as the ministry's Alfred Weikert wrote to Rudolf Henz, the editor of *Wort in der Zeit*, because the Grillparzer Institute would have been the "much-desired, long arm of the Ministry of Education."[32]

In 1963, the "charismatic," communist ex-city counselor for culture in Vienna Viktor Matejka described the Gesellschaft as "the long arm of the Ministry of Education."[33] With the Grillparzer Institute, the ministry had recruited an existing state-private organization to promote Austrian literary culture abroad. Here, foreign cultural diplomacy advanced not just a state foreign policy interest—for example, building relationships with Habsburg successor states—but the Austrian state as a state. For if the partnership had advanced as intended, the effect of the Grillparzer Institute to promote Austrian literary culture abroad would be to produce a legitimacy for a state that was, in turn, the guarantor of Austrian literary culture. But that effort failed. And in the Gesellschaft, the Drimmel team sought success by creating the desired organization from scratch. Indeed, the Gesellschaft would be reassigned the activities of the Grillparzer Institute, and as the ministry put it, "undertake expanded and more intensive efforts than were previously possible within the framework of an already existing association.[34] The subvention to the Gesellschaft would be modestly increased over its predecessor organization, as well, rising from 14,000 to 20,000 Schillings monthly.[35]

In announcing its new agenda, the Gesellschaft continued much of the work once tasked to the Grillparzer Institute. The promotion of Austrian literature to cultural professionals abroad, including book shipping, for example, as well as building up *Wort in der Zeit*, now belonged to the Gesellschaft.[36] But supervisory personnel also provided continuity. Indeed, as the ministry's director of Section II (*Kunstangelegenheiten*), Alfred Weikert both monitored activities as an insider and positioned himself as an intellectual outsider. For while Weikert had published an article in 1960 in *Österreichische Osthefte* on "cultural political negotiations between Austria, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union," he had also appeared, somewhat improbably, on an Gesellschaft panel with writers Milo Dor and Franz Theodor Csokor to discuss the situation of literature in Austria.[37] Drimmel, it is said, could count on great loyalty and no dissent or independent action internally from his staff.[38] In 1964, Weikert described himself as the "founder" of the Gesellschaft, a claim not often repeated in the histories of that institution.[39] Weikert himself did lose his position and career with the ministry in 1965, following charges that he had accepted gifts from Stiasny Verlag.[40] But later, in 1971, Kraus said that the Gesellschaft would not have existed without him.[41]

Fixed atop the Gesellschaft during its years of greatest relevance in the 1960s, Wolfgang Kraus belonged in the international spotlight with the "cool and habitually resisting ones," as Jean Améry put it.[42] Yet, in his activities, Kraus rarely emerged from the shadow of the Austrian state, while the Ministry of Education was a constant

escort. Of this awkward arrangement, scattered testimony remains. The fact that three ministers joined Austrian Chancellor Josef Klaus to attend the presentation of the fifth annual report of the Gesellschaft in 1966 was visible to all.[43] But there were less visible moments. The discussion evening devoted to Kraus's first book, *Der fünfte Stand. Aufbruch der Intellektuellen in West und Ost*, (1966), for example, was recorded. Near its beginning, Günther Nenning, who joined Hilde Spiel as a codiscussant, took the stage. He denied that Austria deserved the praise for its cultural policies that event attendees had just heard from Scherz, the Swiss publisher of *Der fünfte Stand*. He does, however, concede a few "sterling exceptions," acknowledging first Kraus, then the foreign cultural diplomacy of Franz Karasek (the director of foreign cultural affairs from the ministry), before crediting "every possible thing (*alles mögliche*) from the Ministry of Education sitting in the front row."[44] It was an uncomfortable observation, followed by nervous laughter.

Declarations of Independence

Kraus never questioned the presence of the state in the room. Yet, in both his own writings and in the international congresses he organized for the Gesellschaft, Kraus sought to bestow a reality upon alternatives to the modern-day state. Indeed, particularly in his early work, state institutional power, if not the Austrian state, occupied a central place in his reflections. In *Der fünfte Stand*, a book that appeared between the second and third literature congresses in Vienna, Kraus directed his attention to the relationship between the intellectual and the state on both sides of the Iron Curtain. In the East, he argued, the psychology of the individual was directly confronted with the presence and repressive power of the state.[45] The presence of that power forces the citizen to respond to it and it is harmful. But the artist in the East becomes creatively resistant, the intellectual is a "genuine advocate of individual freedom."[46] The citizen of the West, by contrast, is her own advocate for freedom. But that, too, is harmful. Enabled by a postwar state that equates the well-being of its citizens with "enormous economic prosperity," the egoism of the individual expands unchecked. The citizen is unable "to obtain a mature, capable and sovereign perspective that rises above the level of consumption," he is overwhelmed by the freedom of choice in all spheres of everyday life.[47]

For Kraus, whether living under communism or under capitalism, the individual experienced oppression. To be sure, the individual in the East endures the exercise of state power and feudal-like structures directly. Here, the force of the state is manifest. But state embrace of the economic production under capitalism also entailed a submission to state power, if a less visible one. Thus, the individual in the West is increasingly trapped by the pursuit of material goods—even as those goods were once the necessary basis for individual freedom. In framing the East-West predicament in this way, Kraus adopted the unofficial antistate posture of his mentor, Education

Minister Heinrich Drimmel.[48] For Drimmel, too, had severe misgivings about social developments on the western side of the Iron Curtain. In his 1964 speech, "Against the Spirit of Consumer Society," Drimmel rejected the self-satisfied definition of the West that made consumer choice the symbol of freedom, in contrast to the choice-constrained, goods-poor East. Indeed, what the West needed, Drimmel argued, was not more consumer choice and goods but a counterweight to consumerism. Consumer society, Drimmel told his listeners, could not keep its promises and, confronted with new forms of advertising, the individual feels "completely helpless." "In many cases," he wrote, "the consumer does not even know what he wants."[49]

In locating the origins of the contemporary crisis within the state, Kraus delivered a dark diagnosis. But a force was emerging that could liberate individuals and their societies from that crisis. That force, to which Kraus devoted his book, was the "fifth class" of intellectuals, an international class that, like Marx's proletariat, would upend traditional political arrangements and remake existing institutions. As Kraus wrote: "For a long time now, a power is emanating from unpolitical congresses and unofficial contacts among scientists and intellectuals, regardless of borders, that influences political developments. Soon, statesmen of the old style will manage the course of politics from within a much-reduced space to which scientists and intellectuals have consigned them."[50] With this, Kraus anointed intellectuals the leaders of the future. Freed from the state, their leadership will straddle the ideological divide between East and West. "Statesmen of the old style," Kraus prophesied, "will manage politics from a much-reduced space." According to *Der fünfte Stand*, which Kurt Marko aptly described a "manifesto," intellectuals had found their world-historical task.[51] For Kraus, the intellectual would make the state itself obsolete.

The "awakening" of the intellectuals proclaimed by *Der fünfte Stand* would challenge state authority in both East and West. And, as someone who clearly endorsed this challenge, Kraus might well be situated within a longer tradition of Austrian thinkers thinking against the state. In *The Vienna Students of Civilization*, Erwin Dekker argues that the sources of this tradition remain poorly understood and that influential contributors to it, such as Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich von Hayek, have been considered too exclusively in terms of economics and the market.[52] For Dekker, Mises, and particularly Hayek were working through a problematic of civilization in order to study economics. Thus, Hayek was not primarily concerned with the individual freedom that the market enables, as is so often emphasized. The "student of civilization," Hayek marveled at the functioning of the market, not because the market emancipated the individual, but because it acted as a coercive state substitute that forced the individual to submit.[53] Like Hayek and Mises, Kraus sought an alternative to the state that could shape society. But in his diagnosis, Kraus tracked closely with the Catholic-influenced tradition of Heinrich Drimmel. Where Drimmel could hope that "more and more people are realizing . . . that one must experience consumer

society with reason and calm," Kraus proposed that the new intellectual class would accelerate this realization. If Drimmel called upon the individual to use their own resources to counter consumer society, Kraus put his chips on the intellectual.[54]

Culture contra State

Of all the activities organized by Wolfgang Kraus, it is the three East-West congresses, or "Roundtable Discussions" as they were modestly titled, that earned the greatest attention at the time and remain the most lasting distinction of the Gesellschaft. With each congress scheduled to take place in private and in public over three days—"The Theater of the Present/The Presence of the Theater" (March 1965), "Our Century and its Novel" (October 1965), and "Literature as Tradition and Revolution" (April 1967)—these events offered a structured occasion at which participants could engage in an exchange on social and aesthetic issues related to literature. The extraordinary achievement of these congresses, to put it bluntly, is that Kraus managed to recruit celebrated writers from the West for his event, and still more remarkably, succeeded in getting prominent writers from the East to show up in Vienna at the same time. Writing on the postponement of a planned 1966 conference, the German-Polish critic Marcel Reich-Ranicki characterized the event as the "Vienna Congress 1966," an ironic description that expressed the resentment Reich-Ranicki felt towards the conference.[55] And yet, ironic or not, the analogy to the famous Congress of Vienna, held in 1814–1815, could not have been more wrong. Whereas that earlier Congress of Vienna convened state leaders to shape the future of Europe, the leaders convened at the three East-West congresses wrote books. Indeed, the proposition of the Roundtable Discussions was that dialogue among intellectuals could create an alternate discourse for communication that was more meaningful, because more inclusive, than the one that had been developed by politicians. And if the medium of exchange at the first Congress of Vienna had been spheres of influence and power, the medium of exchange at the Gesellschaft congresses was culture.

In Vienna, leading writers and thinkers from East and West convened. But because the problematic role of the modern state loomed large over the event, the integrity of the occasion derived in part from declarations of independence from that state. Of course, the locations where Gesellschaft events were held—the Palais Palffy and the Palais Wilczek in Vienna's First District—have frequently been rebuked for being inappropriately "feudal" or too "auratic" to serve as venues for the presentation of avant-garde literature and critical discussion.[56] But such rebukes overlook the aim of Kraus to disassociate Gesellschaft activities from the modern state, while it could even be noted that these city palaces are lasting reminders of the failed Habsburg state. Indeed, looking back at the congresses, it is instructive to recall just how "noninstitutional" these occasions were. At the second Roundtable Discussion in October 1965, for example, invitees included Ladislav Mňačko and Josef Skvorecky

(Czechoslovakia), Hans Mayer (East Germany), Alain-Robbe-Grillet (France), Elias Canetti and Erich Fried (Great Britain/Austria), Tibor Déry (Hungary), Roman Karst and Tadeusz Konwicki (Poland) and Georgij Bondarew (Soviet Union), among others.

So, here was a conference not held at a university, featuring virtually no professional academics, where the subject of discussion was simply the "the twentieth century and the novel." With respect to event organization, moreover, there was no sponsor: the Gesellschaft claimed to be the sole initiator. Thus, though the CCF office funded most of the conference, and Kraus coordinated speakers and planning closely with François Bondy and CCF leadership in Paris, the CCF name was nowhere mentioned in connection with the Roundtable Discussion. When rumors did circulate at the event regarding CCF involvement, Kraus raged at an apologetic Bondy.[57] The revelation in April 1966 by the *New York Times* of the financial backing of the CCF by the CIA was still six months away.[58] But, to Kraus, the congress comprised intellectuals, who spoke for themselves, not their states, speaking to other intellectuals. Characteristically, one of the few event details he highlighted in his brief 1966 Opening Address was that "The individual countries in our Roundtable are not represented by official delegations. The invitations were sent to individuals in the West as well as in the East, whose work we value."[59]

Writing in 1960, Theodor Adorno, famously observed that "whoever speaks of culture speaks of administration as well, whether this is his intention or not." His aphorism recalls the modern confederacy of what are, in principle, two adversarial terms. For as Adorno continued, "administration is opposed in the German tradition to the concept of culture, which would like to be "higher and more pure, something untouchable which cannot be tailored to any tactical or technical considerations."[60] To Wolfgang Kraus, administration meant the state, and in the early 1960s, he labored mightily to avoid the impression that the international congresses were "tailored to any tactical or technical considerations." But what does it mean that Kraus did not intend to speak of administration? It means that the more the dialogue of culture advanced in the Roundtable Discussions, the more the presence of the state would recede. In this parallel sphere, liberated from *Staatsräson*, culture would become the medium for communication among intellectuals that showed the way across the Cold War ideological divide. Of course, "culture," like blood in Goethe's *Faust*, was a "very special fluid." It would circulate at the congress and endow the event with life and the critical spirit but it would not constitute the subject of the proceedings. To be sure, Kraus did not imagine that the congress alone would create "culture." Adorno notes that popular opinion associates culture with "personality," and, for his part, Kraus pursued only writers with an elite reputation for the Roundtable Discussions. A modern administrator, Kraus would never reproduce the conditions of autonomy required for "culture" by Adorno, who found these conditions in the Schoenberg circle of 1920s Vienna.[61]

Nevertheless, the broader vision of the early Gesellschaft under Wolfgang Kraus in which the expansion of space occupied by culture would lead to a shrinking of the space available for the state was anything but a call for an activist Austrian *Kulturstaat*. Indeed, given the deep-set association between the image of Austria and the idea of a "culture nation," it needs to be repeated that Kraus considered the role of the state in culture to be harmful.[62] The framework for such a position, where cultural policy confronted the authority of the state, was, again, articulated by Heinrich Drimmel. In his 1962 essay on "Austrian Cultural Policy since the State Treaty," Here, Drimmel conceded that the "modern, in part, overorganized and overrationalized state is among the most extraordinary features of cultural life." And it is for this reason that "big names who otherwise don't give a lot of thought to the relationship between state and culture, declare their belief in the culture state on celebratory occasions."[63] But for the Minister of Education Drimmel, cultural policy referred to the relationship between the state and culture only in the narrow sense. In the broader sense, cultural policy concerned the efforts of the most diverse kinds of institutions engaged with culture, including, federal, provincial, and municipal governments, churches, associations, trade associations, political parties, and more. To speak with contemporary scholarship, Drimmel argued that the state had come to see culture like a state. That is, culture became what the state in its narrowed vision subsidized as "culture."[64] For Drimmel, meanwhile, a cultural policy faithful to its object should support the most diverse kinds of institutions engaged with culture.

Drimmel was no postmodernist prophet who wished to let a thousand flowers of culture bloom. His primary point of reference in reshaping cultural policy to accommodate a broader view of culture was his antipathy towards state encroachment on education and other traditional areas of church responsibility.[65] In this broader view, the Gesellschaft held the status of something like a private association. Such an endeavor, no less than the other institutions engaged with culture, needed more material support and less administration. Drimmel described his approach as "material support without material influence." And since the state could destroy culture but not create it, the task of cultural policy, in his view, was principally to "establish and maintain the intellectual climate."[66] In his research on Austrian higher education of the late 1950s and early 1960s, Thomas König has documented just how strategically Drimmel linked the conservative credentials of individuals to professional promotion and advancement.[67] But once those credentials were accepted, it seems, the protégés of Drimmel enjoyed a freedom of action. The Catholic Kraus did not fully share the political Catholicism of Drimmel, but his Gesellschaft explored this freedom.

From Cultural Policy to Cultural Management

In the lectures he delivered at the Collège de France in the late 1970s, Michel Foucault once turned his attention to the deep aversion to the state that runs as a

theme across the twentieth century. After all, it was a particularly bad stretch, during which the more monstrous incarnations of the state produced millions of disillusioned witnesses to its capacity for destruction. Indeed, where the state direction of cultural policy is concerned, it might be argued that the extreme cases represent a kind of "intolerable limit." The fact that the intolerable limit of National Socialist or Soviet manipulation of culture is not reached is used to preempt questioning of activist state interventions into cultural policy. Meanwhile, discussion of the many different forms of twentieth-century resistance to state cultural policy is also stifled. It is, in any case, to the aged British art historian Bernard Berenson of the years 1950–1952 that Foucault ascribes a particularly pure form of state phobia. Berenson said something like, "God knows I fear the destruction of the world by the atomic bomb, but there is at least one thing I fear as much, and that is the invasion of humanity by the state."[68] The first fear is the steady companion of the second. "The state and the atomic bomb," Foucault writes, "or rather the bomb and the state, or the state is no better than the bomb, or the state entails the bomb, or the bomb necessarily entails and calls for the bomb."

Foucault provokes. But it is a provocation with some application to Wolfgang Kraus, for Kraus wrote and conducted the work of foreign cultural diplomacy for the early Gesellschaft within such a general framework of a state phobia. The indifference of his own state shaped his youth during wartime—he avoided the eastern front as an eighteen-year-old only because of a heart defect—and he knew that such indifference must also be a feature shared by the two principal Cold War states. Where the postwar Austrian state did trumpet its success, such as in accelerating economic production and an ever-increasing supply of consumer goods, Kraus, like Drimmel, not only questioned the end but saw the means as a pretext for the state to continue expanding its administration. Indeed, the administration of both domestic and foreign cultural policy was one area in which the state increasingly staked its claim.

An agent of the state himself, Kraus remained faithful to administration of the Gesellschaft, while also fearing the state. It was a precarious balancing act. As the Austrian state demonstratively upped its investment in the Gesellschaft, Kraus invested a notable share of Gesellschaft activities in the hope that the power of the state could be diminished.[69] The Roundtable Discussions were one such activity, which sought to shrink the space available to the state by creating an alternate sphere of dialogue in which "culture" flourished. But in his early writings as well, above all in *Der fünfte Stand*, Kraus prophesied the rise of collective forces that would challenge state authority. Kraus saw the birth of these forces directly in connection with nuclear destruction. In particular, he noted that in recent years the position of intellectuals had gained a special relevance. In the East, "the collective farmer, the factory worker, and the plain office clerk expected their political salvation and economic improvement from writers, scientists, and artists." But also in the West, Kraus continued, a trend to seek solutions from intellectuals had begun. "At the latest since the explosion of

the first atom bomb," he wrote, "even the most passive petit-bourgeois has become aware of those people who are capable of designing and manufacturing those bombs. Hiroshima as the launch of the age of the intellectuals"[70]

Of course, the international congresses were also events shaped by the risks and rewards of participating in East-West politics.[71] With its neutrality established in the State Treaty of 1955, Austria took skillful advantage of its officially nonaligned position perched between the two Cold War superpowers. Admiration of that skillfulness grew in particular following the successful staging of the 1961 Vienna Summit between the US President John F. Kennedy and the Soviet Communist Party Chairman Nikita Khrushchev, and it may be that Kennedy's belief that Vienna was "symbolic of the possibility of finding equitable solutions" resonated with the global audience who watched this "first summit of the television age."[72] Indeed, the cultural *Besuchsdiplomatie* of the Gesellschaft Roundtable Discussions, with their face-to-face meetings among literary elites, always well-covered by the European media, might be seen as recycling the strengths of the Vienna Summit.[73] But seeing the Roundtable Discussions this way would do an injustice to their intent. It would reinject the clash of two state apparatuses, the Soviet Communist and the American capitalist, into an event premised on the belief that the state itself constituted the problem. More importantly, by making Austrian neutrality the real hero of the international congresses, it writes off the deep dissatisfaction with the state, including the modern Austrian state, that fueled so much of the intellectual and organizational energy behind the conferences.

The circumstances in which Wolfgang Kraus could both sustain a challenge to the state and act on its behalf were brief. With the third and final Roundtable Discussion in April 1967, if not sooner, they were over. The events of 1968, with the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and student revolts in Western Europe and North America, ended the great period of revisionism in Eastern and Western Europe. Sanctioned encounters of the type staged by the Gesellschaft were now less relevant. And though he blamed consumer culture for many of the ills of the West, Kraus had always scorned the counterculture movements of the 1950s. In the first edition of *Der fünfte Stand*, he wrote that the "angry and bearded young men, the beatniks" were "the new gypsies," a judgment that did not survive intact to the reprint.[74] The exposure of the CCF as the human face of the CIA, moreover, compromised the achievement of the Gesellschaft international congresses, to which the CCF had contributed, especially in the eyes of the student generation of 1968. That generation aimed to take things into their own hands; it did not require an invitation to the *Hofburg* from the Gesellschaft. Nor was Europe standing still. Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* proposed a new direction for East-West relations on the continent. Meanwhile, post-de Gaulle France now found the solo act of neutral Austria a problem, not just in terms of its relationship with the Soviet Union but in its effect of strengthening West Germany, through a "German bloc," in the European balance of power.[75] Indeed, by 1970, Kraus could tell his old

friend Manès Sperber that "Austria was no longer important for the encounter of East and West. "Other countries (France, West Germany) have overtaken us, even if often, as I see it, in a rush of blind fervor."[76]

As the advantages that pushed Austria into the East-West spotlight during the early 1960s faded, what remained for Wolfgang Kraus was his position within the Austrian state apparatus and his considerable reputation. Of course, Austria, too, was changing. Internally, foreign cultural diplomacy was increasingly aligned with official foreign policy. One consequence of this alignment was the transfer of the foreign cultural diplomacy portfolio from the Ministry of Education to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Thus, though foreign cultural diplomacy had not been mentioned within its original remit in 1959, when the Ministry of Foreign Affairs was established as a distinct institution, the first Foreign Minister under this arrangement, Bruno Kreisky, began sharing cultural diplomatic responsibilities in the early 1960s with the Ministry of Education. In 1973, a Federal Ministries Act completed this shift, reassigning responsibility for all activities of foreign cultural diplomacy to the Foreign Ministry.[77] Together with ensuring that cultural diplomacy moved in step with foreign policy priorities, Kreisky, who had been elected as chancellor in 1970, modernized the administration of domestic cultural policy by broadening what the federal state recognized as constituting "culture" and "cultural activities."[78] The famous "catalog of measures in cultural policy" (*Maßnahmenkatalog*), issued by the Ministry for Education and Art, provided the actions needed to be taken in the era of expanded cooperation among the state, new cultural institutions, and new agents of culture.[79]

If Wolfgang Kraus had once envisioned culture as an alternative to the state, that vision had now dimmed. Indeed, as the 1970s unfolded, the potential of culture was increasingly shaped, for Kraus at least, by its potential to be managed in the service of Austria. Kraus kept his position as director of the Gesellschaft but, from 1975 to 1981, he also served in the Foreign Ministry as a liaison between the ministry and the Austrian Cultural Institutes abroad. It was a high-level position with a clear purpose. Thus, as the conditions of his employment noted, Kraus had the authority to directly contact Austrian embassies, cultural institutes, and cultural advisers.[80] But his activities continued the official instruction, issued in 1970, to improve the image of Austria abroad.[81] For his part, Heinrich Drimmel, too, had seen the world change around him. Hurried out of office by the Austrian People's Party reform group led by new chancellor Josef Klaus in 1964, Drimmel served in the Vienna municipal government, in part as vice mayor, until 1972. He also briefly returned to the Ministry of Education but, by 1972, he had taken the earliest possible pension and exited political life altogether. In later years, he published histories of Austria and accounts of current affairs with a decidedly conservative turn, as well as his autobiography, *Häuser meines Lebens*, a book whose title expressed its preference for small-scale approaches. Both Kraus and Drimmel, at a time of growing state influence in all realms of life, questioned

the consequences of that influence and called attention to what they saw as the flaws of the state enterprise. But while the politician Drimmel left the state entirely, the cultural entrepreneur Kraus increasingly came to identify culture with the state and the state as the solution.

Today, foreign cultural diplomacy, much like cultural policy, offers its services to the state by professing its "neutrality" as an intermediary agent. Efficiency is the objective where the goal is not set by those who administrate culture.[82] Indeed, "the principles of project management," as Emil Brix, the grand seigneur of Austrian cultural diplomacy puts it, "apply to the successful implementation of projects, even in foreign cultural activities."[83] For the Wolfgang Kraus of the Roundtable Discussions of the early 1960s, such propositions would have been untenable. Culture, by definition, could not be contained as a project, while an understanding of "neutrality" that presupposed the involvement of the state could not be considered neutral. But the Wolfgang Kraus who continued to work into the 1970s had shed such views. True, he still professed his own autonomy, even as these professions sounded increasingly hollow. He opened his 1975 *Kultur und Macht*, for example, with not an introduction but a "Declaration" (*Feststellung*). Concerning the writing of his book, the well-situated Kraus announced, "I have no institution, no foundation, and no state position to thank for assistance."[84] More significantly, Kraus had himself had become a convert to principles of project management. The sources of this management, moreover, were ancient, as he told the audience of distinguished academics, intellectuals, and state officials who had gathered for his November 1977 seminar on "Culture in Austria and Its Impact Abroad." Addressing the subject of "The Practice of Management," Kraus observed that "cultural management had already begun in antiquity with the Greek theater, which among other things was used as an instrument of education."[85] Always one to attach to his favorite ideas a philosophical connection with ancient Greece, Kraus meant it. The old fear of the state had passed. In its place, Kraus discovered the promise of value-free cultural management.

The foreign cultural diplomacy practiced by Austria today is greatly aligned with Austrian foreign policy. Scholars, historians, and other intellectuals have often justified this alignment by pointing out that cultural diplomacy abroad has succeeded in mitigating the negative international impact of news events at home, such as the 1986 Waldheim Affair and the 2000 coalition government between the center-right Austrian People's Party (ÖVP) and the far-right Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ).[86] Domestically, as well, political controversies have worked to discourage a closer examination of how attitudes towards the Austrian state and culture have evolved over time. One such controversy concerns the use of the phrase "*Staatskünstler*" (state artist) by the late far-right politician Jörg Haider and his followers. By invoking this term, Haider recalled its previous use by National Socialist leaders to denounce their enemies, like the artist Heinrich Mann. But he also suggested that state subsidies propped up

artists whose aims were expressly political, namely, to stop his electoral ascent. In this way, he placed into question, as well, the entire system of state subsidies for artists.[87]

In such a politicized context, it can well be imagined how virtually any proposal to examine the relationship between the state and culture can be construed as the reformulation of a far-right agenda. Revisiting the work of Wolfgang Kraus with the Gesellschaft, together with Heinrich Drimmel presents the opportunity to consider a different, somewhat more tangled line of thinking about culture in Austria. This tangled line does, to be sure, share much with a conservative tradition of reflection upon the state. But it is also deeply rooted in an experience of the first half of the twentieth century, Second Republic Austria, and a belief in the power of culture that has little to do with contemporary popular celebrations of Austria as a culture nation. The search of Wolfgang Kraus with Heinrich Drimmel for an alternative foreign cultural diplomacy failed but, for the present, its failure recalls a period of open, spirited, and even hopeful discussion of the limitations of the state and the possibilities of culture.

Notes

1. Willy Brandt, "*Bedeutung und Aufgaben der auswärtigen Kulturpolitik. Ausführungen von Außenminister Brandt anlässlich der Veröffentlichung des Tätigkeitsberichts 1966 der Kulturabteilung des Auswärtigen Amtes*," in *Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung*, *Bulletin* 71, (July 5, 1967): 613–616, here 613.
2. On the enduring character of 1960s reforms in foreign cultural diplomacy—reforms that remained in place until the opening towards Eastern Europe in 1989—see Corine Defrance, "Zwischen Reform und Tradition. Die auswärtige Kulturpolitik der Bundesrepublik 1974–1990," *Mémoire(s), identité(s), marginalité(s) dans le monde occidental contemporain*, MIMMOC, 2016, La politique étrangère de la RFA (1974–1990), http://journals.openedition.org/mimmoc/2509.
3. Hansgert Peisert, *Die auswärtige Kulturpolitik der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1978), 43–54.
4. Theodor Piffl-Perčević, *Kulturenquete über die Ziele und Formen der Auslandskulturpolitik Österreichs [Protokoll über die am 27. und 28. März in Wien abgehaltene Auslandskulturenquete*], ed. Alwin Westerhof (Vienna: Bundesministerium für Unterricht: 1968), 13.
5. *Die dritte Säule: Beiträge zur Auswärtigen Kultur- und Bildungspolitik*, ed. Olaf Zimmermann und Theo Geißler (Berlin: Politik & Kultur, Zeitung des Deutschen Kulturrates, 2018).
6. Frank Trommler, *Kulturmacht ohne Kompass. Deutsche auswärtige Kulturbeziehungen im 20. Jahrhundert*. (Cologne: Böhlau, 2014), 689–699.
7. Frances Stonor Saunders, *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War* (London: Granta, 1999).
8. Hans Krabbendam and Gilles Scott-Smith, eds., *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945–60* (London: Frank Cass, 2003).
9. Giles Scott-Smith, *The Politics of Apolitical Culture: The Congress for Cultural Freedom, the CIA, and Post-War American Hegemony* (London: Routledge, 2003); Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 10.
10. Hans Magnus Enzensberger, "The Industrialization of the Mind," in *The Consciousness Industry* (1962; New York: Seabury, 1974), 3–15.
11. Among his many high-profile activities while leading the *Gesellschaft*, Kraus moderated cultural programming for Austrian state television, including "Jour fixe mit Wolfgang Kraus" (1968–1994)

and "Die Welt des Buches" (1979–1981). He also lent himself to various prize juries, such as the *Manès Sperber Prize*, which he initiated, and he served on numerous cultural committees. In addition, between 1975 and 1981, Kraus oversaw the cultural work of all ten Austrian cultural institutes abroad, "managing to a great extent the foreign image of domestic cultural activities," as an unsigned article in the Austrian newsweekly *Profil* put it. "Arabesken des Lebens," *Profil* 4, January 25, 1977, 54–55, here 54. For biographical highlights, see Stefan Maurer, "'The Management is Relentless': Life, Work and Impact of Wolfgang Kraus," in *East Central Europe at a Glance: People, Cultures, Developments*, ed. Marija Wakounig and Ferdinand Kühnel (Berlin: Lit, 2018), 293–308.

12. Thomas Rothschild, "Wenn Kultur zum Privatbesitz wird," *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 113 (May 16–17, 1992), 202. To his critics, Kraus cannot be said to have turned the other cheek. When as part of an edited volume, the Viennese Germanist Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler published an extended polemic against Kraus that Thomas Rothschild had delivered at a conference in Angers, France, cosponsored by the Paris *Kulturinstitut*, Kraus asked Austrian Vice Chancellor Edward Busek to block the planned appointment of Schmidt-Dengler as General Director of the Austrian Archive in the Austrian National Library. Busek agreed, but later changed his mind. Letter from Wolfgang Kraus to Erhard Busek, vice chancellor, February 27, 1994. Letter from Erhard Busek to Wolfgang Kraus, May 9, 1994, Literary Estate of Wolfgang Kraus, Österreichisches Literaturarchiv 63/97. Literary Archive of Austrian National Library. At the 1999 Budapest conference, held posthumously in honor of Kraus, a more conciliatory Schmidt-Dengler offered his thanks to Kraus, "with an apology for its lateness." Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler, "Wolfgang Kraus," in *Literatur als Brücke zwischen Ost und West. Zum Gedenken an Wolfgang Kraus*, ed. Péter Bassola and Endre Kiss (Szeged: Grimm, 1999), 17–24, here 23.
13. W. Scott Lucas, "Beyond Freedom, Beyond Control: Approaches to Culture and the State-Private Network in the Cold War," *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945–60*, ed. Hans Krabbendam, and Giles Scott-Smith (London: Routledge, 2004), 53–72.
14. A detailed account of the second conference is provided by Ursula Ebel and Holger Englerth, "Inszenierung: Ost Roman West. Das II. Round-Table-Gespräch der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Literatur. 'Unser Jahrhundert und sein Roman' (25.–27. Oktober 1965)," *Spannungsfelder. Zur deutschsprachigen Literatur im Kalten Krieg (1945–1968)*, ed. Günther Stocker and Michael Rohrwasser (Vienna: Arco Wissenschaft, 2014), 68–100. For a detailed account of Gesellschaft activities in the 1960s, see Stefan Maurer, "Wolfgang Kraus: Impresario of Austrian Literature and Cold Warrior," in *Austrian Lives*, ed. Günter Bischof, Fritz Plasser, Eva Maltschnig (New Orleans: UNO Press, 2012), 256–276, here 259–262.
15. Wolfgang Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand. Aufbruch der Intellektuellen in West und Ost*, (Bern: Scherz, 1966).
16. Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer*.
17. On Drimmel, see Anton Staudinger, "Heinrich Drimmel," in *Die Politiker. Karrieren und Wirken bedeutender Repräsentanten der Zweiten Republik*, ed. Herbert Dachs, Peter Gerlich, Wolfang C. Müller (Vienna: Manz, 1995), 118–123. Reinhold Knoll, "Zur politischen Philosophie eines Politikers—Gedanken über Heinrich Drimmel," in *Verdrängter Humanismus—verzögerte Aufklärung*, ed. Michael Benedikt, Reinhold Knoll, Franz Schwediauer, Cornelius Zehetner (Vienna: Facultas Verlag, 2010), 871–877.
18. Emil Brix, "'Das Durchschneiden des Eisernen Vorhanges hat Kulturarbeit gebraucht,'" *Am Ort des Geschehens in Zeiten des Umbruchs*, ed. Michael Gehler and Andrea Brait (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2018), 487–516, here 488.
19. Michael Hansel and Stefan Maurer, "'In Wien sind Dinge möglich, die in Berlin schon nicht mehr möglich sind.' Wolfgang Kraus und die Netzwerke des kulturellen Kalten Krieges," in *Kalter Krieg in Österreich*, ed. Michael Hansel and Michael Rohrwasser (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2010), 244–264. Also see, Stefan Maurer, "'Der Boden des neutralen Österreichs scheint uns besonders für eine

Auseinandersetzung zwischen Ost und West geeignet zu sein.' Wolfgang Kraus Netzwerke im kulturellen Kalten Krieg, in *Österreich im Kalten Krieg*, ed. Maximilian Graf and Agnes Meisinger (Vienna: Vienna University Press, 2016), 209–229.

20. Tony Judt and Timothy Snyder, *Thinking the Twentieth Century*. (New York: Penguin, 2012), 222.
21. Endre Kiss, "Über den Charme des Homo Aestheticus in einer Welt des eisernen Vorhanges," in Bassola and Kiss, *Literatur als Brücke zwischen Ost und West,* 26–39, here 29.
22. Franz Schuh, "Literatur und Macht am Beispiel Österreichs der siebziger Jahre," in *Franz Schuh, Liebe, Macht und Heiterkeit. Essays* (Klagenfurt: Ritter, 1985), 175–203, here 199.
23. Wolfgang Kraus, "Eröffnungsansprache von Dr. Wolfgang Kraus," December 18, 1961, www.ogl.at/info/geschichte/gruendungsrede
24. On the nonconflictual literature industry in early Second Republic Austria, see Robert Menasse, "Die sozialpartnerschaftliche Ästhetik. Das Österreichische an der österreichischen Literatur der Zweiten Republik," in *Überbau und Underground. Die sozialpartnerschaftliche Ästhetik*, (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997), 11–110.
25. Walter Seidl, *Zwischen Kultur und Culture. Das Austrian Institute in New York und Österreichs kulturelle Repräsentanz in den USA* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 33.
26. Friedrich Langer, ed., Österreichs Kulturinstitute im Ausland (Vienna: Zeitschriftenverlag Austria International, 1965).
27. Wolfgang Hackl, *Kein Bollwerk der alten Garde—keine Experimentierbude Wort in der Zeit (1955–1965)* (Innsbruck: Steigerdruck, 1988), 34–35.
28. Heinrich Drimmel, "Österreichs historische Sendung im Donauraum," *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur* 1, no. 2 (1957): 1–3.
29. Viktor Suchy, "Hundert Jahre Grillparzer-*Gesellschaft*," *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft* 18 (1991–1992): 1–207, here 124.
30. Suchy, "Hundert Jahre," 128.
31. Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Archiv der Republik (ÖStA/AdR/2.Republik), Bundesministerium für Unterricht (BMfU), "Verstärkung der Maßnahmen zur Bekanntmachung der österr. Literatur. Betrauung der Grillparzerges. m.d. Durchführung" (1957) Mappe 320.
32. Cited by Maurer, "Wolfgang Kraus: Impresario," n20, 261.
33. Viktor Matejka, "Das alles ist Wien, " *Wiener Tagebuch* 14, no. 2 (1963): 3. Hans Haider, "'Der Kartonismus' 1965: Ende und Wende," in *Österreich. 90 Jahre Republik* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2008), 421–428, here 421. *give volume editors
34. ÖStA/AdR/2.Republik, BMfU, "Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur, Bildung" (1960) Mappe 320.
35. ÖStA/AdR/2.Republik, BMfU, "Grillparzergesellschaft. Aktion zur Propagierung der österr. Literatur—Sondersubvention 1958 zweites Halbjahr" (1958) Mappe 320.
36. Kraus, "Eröffnungsansprache von Dr. Wolfgang Kraus."
37. Alfred Weikert, "Zu den kulturpolitischen Verhandlungen Österreichs mit der ČSR und der UdSSR," Österreichische Osthefte 5, no. 2 (1960): 335–338.
38. Staudinger, "Heinrich Drimmel" 120.
39. Letter from Alfred Weikert to Benno Schaginger, September 15, 1964. Archive of Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur, Vienna, Austria.
40. See Hackl, *Kein Bollwerk*, 114–116.
41. Wolfgang Kraus, "Rede zum Jubiläum der ÖGL 1971, December 14, 1971. Literary Estate of Wolfgang Kraus, Österreichisches Literaturarchiv 63/97. Literary Archive of Austrian National Library.
42. Jean Améry, "Die Lust zu fabulieren vergeht. Die Nervenprobe der Frankfurter Buchmesse," *Die Weltwoche*, October 7, 1966, 25.
43. Marcel Reich-Ranicki, "Wiener Kongress 1966 abgesagt," *Die Zeit* 42, October 14, 1966. https://www.zeit.de/1966/42/wiener-kongress-1966-abgesagt

44. "*Der fünfte Stand*—Aufbruch der Intellektuellen in West und Ost, Diskussion mit Günther Nenning, Wolfgang Kraus und Hilde Spiel," Palais Wilczek, June 10, 1966, https://www.mediathek.at/atom/017829B4-05E-00894-00000BEC-01772EE2, at 13:00–13:30.
45. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 24, 29–30.
46. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 102.
47. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 31, 121.
48. Michael Burri, "The Drimmel Effect: The Anti-State Performance of Heinrich Drimmel," *Contemporary Austrian Studies* 29 (2020): 263–278.
49. Heinrich Drimmel, "Rede. Wider den herrschenden Geist der Konsumgesellschaft," *10 Reden wider den Geist* (Vienna: Herold, 1965), 13.
50. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 73.
51. Kurt Marko, "Ein fünfter Stand?" *Österreichische Osthefte* 3 (1967): 246–251, here 246.
52. Erwin Dekker, *The Viennese Students of Civilization: The Meaning and Context of Austrian Economics Reconsidered* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
53. Dekker, *The Viennese Students of Civilization*, 67–90.
54. Heinrich Drimmel, "Wider den herrschenden Geist der Konsumgesellschaft," 14.
55. Reich-Ranicki, "Wiener Kongress 1966 abgesagt." On the considerable friction between Reich-Ranicki and Kraus, see Ebel and Englerth, "Inszenierung: Ost Roman West," 75–78.
56. Horst Ebner, "Kafka, Fink und Guglhupf," *Falter* 5, February 4, 1992. Schmidt-Dengler, "Wolfgang Kraus," 18. The public event, scheduled with the conference, was held in the Redoutensaal of the Hofburg.
57. Ebel and Englerth, "Inzenierung; Ost Roman West," 73.
58. Ebel and Englerth, "Inzenierung; Ost Roman West," 73.
59. Wolfgang Kraus, Eröffnungsansprache, undated. Archive of Austrian Society for Literature, Vienna, Austria.
60. Theodor W. Adorno, "Culture and Administration," in *The Culture Industry. Selected Essays on Mass Culture*, trans. Wes Blomster (1960; New York: Routledge, 2001), 107–131, here 107–108.
61. Adorno, "Culture and Administration," 108, 120–121.
62. On the self-definition of Austria as "culture nation," "in the sense of a cultural superpower or a minor state with a major culture," Marion Knapp, *Österreichische Kulturpolitik and das Bild der Kulturnation* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2005).
63. Heinrich Drimmel, "Österreichische Kulturpolitik seit dem Staatsvertrag," *Österreich in Geschichte und Literatur* 6, no. 8 (1962): 343–351, here 344.
64. James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).
65. Ernst Hanisch, *Der lange Schatten des Staates* (Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1994), 426.
66. Drimmel, "Österreichische Kulturpolitik," 349.
67. Thomas König, "A Strategy of Containment: Heinrich Drimmel's Political Activism in the Realm of Higher Education Policy in the Early Second Republic," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* 29, no. 1 (2018), 180–205.
68. Michel Foucault, "31 January 1979," *The Birth of Biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Palgrave, 2008), 75–100, here 75.
69. The Ministry of Education increased its investment in the early Gesellschaft nearly fourfold, from a subsidy of 20,000 Schillings in the first half of 1960 to 70,000 in 1965. ÖStA/AdR/2.Republik, BMfU, "Aktion zur Propagierung der österr. Literatur. Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur, Subvention 1961" (1961) Mappe 320. ÖStA/AdR/2.Republik, BMfU, "Aktion zur Propagierung der österr. Literatur. Österreichische Gesellschaft für Literatur, Abrechnung der Subvention 1965" (1965) Mappe 320.
70. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 47.
71. Günter Stocker and Stefan Maurer, "'Fellow Traveller,' 'trojanische Pferde,' 'Neutralisten.'

Figuren des Dritten in der österreichischen Kultur des Kalten Krieges," in *Das Imaginäre des Kalten Krieges*, ed. David Eugster and Sibylle Marti (Essen: Klartext, 2015), 117–136.

72. Günter Bischof and Martin Kofler, "'Vienna, a City that is Symbolic of the Possibility of Finding Equitable Solutions': John F. Kennedy and His European Summitry in Early June 1961," in *The Vienna Summit and Its Importance in International History*, ed. Günter Bischof, Stefan Karner, and Barbara Stelzl-Marx (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2014.), 83–123, here 109.
73. Magdalena Reitbauer, "Von Angesicht zu Angesicht im Kalten Krieg. Österreichs besuchsdiplomatische Interaktionen zwischen Ost und West 1960 bis 1983," in *Österreich im Kalten Krieg*, ed. Maximilian Graf and Agnes Meisinger (Vienna: Vienna University Press, 2016), 121–143.
74. Kraus, *Der fünfte Stand*, 15.
75. Oliver Rathkolb, "Umkämpfte Internationalisierung," in *Das Jahr 1968—Ereignis, Symbol, Chiffre*, ed. Oliver Rathkolb, Friedrich Stadler (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2010), 221–238, here 240.
76. Letter from Wolfgang Kraus to Manès Sperber, December 28, 1970. Literary Estate of Wolfgang Kraus, Österreichisches Literaturarchiv 63/97. Literary Archive of Austrian National Library.
77. Today, foreign cultural diplomacy remains fully integrated with other Austrian foreign policy objectives pursued by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration, and Foreign Affairs. Peter Kampits, *Die Auslandskulturpolitik Österreichs* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1990), 23–24.
78. Knapp, *Österreichische Kulturpolitik*, 148.
79. Michael Wimmer, "Vom Werden und Vergehen sozialdemokratischer Kulturpolitik in Österreich seit 1970," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft*, 1 (1987): 17–34.
80. "Arbeitsverhältnisse: Bundesministerium für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten (Verträge, Bestimmungen)," Literary Estate of Wolfgang Kraus, Österreichisches Literaturarchiv 63/97. Literary Archive of Austrian National Library.
81. *Außenpolitischer Bericht des Bundesministers für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten über das Jahr 1975* (Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1975), 112.
82. Jens Badura, Monika Mokre, "Von der Kulturpolitik zum Kulturmanagement," *Kulturmanagement und Kulturpolitik. Jahrbuch für Kulturmanagement* 1 (2011): 53–68, here 55.
83. Emil Brix, "Cultural Work Abroad: Between Management and Diplomacy," "Public Diplomacy," *Favorita Papers* 1 (2004): 41–45, here 44
84. Wolfgang Kraus, *Kultur und Macht* (1975; Munich: Dtv, 1978), 12.
85. Wolfgang Kraus, "Praxis des kulturellen Managements, " "Seminar: Kultur in Österreich und Ihre Wirkung in Ausland, November 21–23, 1977." Literary Estate of Wolfgang Kraus, Österreichisches Literaturarchiv 63/97. Literary Archive of Austrian National Library.
86. See, for example, Michael Gehler, *Von der allierten Besatzung bis zum Europa des 21. Jahrhunderts, Österreichs Außenpolitik der Zweiten Republik*, vol. 2 (Innsbruck: Studien, 2005), 565. For a critique of this claim of foreign cultural diplomacy, see Michael Burri "Austrian Studies and the Disembrace from Foreign Cultural Diplomacy," *Journal of Austrian Studies* 5, no. 3 (2018): 43–59.
87. Alfred Pfabigan, "'Staatskünstler.' The Debate About the Austrian System of Subsidy for Art and Artists" in *Literature, Film, and the Culture Industry in Contemporary Austria*, ed. Margarete Lamb-Faffelberger (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), 51–63.