

Luca Lecis

Contemporary History at the University of Cagliari

Orcid: 0000-0002-6662-3281

Doi: 10.51918/ceh.2023.1-2.1

Abstract

Austria's 'perpetual neutrality', the price paid in 1955 for its independence and the withdrawal of Soviet troops, was the starting point of the Austrian 'lone course' to Mitteleuropa, carried out mainly thanks to the efforts of both political and intellectual actors. The fortunes of Austrian cultural policies received a considerable boost in the mid-Fifties, thanks to the efforts of Budapest-born Austrian writer and journalist György Sebestyén, who was to play a key role in the various stages of the Mitteleuropa process, favouring a transnational bond in the Danube region, which in the 1980s led Austria back into the middle of the action unfolding along and beyond its Eastern borders. By exploring Austria's cultural diplomacy with East-Central Europe from the 1950s to the 1990s, this article uses archival and press sources to show how political and intellectual Austrian elites constantly and skilfully developed a new 'transnational scenario' in Mitteleuropa (even though the Iron Curtain constituted a fearsome border regime cutting the Alpine country off from its traditional neighbours). This not only projected a new positive image of their country, veering between culture and dialogue, but also built new partnerships to buttress Austria as a cultural pioneer in the pan-European context.

Keywords

Mitteleuropa, Central Europe, intellectual history, Austria

Luca Lecis

“Mitteleuropa’s unique spiritual power has to flow into the common European culture”

György Sebestyén and cultural policies in Austria in the 1970s and 1990s

Introduction

Europe, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Central Europe, East-Central Europe: these are apparently simple geographical designations of certain regions but behind them lie complex systems of cultural, historical, political, and phenomenological attributions, which may all vary greatly depending on the era and the viewpoint of the observer. Any attempt at a clear definition seems particularly hopeless in the case of Central Europe. However – or perhaps precisely because of this – an intensive and quite effective discourse on this issue began in the early 1980s, which broke open the fossilised East-West paradigm and which can be regarded as an intellectual precursor of the political turning point of 1989. This discourse began with a particular self-location: Central Europe. This region was seen as culturally close and related to the West, but politically it was inevitably linked to the East.¹

Identitarian issues constitute a privileged field for intellectual reflection and the issue of East-Central Europe has always held a special place in the Danubian consciousness, especially since the 19th century, when cultural movements began to stimulate an identitarian debate over a possible East-Central European mode of thought²,

1 Cf. Chołuj, “Die Renaissance des Begriffes Mitteleuropa”

2 On this issue, see Janowski, ‘Multiple Sonderwegs’. Troebst, *Erinnerungskultur Kulturgeschichte Geschichtsregion*; Schultz and Natter, *Imagining Mitteleuropa*, Miller, “Central Europe”, 85–89, Jaworski, “Ostmitteleuropa”.

with the subsequent considerations for Austria following the First World War. In the aftermath of World War I a widespread feeling of loss affected all the people who had once lived in the Habsburg territories. As Milan Dubrović (Austrian journalist, and editor, one of the greatest representatives of Viennese modernism) recalled, quite a few intellectuals clung to an Austrian idea (i.e., national identity) that was “superior to a feeling of togetherness among the peoples in the Danubian states”, since, to quote Adolf Storfer³, “Austria wasn’t a geographical concept, but a state of mind”⁴.

After 1945 great changes took place in the political boundaries and cultural landscape of Europe, which altered perceptions of what the extent of East-Central Europe could be, even though, historically speaking, in the German world (‘German’ to be understood here as meaning ‘of the German language’), the term *Mitteleuropa* refers to a uniformly wide band running across Europe in a north-south direction⁵. It was conceived of as an area with its own physiognomy, and characterised by common features, such as the “feeling of belonging to a community of destiny”⁶ suspended (geographically speaking) between the West and Russia, between the Prussian North and the Mediterranean South, and defined by the predominance of the German language as its *lingua franca*, or more precisely as the ‘Esperanto of the Slavs’⁷.

At that time, *Mitteleuropa* as a topographical term included seven independent states: Austria, Czechoslovakia, both “Germanies” (the Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany), Hungary, Poland, and Switzerland. In addition, if observed from a broader and historical-economic perspective, it also included two Italian regions (Friuli Venezia Giulia and Trentino Alto Adige), two components of the Republic of

3 Adolf Joseph Storfer (1888–1944) was an Austrian journalist, etymologist, and psychoanalyst born and raised in Siebenbürgen (Transylvania) into a wealthy Jewish family, and who was director of the *Wiener Psychoanalytischen Verlags* (1925–1932). In 1938, he fled to Australia. *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon* 328.

4 Quite a few of us [writers] who came from Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary or Croatia have suppressed the lost war from our consciousness, clinging to an Austrian idea that is superior to reality and the sense of unity among the peoples of the Danube states. “Austria is not a geographical concept, but a state of mind”, declared Adolf Storfer. Dubrović, *Veruntreute Geschichte*, 32.

5 The term *Mitteleuropa* was thus used by Hassel in 1819 in a comprehensive German geographical reference work, including the German states, Austria–Hungary, Switzerland and the Italian peninsula. See Gaspari, Cannabich and Hassel (eds.), *Vollständiges Handbuch*, Vol. I, t. II, 38.

6 Reszler, “La signification présente”, 30.

7 This supposition was envisaged for the first time by Naumann, *Mitteleuropa*, 101.

Yugoslavia (Slovenia and Croatia), and Northern Romania⁸. This, for example, was how the idea of Mitteleuropa would be understood later during the so-called ‘Duino Talks’, organized from September 1983 by the “Giuliano-Dalmati Association around the world”, with the collaboration of the ‘Coudenhove-Kalergi Foundation’ and funding from the Italian Autonomous Region of Friuli Venezia Giulia (the first meeting, held in Trieste, was on the theme of ‘The European significance of Mitteleuropa’)⁹.

By the mid-1980s the issue of Mitteleuropa had become the subject of intense debate particularly among intellectuals, thanks to the relative liberalisation which, as Catherine Horel, points out “enabled intellectuals in Central Europe to meet and also to make contact with exiled compatriots”¹⁰. The history of the Danube region was consequently reassessed, and the Habsburg regime largely rehabilitated in the light of historical events subsequent to the collapse of its Empire. This led to the strengthening of cultural relationships between Austrians, Slavic peoples, Hungarians and Italians, and provided fresh stimulus for reflecting on Austria’s role in East-Central Europe. Prime examples of this reawakening, for instance, are to be found in the works of the Czech

- 8 According to Karl Sinnhuber, attempts at the classification of Mitteleuropa should consider at least four aspects: Middle Europe as a topographical term (here used in its original meaning, indicating the position of an area); Middle Europe as a physical region, based on a single physical criterion or several criteria; Middle Europe as a concept with an historical or political bias; Middle Europe as a geographical region delimited by means of both physical nature and cultural elements. As a matter of fact, Sinnhuber underlined that, “it is possible to use the ‘vague’ term Middle Europe in a clear and unmistakable manner provided we express precisely which kind of Middle Europe we mean. ‘Middle Europe as a topographical term’ and ‘Middle Europe in a physical sense’ remain unchanged by historical events. ‘Middle Europe in a political sense’ depends on the political situation at a given time, and at least for the moment has ceased to exist. ‘Middle Europe as a geographical region’ is still with us, although its extent has become smaller, but it is still a geographical entity worthy of being studied not as a mere group of states, but as a geographical subject of more lasting character: a geographical region”. Sinnhuber, “Central Europe – Mitteleuropa – Europe Centrale”. 37.
- 9 The ‘Duino Talks’ launched a season of high-profile cultural events and meetings, in which Austria, and Vienna in particular, on account of its central position, inevitably became the centre of cross-border cultural activism; in particular the ‘Vienna Festival Symposia’ (*Wiener Festwochen- Symposien*, 1986), a conference organised in the Austrian capital in January 1987, on the subject of ‘Europa and Mitteleuropa’, the ‘Donauraum- symposium’, held the following June at the Benedictine abbey in Melk, and the subsequent second meeting of the Duino Talks in 1987. Rathkolb and Stadler (Eds.), *Verdrängte Kultur*. On the historiographical debate on Central Europe as a term, see also Górný, “Użyteczność i granice” 801–808; Müller, “Where and When Was (East) Central Europe?”, Müller, “Southeastern Europe as a Historical Meso-region.” Janowski, “Pitfalls and Opportunities.”
- 10 Horel, “The rediscovery of Central Europe in the 1980s”, 25.

novelist Milan Kundera (1929–2023), and the Hungarian writer and journalist György Konrád (1933–2019), who: inspired by the Austrian exhibition ‘Dream and Reality. Vienna 1870–1930’ displayed at the Künstlerhaus¹¹, started to write about the ‘dream’ of Central Europe¹². The then Vice-Mayor of Vienna, Erhard Busek (ÖVP), was among the first to grasp the importance for the capital city and for Austria of being seen as a ‘political alternative’: the ‘Austrianisation’ of Mitteleuropa could be achieved despite the Soviet control over Eastern countries, since Austria, Busek argued, could “get a chance for its future” in, and with Central Europe¹³. There again, as Wendelin Ettmayer (ÖVP’s deputy and diplomat, seconded to head the office of Alois Mock, later Austrian foreign minister) emphasised, a deep “sense of togetherness” could be achieved, regardless of the prevailing ‘quality’ of relations between the Great Powers while increasing the room for manoeuvre across the ideological blocs in the centre of Europe¹⁴.

Hence, the message instilled was a newly discovered concept of East-Central Europe, an expression coined to define a space characterised by an extreme divisiveness – brought about by the sovietisation of East Central Europe in the wake of the Second World War – but which nevertheless belonged together culturally, socially, and economically in the deep structures of historical development of the Danube Region¹⁵.

These political, and cultural dynamics were to provide the basis for a new transregional cooperation at the core of Europe, promoted and actively supported by György Sebestyén with his cultural and journalistic mission through the journals *Pannonia* (1973), and later *Morgen* (1977). Sebestyén launched both magazines to help realise his cultural and political plans, and they were published thanks to economic and financial support guaranteed by the Funds of the regional government of Upper Austria. *Morgen* was seen as a prestigious cultural medium by the local political class, i.e., that of Lower Austria (Niederösterreich), where the revitalisation and enhancement of a rich cross-border identity heritage were considered to be a primary form of cultural promotion (later culminating in the so-called *Drosendorfer Manifest* of 1980). Despite being

11 Russel, “Art: Vienna Festival Exhibitions”.

12 Luif, “Forum on ‘Central Europe’”, 97.

13 Busek and Brix, *Projekt Mitteleuropa*, 173.

14 Ettmayer, *Plädoyer für Mitteleuropa*, 52.

15 Here it was especially meant as a wider Central European region. For a deeper, and broader analyse on this topic, see Troebst, “Geschichtsregion”.

actively and sufficiently supported, *Morgen* did not have fortune on its side: ten years later it was still languishing on the national publishing scene, and by 1986–87 it was in a precarious commercial and financial condition¹⁶.

Cultural policies ‘beyond’ the Iron Curtain

Any discussion of exchanges between East and West in Europe during the Cold War evokes the idea of a nearly impossible kind of cooperation between States divided by the Iron Curtain. This inevitably means that relationships in a wider, broader transregional context – that would be able to overcome the ideological borders through a shared idea of Mitteleuropa (Central Europe) – have often been seen as the legacy of a distant past. This was in spite of the fact that the political concept of cross-border cooperation was a fixture in international, intellectual debate, particularly in Austria, thanks to the special relationship which for centuries had bonded the Alpine country – even in its current form, created after the dissolution of the Dual imperial monarchy (Cisleitania) – to the East-Central European countries.

The spirit of the idea of Mitteleuropa was somehow revitalised in 1953, after Stalin’s death. Indeed, not long after his death was announced, in May, the idea of cross-bor-

16 In order to find a long-term solution to the magazine’s economic crisis, which was draining substantial public funds, the NÖ- Fund’s board met in March 1987. At this meeting, the honorary president of the board, Andreas Maurer, proposed a reduction of the annual grant, but the suggestion was rejected by the general director of the Fund, Walter Wolfsberger. In his opinion, a cultural newspaper such as ‘Morgen’ should always be subsidised to prevent it from shutting down. An eventual drastic measure was also discarded by another member of the board, Franz Albrecht Metternich-Sandor (pp. 4–6). Likewise, another critic of Sebestyén’s management was former Lower Austria Governor and board member Andreas Maurer (ÖVP, 1966–1981): in his opinion, the magazine’s management and editorial board were excessively elitist and unwilling to open up to younger staff who were consequently precluded from holding positions of trust which, if granted, could have helped the magazine to open up to new trends. The discussion was closed by the president Rudolf Gruber. After admitting that, on account of political expediency, no changes could be made to the magazine board, he contacted the *Landeshauptmann* Siegfried Ludwig (ÖVP, 1981–1992) to discuss a possible redistribution of the funds and to examine the possibility of a merger between ‘Morgen’ and other local cultural information publications (pp. 6–8). *Protokoll des Kuratoriums des NÖ- Fonds*, 9 March 1987 (Vienna), typescript, in Literaturarchiv (LIT) der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), Wien, Nachlass György Sebestyén, Sign. 120/S/109/22-23.

der cooperation brought together Austrian, Czech, Hungarian, Croatian, and Slovenian representatives in Bad Reichenhall (an Alpine Bavarian town very close to the Austrian border, not far from Salzburg), where they decided to establish the ‘Research Institute for the Issues of the Danube Region’ (*Forschungsinstitut für die Fragen des Donaupraumes*, FID, later renamed ‘Donauraum-Institut’)¹⁷. Its foundation owes much to the commitment of an Austrian diplomat and the former head of the political department in the Austrian foreign ministry, Theodor von Hornbostel¹⁸. Its main goal was the development of cultural, scientific, and intellectual cross-border exchanges. The institute’s founding father and first chairman, Hornbostel recognised the need for academic research into this strategic cross-border region, i.e., the Danube basin, and a decade later, his opening speech, given at the Annual Conference in Salzburg, commemorated this:

‘The purpose of the Institute is the study of the social, ethical, historical, legal, cultural, political, and economic problems of the Danube Region, to discuss them in speeches and writing and to work out practical proposals for solutions, which are to serve the demand of (should promote the) peaceful cooperation of the European peoples in general, and that of the Danube region in particular’. The Research Institute should, thus, be in a privileged position to continue the scientific traditions of the former monarchy in those areas where solutions are still needed after its end and in those areas where problems remain unsolved to this day. This applies first and foremost to the national question in the Danube region. Based on this decision of Bad Reichenhall, the Institute was also given the task of dealing with the new problems that arose in the Danube region after 1918 and 1945, above all the question of Austria’s international position, the economic relations between the Danube states and, more recently, the ideological development under the communist governments in the Danube region. Politics is only one subject of the Institute’s research¹⁹.

17 See Großmann, *Die Internationale der Konservativen*. 126–127.

18 For a biographical portrait of Hornbostel, as well as for a deeper analysis of his work within the scientific institution, see Dörner and Dörner-Fazeny, *Theodor von Hornbostel*. 179–187.

19 The purpose of the Institute is to study the social, ethical, historical, legal, cultural, political and economic problems of the Danube region, to discuss them in oral and written form, and to work out practical solutions which should serve the demand for peaceful cooperation between the peoples of Europe in general and the Danube region in particular. The Research Institute should thus be in a position to continue the scientific traditions of the former monarchy, where solutions are still needed after the end of the monarchy and where problems remain unsolved to this day. This applies first and foremost to the national question in the Danube region. No less important is the fact that, on the basis of the Bad Reichenhall decision, the Institute was given the task of dealing with the new problems that arose in the

The struggle for a peaceful and united Europe was, indeed, its main task, but achieving this goal remained a long way off, since the Iron Curtain separated peoples and countries in the Danube region, and the countries of post-war Europe found themselves in very different political and economic conditions.

The ‘Donauraum-Institut’ was the first, and the only (for at least three decades) scientific institution in Austria specifically dedicated to research on the Danube region, on both sides of the border. From 1956 onwards, it published the results of this research in its ‘own journal, entitled “Der Donauraum. Zeitschrift des Forschungsinstitutes für Fragen des Donauraumes” (‘The Danube Region. Journal of the Research Institute for Questions of the Danube Region’)²⁰. Ever since, the Institute has tirelessly promoted activities and conferences to maintain a high level of discussion on a possible transnational cooperation²¹.

1956 was a year of critical transformations and constitutes a turning point in the history of Europe. Not only did the celebrated Hungarian revolution plunge the broader East-Central European scenario into chaos, heightening the conflictual dynamics of post-1945 European history to a new level and proving itself to be meaningful for the wider context of the Cold War and for East-West relationships, but it also thrust new actors onto the stage in the European intellectual debate, especially in Austria, due to its unavoidable proximity to the Hungarian border.

Danube region after 1918 and 1945, above all the question of Austria’s international position, the economic relations between the Danube states and, more recently, the ideological developments under the communist governments in the Danube region. *Politics is only one* of the themes of the Institute’s research. Hornbostel, “Bücher und Zeitschriften”. 257.

20 Quoting Schlenger, “the Research Institute for Danube Region Issues, which was founded two years ago in Salzburg and is chaired by Theodor Hornbostel, has converted its previous newsletter into a quarterly journal, which has enabled it to expand the scope and content of its communications. The Secretary General of the Institute in charge is Peter Berger. According to Hornbostel, the journal serves the ‘task’ and the ‘ideal goal’ of conveying ‘the results of research in a factual manner to circles scattered over all continents who are interested in the manifold problems that the Danube region, with its diverse peoples, has always posed and will continue to pose in the present and future, and, in addition, to provide references to relevant publications and news’. The first issue gives rise to the hope that the editor and the editorial staff will succeed in fulfilling this task. Since not only Slovakia and Moravia, but also Bohemia is included in the Danube region, the readers of the *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* will also learn a lot about their field of interest from the new quarterly”. Schlenger, *Der Donauraum*, 304.

21 See “Tagung des Forschungsinstitutes für Fragen des Donauraumes”, 530, and Berger, “Jahrestagung des Forschungsinstitutes für den Donauraum”, 152–153.

As a matter of fact, Austria, and Vienna in particular, was an important destination for a number of exiles, several of whom were intellectuals²², escaping from the dictatorship in Budapest²³. Among these exiles stands the pivotal figure and multifaceted character of György Sebestyén²⁴.

Sebestyén was born and raised in Budapest and grew up speaking two languages. A passionate communist in his early years, he then became a critic of the regime prior to the uprising of the Hungarians against the Soviet dictatorship, before fleeing to Austria

- 22 Notable among them is Paul Lendvai, a Jewish intellectual born in Hungary (1929) who, like Sebestyén, was an Austrian citizen, journalist, and author. In 1973, he founded the quarterly magazine ‘Europäische Rundschau’, laying the foundations for the beginning of a public political debate on the idea of an East-Central European consciousness. A common status and a harmony of views strongly linked to the Central European Danube area and to the political and intellectual heritage shared by Austria and Hungary, therefore, inform two of the main interpreters of the Austrian cultural debate of the 1970s and 1980s.
- 23 According to Austrian diplomats, the events occurring in Budapest were “an explosion of nationalist circles (namely the Petőfi circle, an intellectual circle within the framework of the Communist Youth League, which opposed Rákosi), within the party against the Rákosi regime”. In fact, it was pointed out, it was “writers and intellectuals who led the opposition, and not the workers”, since “the working class was not brought up with an active fighting spirit”. *Die Opposition gegen Rákosi* (Budapest, 29 June 1956), in ÖStA, AdR, BKA/AA, II-pol, Ungarn 3, Zl. 104-Pol/56 (GZl. 511.185-pol/56). Moreover, Austria’s behaviour was strongly criticised, as stated in the diplomatic reports from the Austrian embassy in Moscow, which underline the Soviet resentment toward the Viennese Chancellery’s policies. In a secret dispatch (1 December 1956), Norbert Bischoff, Austrian ambassador in Moscow, highlighted Khrushchev’s ‘disappointment’ with “Austria’s use of its neutrality” in solving the Hungarian refugee crisis. ÖStA, AdR, BKA/AA, II-pol, Ungarn 3c, Zl. 791.362-Pol/56 (GZl. 511.190-pol/56). Granville, “Of Spies, Refugees and Hostile Propaganda”, 62–90. For a historical overview of Hungary’s fate as a Soviet satellite, see Borhi, *Hungary in the Cold War*.
- 24 György Sebestyén (born Budapest, 30 October 1930, died Vienna, 6 June 1990) was a writer, novelist, director, and journalist. He studied ethnology and philosophy in Hungary and by 1947 he was active as a literary and theatre reviewer in Budapest, part of the so-called revolutionary Petőfi-circle. As one of Imre Nagy’s supporters, he had to flee to Austria in 1956. He wrote many novels and short stories, including *Die Türen schließen sich* (1957 ‘The doors close’), *Der Mann im Sattel* (1961, ‘The man in the Saddle’), *Thennberg oder Versuch einer Heimkehr* (1969, ‘Thennberg or The Attempt at a Homecoming’), *Der Faun im Park* (1972, ‘The Faun in the Park’), *Albino* (1984), *Die Werke der Einsamkeit* (1986, ‘The Works of Solitude’). From 1973 Sebestyén was the editor of the ‘Pannonia’, magazine and, from 1977, of the cultural magazine ‘Morgen’. Originally on the far left politically, he later adopted more moderate positions. Ackerl and Weissensteiner, *Österreichisches Personenlexikon*, 443. For a more extensive portrait, see Schramm and Sebestyén (ed.), *György Sebestyén*. Also, see his autobiography, Sebestyén, *Vorläufige Behausungen*.

after the uprising was suppressed²⁵. In Vienna, Sebestyén was quickly accepted into the circle of the up-and-coming generation of local authors, such as Heimito von Doderer, Alexander Lernet-Holenia and George Saiko (which also included, among others, Herbert Eisenreich, Milo Dor, Reinhard Federmann, Peter von Tramin, Herbert Zand, Humbert Fink), and established himself as a flamboyant narrator, writer, journalist and theatre critic. He became an Austrian citizen in 1963 and from the mid-Seventies onwards he adopted a new approach to the issue of Mitteleuropa: from 1973 to 1990 he published the magazine *Pannonia*, which soon became an organ for cultural cooperation in Central Europe. Numerous authors from the Eastern Bloc, including many from the Soviet Union, contributed to the journal.

Sebestyén was one of the first European authors to deal with and address the Hungarian uprising of 1956 on a literary level: his personality emerges through the pages of his novel *‘Die Türen schließen sich’*²⁶ and it is clear that, as a result of the positive combination of Austrian and Hungarian cultures, which are so different but nevertheless intimately linked, he was endowed with a unique awareness and attitude. This pushed him to encourage various cultural initiatives in order to bring together two realities that, despite their geographical proximity, were politically distant. He was deeply convinced of a different idea of Europe since, as highlighted by Helmut Niederle, Sebestyén, he “dreamed of a Europe of an unlimited interchange of opinions, a continent of open borders”²⁷.

The Budapest-born journalist was a convinced supporter of both a new approach to Austrian cultural policy and the importance of ‘regional policies’, particularly re-

25 For an autobiographical recollection, see *Warum ich für den Pen-Club bin. Ein Weltverband der Einsamkeiten...*, in “Die Furche”, 15 November 1975. Also, see LIT, Nachlass György Sebestyén (120/98), 4.3.2.36, 120/s/90, Pannonia betreffend, *Lebenslauf* (Wien, 6 March 1967). *Die Opposition gegen Rákosi* (Budapest, 29 June 1956), in ÖStA, AdR, BKA/AA, II-pol, Ungarn 3, Zl. 104-Pol/56 (GZl. 511.185-pol/56): “Meanwhile Stalin’s shadow began to lose its impact within the public opinion, the political opposition against Rákosi started to take courage and appears always more and more organised (...). A new element emerged within the party, which in Hungarian political life has played a significant role, and which is now emerging as the fiercest enemy of Rákosi, namely authors, writers, journalists and intellectuals”.

26 Sebestyén, *Die Türen schließen sich*. On this topic, see Maurer, “Hingerichtet und wir leben noch”.

27 György Sebestyén had a dream of a Europe of free exchange, a continent of open borders. See Niederle, “György Sebestyén und der österreichische Pen”, 77.

garding border areas with linguistic minorities, such as Lower Austria and Burgenland, considered, on Austrian soil, as being the most closely interconnected regions with the macro-theme of the Danube region²⁸.

Sebestyén was a strong advocate of the need to strengthen regionalism and democratic federalism and promoted the setting-up of working groups to discuss and intervene in culture and the economy, and to encourage cross-border relations between regional areas with a similar background, such as Bavaria and the north-eastern regions of Italy (with particular attention to foreign workers from other northern parts of the country historically linked to the Austrian cultural heritage). On a more concrete level, it was necessary to promote the establishment of inner circles, a founding principle, for example, behind the constitution of the ‘Ethnic Group Institute’ (*Volkgruppen-Institut*) in Hornstein (at that time the largest municipality in Burgenland with Croatian speaking inhabitants in 1976), the ‘Institute for Comparative Cultural History of the Austrian Ethnic Groups’ (*Institut für vergleichende Kulturgeschichte der österreichischen Volkgruppen*, 1983), as well as the ‘Donaufestival’ (1988)²⁹.

He symbolises the beginning of a different approach toward the Danubian issue, characterised by an alternative approach to East-West conflicts, and bringing important changes in the Mittel Europe debate. With his cultural and political commitment, Sebestyén stood up for East-West understanding and stimulated the discussion about Central Europe anew.

28 The Magyar presence in Austria was mainly concentrated in Burgenland, which was where the only officially recognised institution for the tutelage of this minority, the ‘Burgenland Hungarian Cultural Association’ was active (*Burgenländische Ungarische Kulturverein*). From 1968 onwards it published an annual information sheet, *Őrség*, promoted and directed by Janos Moór, and later by Ferenc Galambos. It often addressed the problems of protecting a community that was constantly shrinking due to the reduction in the number of members of the Hungarian community. Data is difficult to quantify, due to the lack of statistical information. In the last census mentioned by the magazine, 1981, question of mother tongue of the population was not included in conclusions about the social composition of the population. “Pannonia” stated: “the Magyar minority in the last sixteen years has been reduced by 62.8% compared to the other minority communities present in Austria (28.6% South Tiroleans, 56.1% Ladin)”. Tüskés, “Strahlungen einer kleinen Welt.” *Pannonia* no. 2 (1988): 13–14. For a wider overview on the history of German minority in the region, see Sparwasser, *Identität im Spannungsfeld von Zwangsmigration und Heimkehr*, Márkus, “Behandlung der deutschen Minderheit Ungarns während und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg.” 247–268.

29 His considerations and suggestions can be found here: Sebestyén, *Zur Kulturpolitik in Niederösterreich. Einige grundsätzliche Erwägungen und Anregungen* (28.07.1986), LIT 120/S/109/9-20.

Meanwhile, in 1958, on behalf of Heinrich Drimmel, Minister of Education (ÖVP), a young researcher who would go on to be appointed professor, Richard Plaschka founded the ‘Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Ost- und Südosteuropaforschung’ (Working Group for East and South-East European Studies, renamed ‘Österreichisches Ost- und Südosteuropainstitut’). Nonetheless, the idea of Mitteleuropa struggled to acquire popularity among Austrians, with motivated reasoning playing its part in its lack of credibility among the public, since it was almost certainly still interpreted as a vestige of a by then distant past. Even so, a number of politicians, mainly People’s Party representatives (Fritz Bock, Alois Mock, and Erhard Busek) did not hesitate in their speeches, albeit occasionally, to emphasize the need to develop deeper cooperation with the countries of the Eastern Bloc.

The East-Central European idea was therefore not a marginal issue, but neither was it a central one. The primary concern for Austrian politicians on both sides of the political spectrum, namely the ÖVP and the SPÖ, was to avoid raising an excessive outcry over the idea of Mitteleuropa, which would inevitably have been viewed negatively by the Great Powers, irritating their ‘sensibilities’, as it could be inevitably considered, if not as a ‘revanchist claim’, then at least a symptom of an aspiration to feed a still unsatiated Pan-Germanist yearning³⁰.

In any case, Austria’s neutral status (since 1955) made it possible to create a space for mediation and communication with the countries beyond the Iron Curtain. Thus, cross-border cultural circulation facilitated the revival of interactions between Austrian cultural players and their East-Central European counterparts, which had never been entirely severed in the decades following the outbreak of the Cold War. Thus, from the mid-1950s onwards, cultural interchanges with Eastern European countries were actively promoted, first and foremost with Hungary, considered “the weakest link in the chain of satellite cities” of the Kremlin³¹. In June, 1956, for example, the “Vienna Boys Choir” performed in Budapest; as noted by the Austrian embassy in Hungary, the *Wiener Sängerknaben*, this group, once depicted as a “symbol of the capitalist deca-

30 Marjanović, “L’idée d’Europe centrale”, 73–76. Marjanović has highlighted how, in the wider composite intellectual milieu, the first traces of a revival of the Mitteleuropa idea were envisioned in Italy in the early 1960s, with the publication of a study by Claudio Magris, then a young Germanist from Trieste, entitled ‘The Habsburg myth in modern Austrian literature’. See Magris, *Il mito asburgico*.

31 Statement made by the Austrian ambassador in Budapest, Walther Peinsipp. *Die Wachenablösung in Budapest* (27 July 1956), in ÖStA, BMfaA, AdR/II, Pol/56, Ungarn 3b.

dence”, was now portrayed differently by the Hungarian press and welcomed, “thanks to the political distension”, as a “significant step toward (a better) Austrian–Hungarian relationship”. Shortly after this, another important step was officially taken, this time by the Hungarian government: on the occasion of Mozart’s bicentenary the Austrian envoy to Budapest Walther Peinsipp³² was invited to attend the inauguration of a Mozart exhibition in Budapest³³.

These interchanges were later intensified from the early 1970s onwards, both on the musical scene – see, for instance, the road show by the Vienna Philharmonic (*Wiener Philharmoniker*), which toured the major cities and capitals of the so-called Eastern Bloc (Prague, Budapest, Wrocław, Brno and Bratislava)³⁴ – and in the area of communications; see for instance the collaboration proposed by the Austrian state television (ÖRF) to start a partnership with the Czechoslovak state television³⁵.

The mid-1970s marked another important opportunity for Austria to strengthen its neighbourhood policy, not only at the federal level: as underlined by Marjanović, it was implemented on a transregional basis with the establishment of the ‘Alps–Adriatic’ working group (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft Alpe–Adria*, ARGE) in November 1978³⁶. The main goals of this group, instituted as a transnational community between the Alpine regions of Bavaria (Germany), Carinthia, Styria, Tyrol, and Burgenland (Austria), Friuli Venezia Giulia, with Trieste (Italy), Slovenia and Croatia (Yugoslavia), were to jointly discuss and coordinate issues that were in the interest of the members, in order to develop cooperation and exchange in the Alps–Adriatic area in the fields of culture, economy, environment, spatial planning and energy problems, communication and transport.

32 Peinsipp (1906–1990) – later better known as the ‘Austrian Hero of Budapest’ – headed the Austrian diplomatic representation in Budapest as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary between 1956 and 1962. Follner, *Österreichs Spitzendiplomaten*, 354–356.

33 *Die Wiener Sängerknaben in Budapest* (26 June, 1956), and *Mozart-Ausstellung in Budapest* (27 June, 1956), in ÖStA, BMfaA, AdR/II, Pol/56, Ungarn, K1.

34 For a recollection of that period, see the memoirs of Paul Twaroch, General Secretary of Austrian State television from 1970 to 1978, *Das Land der Böhmen mit der Seele suchend. Begegnung mit den Nachbarn*, in “Morgen”, N. 36 (1984), pp. 198–200. Also, see the diplomatic reports dispatched by the Austrian Federal Foreign Minister to its embassies located in Eastern Bloc countries, in ÖStA, BMfaA, AdR/II, Pol/60–70.

35 Knobl, “Mit dem Osten reden“, 3. Also, see Marjanović, *L’idée d’Europe centrale*, 75–78.

36 Marjanović, *Die Mitteleuropa*, 85. and onwards.

tation, tourism and sports, and to strengthen the Central European cultural identity³⁷. On the one hand, then, an increasingly vivid and multifaceted debate was taking place on cross-border interactions, even though the Danube basin and adjacent areas were then unconditionally affected by the clash between the superpowers. On the other hand, however, the ideological conflict neither discouraged nor slowed down the various attempts to create a space that would guarantee at least a limited margin of manoeuvre.

A crucial moment in the history of relations between Austria and its Eastern neighbouring countries, still under Soviet control, is represented by the 1980s. This is when a clear political awareness emerged within the Vienna Chancellery of the valuable work that could be accomplished in the wider international context, namely a cultural policy capable of advancing a new strategic vision of the idea of a shared Mitteleuropa, based on a common ideal, values and identity heritage.³⁸

In addition, we must also take into account the long tradition of using landscapes for national representation, strictly connected with the nation-building processes of the last centuries, which played, of course, a significant, political role in the national symbol systems of the region. The Austrian case is particularly remarkable, since it shows the prominent role landscape can play in both national and transregional identity constructions. As Tobias Schweiger has pointed out, “wherever the production of ‘homeland’ is involved in Austria, landscape (also) is part of the game”.³⁹

The ‘Program of the Foreign Cultural Conference of the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs’ (*Programm der Auslandskulturtagung des Bundesministeriums für auswärtige Angelegenheiten*) was an exemplary initiative launched by the Austrian ministry of foreign affairs led by Alois Mock and was of great relevance on account of its polit-

37 This cooperation favoured a gradual introduction of the term Alps–Adriatic region as a geographic description of the territory. Moreover, at the beginning of the 1980s, when the Austrian province of Burgenland and some Western Hungarian counties joined the group [on this issue, see Jurić-Pahor, “The Alps–Adriatic Region”, 189–191. The geographic term Alps–Adriatic–Pannonian region was introduced to better specify the area of the Working Group. Klemenčič, “Indigenous National/Ethnic Minorities”, 10.

38 On this topic, see Graf and Meisinger (Eds.), *Österreich im Kalten Krieg*, 283 onwards. On the diversity of the Habsburg Monarchy and the national question, see, among others, Csáky, “Die Vielfalt der Habsburgermonarchie”.

39 “überall dort, wo es in Österreich (auch) um die Produktion von “Heimat” geht, ist Landschaft mit im Spiel”. Schweiger, “Zur Repräsentation von ‘Landschaft’”, 401. Also see Breuss, Liebhart and Pribersky, *Österreichische Identitäten*, 34–37.

ical repercussions, The initiative was headed by Bernhard Stillfried – one of the formative figures in Austrian foreign cultural policy in the 1970s and the 1980s, head of the Cultural Policy Section of the ministry – starting in September 1988.⁴⁰ As the Cabinet of the Federal ministry (now renamed ‘Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs’) emphasised in its own Yearbook of 1988 (in the section on “Cultural Policy Abroad and International Scientific cooperation”), Austrian foreign cultural policy “has a special mediating function, especially in publicising and promoting contemporary artistic and scientific work in Austria”. Increased Austrian involvement in international cooperation in Europe, including and especially between East and West, meant that the Vienna Chancellery increased its specific engagement in cultural and scientific relations with its neighbouring countries to the East:

The entry into a new phase of cooperation with these states – stated the Cabinet of Foreign Affairs – is signalled by the expansion of Austrian cultural representations in this region: in December an agreement was signed on the establishment of cultural institutes in Prague and Vienna and a second cultural envoy has already been sent to Prague. The staff of the Cultural Institute in Budapest will be increased in order to support the preparations for the planned World Exhibition Vienna–Budapest and to participate in the design of the cultural framework programme⁴¹.

40 Bernhard Stillfried (1925–2011), distinguished and decorated diplomat, historian, and anthropologist, began his career as a programme assistant for the BBC European Service in London (1953–58) and was later appointed head of the Cultural Department for the Middle East (1958–1974); Stillfried directed the Austrian Cultural Institute in London (1975–1986) and was head of the Cultural Policy Section of the Foreign Ministry (1986–1990), also serving as consultant to Foreign Minister Alois Mock. For a portrait of Stillfried, see Erschen, *Stillfried*.

41 *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Außenpolitik, Außenpolitischer Bericht, 1988*, 304–305. The report continued: “An essential part of this year’s *Auslandskulturtagung* (Foreign Cultural Conference) was the panel discussion on the topic ‘1918–1988. Austria and its Neighbours. From Disintegration to Cooperation’: this discussion saw the participation of renowned representatives from the CSSR, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Poland, and Italy. In order to promote the desired expansion of cultural cooperation in the Danube region, a ‘Danube Region Working Group’ (*Arbeitskreis Donauregion*) was set up in June on the initiative of the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs. The group counts among its members a number of personalities from the fields of culture and science. The goal and task of the committee is to counsel the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs in its efforts to deepen contacts in this region. The activities of the working group have already been fruitful for the Austrian foreign cultural programme. For example, this group’s proposals were the basis for the symposium entitled ‘Austria–Hungary. Example of a Neighbourhood in Europe’ held in Budapest, a commemorative event in Görz (Gorizia) with the participation of the Austrian Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs and an Italian minister on the subject of ‘1918–1988: Italy and Austria. A new chapter of common history’, as well as meetings of journalists in Prague and Belgrade with

Through an original initiative promoted at the end of the 1980s by the Section for Cultural Relations Abroad of the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs (BMEIA), Austrian libraries and cultural centres were established in the then still communist states of East-Central and South-East Europe, an act that showed, before the international political changes, a unique sense of foresight. Moreover, Stillfried, who was working as a consultant to the foreign minister Alois Mock at the time, set up a lectorate program for Austrian literature and history and for the dissemination of Austrian–German heritage in Austrian libraries in the countries of the former Eastern Bloc, at the latter’s request from 1989 onwards⁴².

As regards personal relations and specific personalities, it is worth acknowledging the important role of Wolfgang Petritsch, for the SPÖ, and Erhard Busek, for the ÖVP, in the international debate over transnational-transregional partnership, and in establishing Austria as a trusted part of the multilevel networking processes that were taking place at that time at a broader level. Since the Kreisky Era in the 1970s, there had already been some attempts in the ranks of the ÖVP’s opposition to establish contacts with the increasingly active opposition groups in the neighbouring states of East-Central Europe, especially on the part of the party’s foremost exponent of urbane liberalism, Erhard Busek (then a Viennese town councillor, and later vice-chancellor in the grand SPÖ–ÖVP coalition, as well as chairman of the Austrian People’s Party). A key participant in the ‘Mitteleuropa’ debates of the 1980s⁴³, as Minister for Science and Research (1989–1994) he was responsible for crucially important changes in higher education, paving the way for a European, shared model⁴⁴.

the motto of eliminating mutual prejudices. In its activities abroad, the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs can currently count upon 10 cultural institutes and more than 80 professional representative authorities, 13 of whom have their own officials for cultural agendas. Austria can make use of a variety of media for the presentation of its art and science: exhibitions, musical and literary events, donations of books, artistic workshops, academic events in the form of lectures, seminars, symposia, sponsorships, etc. It is quite in keeping with these intentions that a large proportion of these events is carried out in cooperation with foreign partners”. *Ibid.*

42 In 1993, at Mock’s request, Bernhard Stillfried voluntarily took over the management of the newly founded *Österreich-Kooperation*, which assisted in the supervision of the ‘Austrian Libraries’.

43 On the debate over whether Central Europe is an ephemeral phenomenon or a historical fact, see Mozetič, “Mythos Mitteleuropa”. Maier, “Wessen Mitteleuropa?”, 171–192, and 193–210.

44 On this topic, see Leidenfrost, “The Demise of ‘Minoritenplatz-Schleicherei’”, 283–319. A

Pannonia

Central to the Austrian second post-war political and cultural debate was a political stance oriented towards an East-Central Europe that lay within the borders of the former Danube Monarchy, despite the difficult situation emerging after 1945 (with the military occupation of the country and its ‘hybrid’ political position, like a Western spur on the edge of the Iron Curtain). However, the East gradually also became an increasingly central topic within intellectual debate in Austria and the focus of various periodicals that were committed to highlighting a transnational identity heritage of the ‘Danube region’, which had been historically particularly relevant for Austrian-German history. Nevertheless, in a period distinguished by the enormous contrasts of a still divided Europe, the first Austrian journal to express and consistently advocate a tangible yearning for understanding between Central-European nations was *Pannonia* magazine, which described itself as a means of bridging the gap⁴⁵. As *Pannonia* stated in its first issue, “the aim of the journal is to promote encounters between different peoples and cultures in Europe”⁴⁶.

György Sebestyén, a Budapest-born journalist, was the project creator, founder, and editor-in-chief of the magazine *Pannonia* (full title: *Pannonia. Magazin für Mitteleuropa* from December 1973 to 6 June 1990 (the date of his death) and, from 1974, of the *Magazin für Europäische Zusammenarbeit* – ‘Pannonia. Magazine for Central-Europe’, and later ‘Magazine for European Cooperation’)⁴⁷. He provided the regional East-Cen-

more detailed description can be found in: Hummer, Vom “Europäischen Hochschulraum”.

45 On the political concept of Austria’s traditional ‘bridging function’ between East and West especially in the 1970s-1980s, see Gehler and Graf (eds.), *Europa und die deutsche Einheit*, 117–139; Gehler, “‘Europe’, Europeanisations and their Meaning”; Fröhlich-Steffen, *Die Österreichische Identität im Wandel*, Gehler, *Der lange Weg nach Europa* 213–425 (vol. 2). Angerer, “Für eine Geschichte der österreichischen Neutralität”. 702–708.

46 *Pannonisches* (Editorial), in “Pannonia”, n. 1 (December 1973), 4.

47 The magazine was printed and published in Eisenstadt, the provincial capital of Burgenland (the easternmost Austrian state, near to the Hungarian border) by the publishing house Rötzer; its editor-in-chief was György Sebestyén, while Erich Schimmerl (and, two years later, Walter Wächtler) was the editor-in-chief. A quarterly magazine (its starting price was 35 Austrian schillings), “Pannonia” was registered (as number 17) in the section on culture, art, philology, and society of the Austrian press. Verband Österreichischer Zeitungsherausgeber und Zeitungsverleger (ed.), *Österreichs Presse Werbung Graphik*, Handbuch 22 (1974), 313.

tral European discourse with a forum in which not only authors, artists and journalists on both sides of the blocs⁴⁸, but also politicians, actively participated⁴⁹.

His main goal was to satisfy a spiritual need in the Pannonia region, a demand for a permanent peace movement. This way of thinking was a result of the situation prevailing at the time, i.e., the Cold war, and aimed to bring together Austrians, Slavic peoples of different cultures, Hungarians and (North-East) Italians, whom, over the centuries, had lived side by side in a specific area, the Danube basin, that is to say the various inhabitants who were linked together by their cultural uniqueness. According to Anton Fennes, “György Sebestyén wanted to create a magazine in which the situation (of East-Central Europe) was reflected, in which an exemplary model was presented and displayed. He wanted to do something against national Fanaticism and against prejudice, he did not want to talk about peace, but to strengthen it through the presence of this magazine”⁵⁰.

Since this long-term and clearly challenging task was carried out in Austria, it was therefore quite reasonable that, within the Alpine country, the ideal base camp from which to start this mission was Burgenland, Austria’s easternmost state that is closely linked to Hungarian and Slavic culture. Sebestyén deserves credit for contributing to

48 Almost all the members of the editorial board, belonged to a close circle of collaborators. They included (in alphabetical order): Tschingis Ajtmatow, Jurij Archibow, Sergej Barusdin, Karl Bednarik, Ivan Boldizsár, Rudolf Chmel, Moritz Csáky, Iwajlo Ditschew, Anton Donschew, Stephan Hermlin, Ivan Ivanji, Heinz Kahlau, Márton Kalász, Zoran Konstantinović, Zlatko Krasni, Claudio Magris, Christoph Meckel, Leopold Melichar, Helmut Stefan Milletich, Assen Nejkow, János Nemes, Jürgen Heinrich Petersen, Margit Pflagner, Rado Pytlik, Ignacy Rutkiewicz, Waclaw Sadkowski, Erich Schimmerl, Günter Unger, Peter Vujka, Richard Winger, Peter Zajac. Cf. Esterhammer, Gaigg, and Köhle, *Handbuch österreichischer*; 749–756.

49 On the number and nature of Sebestyén’s personal interactions with representatives of the Austrian and Central-East European intellectual élites, see the Hungarian-born Austrian journalist-writer’s numerous exchanges of letters, now accessible in Teilnachlass György Sebestyén, Wienbibliothek, Handschriftensammlung, ZPH-681/2.1-2.3 (Archivbox 2, Korrespondenzen).

50 “György Sebestyén wollte eine Zeitschrift machen, in der sich die Lage widerspiegelte, in der das Modellhafte vorgestellt und reflektiert wurde. Er wollte etwas gegen nationalen Fanatismus und gegen Vorurteile tun und er wollte nicht über den Frieden reden, sondern ihn durch die Existenz dieser Zeitschrift stärken”. Fennes, “Das Burgenland als Medienlandschaft.”, 256.

opening a gap in the Iron Curtain: together with Alois Mock and Fred Sinowatz⁵¹, he was among the first to recognise the remarkable opportunity to cut through the Curtain through activity in the fields of culture, art, and literature. Significantly, since the early 1970s, the Austrian journalist and author had revived the term ‘Pannonia’ with the purpose of giving a transborder area (namely the Danubian basin district) its own identarian distinctiveness which had long been lacking.

According to Sebestyén, in order to pursue its goals, *Pannonia* had marked out a clear approach for dealing with the transnational question: firstly, it seems important to me to reduce the resentments in the Danube region, not by contumeliousness (offending), but by a truthful presentation of the intellectual processes in these countries. One should not talk about internationalism, but make it happen where one is. Secondly, this part of Europe is an area in which many minor peoples, (and) very different ethnic groups live in very different social models.⁵²

The quarterly, published in Eisenstadt, immediately became an essential point of reference for all forms of transregional cooperation⁵³ in many different fields, such as cultural exchange, tourism, energy management, transport and spatial planning and scientific research. As a result of Sebestyén’s efforts and through the literary contributions and essays that appeared in it *Pannonia* served as a stimulator of Central-East European intellectual life, carrying out an important role in cultural mediation. Sebestyén hired correspondents from Eastern Europe to write for the magazine, setting up bases in Berlin, Budapest, Krakow, Ljubljana, Moscow, Warsaw, and Zagreb; this international editorial team allowed *Pannonia*, regardless of the Iron Curtain which divided Europe,

51 Fred Sinowatz (1929–2008), historian and politician, was born and raised in Burgenland, the only child of a working-class family. He joined the Socialist Party (SPÖ) after graduating from high school and was active in the Socialist Students, becoming the chairman of the local SPÖ organisation in 1957. He entered the provincial parliament in 1961, and a year later was appointed provincial party secretary. In 1971 Bruno Kreisky brought Sinowatz into his cabinet as Federal Minister for Education and the Arts (1971–1983), and, in January 1981, he became Vice-Chancellor. After Bruno Kreisky’s resignation, he was proposed for the chancellorship and took over the chairmanship of the SPÖ (1983). He was Austrian Federal Chancellor from 24 May 1983 to 16 June 1986, announcing his resignation on 9 June 1986, after the defeat of the SPÖ candidate Kurt Steyrer in the Federal Presidential election, and, two years later, he resigned from political office and retired to private life.

52 Rösicke, “Die geistige Vorgänge im Donauraum”

53 For a broader reflection on the transregional connections, see Castryck-Naumann, “Introduction”.

to become a mirror image of the Eastern European situation. Among others, they included Gerd Bacher (1925–2015, Austrian journalist), Thomas Bernhard (1931–1989, Austrian writer, dramaturge and poet), Elias Canetti (1905–1994, Bulgarian-born British German-language writer, novelist, playwright), Milo Dor (1923–2005, Serbian-born Austrian writer, translator, and poet member of the so-called ‘Group 47’), Albert Drach (1902–1995, Austrian–Jewish writer), Ingeborg Drewitz (1923–1986, German writer and academic), Jeannie Ebner (1918–2004, Austrian writer), Franz Endler (1937–2002, Austrian music critic and cultural journalist), Gertrud Fussenegger (1912–2009, Austrian writer, and author), Alexander Giese (1921–2016 Austrian cultural-journalist, and author), Michael Guttenbrunner (1919–2004, Austrian poet), Stephan Hermlin (1915–1997, German writer), Ivan Ivanji (1929, Serbian author, personal interpreter of the Yugoslavian president Tito, Secretary General of the Yugoslav Writers’ Union, 1982–88), Ernst Jandl (1925–2000, Austrian experimental poet), Robert Jungk (1913–1994, German–Jewish-born journalist), Hermann Kesten (1900–1996, Galician-born German novelist), Claudio Magris (1939, Italian writer, translator, and academic), Ernst Wolfram Marboe (1938–2012, Austrian journalist, and author), Friederike Mayröcker (1924–2021, Austrian poet and writer) Andreas Okopenko (1930–2010, Austrian writer, and member of the so-called ‘Wiener Gruppe’, along with Jandl and Mayröcker), Hugo Portisch (1927–2021, Austrian journalist), Ernst Schönwiese (1905–1991, Austrian writer, and poet), Friedrich Torberg (1908–1979, Austrian writer, and translator), Hans Weigel (1908–1991, Austrian writer, and drama critic), Erik G. Wickenburg (1903–1998, Austrian journalist, and writer), and Dorothea Zeemann (1909–1993, Austrian writer).

For Sebestyén, and for all those intellectuals close to ‘Pannonia’s’ circle, renewing a ‘new’ solidarity that would be able to prevail over the ideological borders that had become demarcation lines not only between West and East, but also between democracy and Communist dictatorship, between freedom of speech, and censorship and suppression of human rights, meant fighting alongside those on the other side of the Iron Curtain who longed for more democracy and freedom. In a nutshell, the challenge was to build, alongside people from both sides of the ‘wall’ who yearned for rights and freedom of thought, a new living dimension for all human beings that respected people and their individual rights and beliefs, a new approach based not just on ideological conflicts, but on a common peaceful coexistence among all Europeans.

That Sebestyén could engage in this form of constructive action and cooperation based on open dialogue and a transnational confrontation was thanks to the development of a comprehensive, political consensus among all the Austrian parties. The Budapest-born journalist could count on a large group of convinced key members of the political establishment, both local, and national figures, united by the desire to keep a ‘window open’ on the fenced-in courtyard of East-Central Europe. These figures included: Erhard Busek (deputy mayor and city councillor of Vienna, deputy to the National Council, *Nationalrat*, Minister of Education, Science and Research, Vice-Chancellor, 1991–1995), Siegfried Ludwig (Governor of Lower Austria, *Niederösterreich*, 1981–1992), Jörg Mauthe (city councillor of Vienna, cultural director of the party), Alois Mock (deputy to the *Nationalrat*, chairman of the People’s Party, Minister of Education and of Foreign Affairs, Vice-Chancellor, 1987–1989), Theodor Piffl-Perčević (deputy to the *Nationalrat*, Minister of Education), for the Christian-conservative People’s Party (ÖVP); Hertha Firnberg (deputy to the *Nationalrat*, Minister of Science), Heinz Fischer (deputy, and later president, 1990–2002, of the *Nationalrat*, Minister of Science, future Austrian Federal President, 2004–2016), Leopold Gratz (Mayor of Vienna, 1973–1984, Minister of Foreign Affairs, President of the *Nationalrat*, 1986–1989), Theodor Kery (Governor of Burgenland, 1966–1987), Bruno Kreisky (deputy to the *Nationalrat*, chairman of the Socialist Party, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Chancellor, 1970–1983), Fred Sinowatz (Minister of Education and Arts, 1971–1983, Vice-Chancellor, Chancellor, 1983–1986), and Helmut Zilk (Minister of Education and Arts, 1983–1984, Mayor of Vienna, 1984–1994), for the Socialist Party (SPÖ); the independent Rudolf Kirchschläger (diplomat, Minister of Foreign Affairs, twice Federal President of Austria, 1974–1986), and, for the Freedom Party, Friedrich Peter (Chairman of the Party, FPÖ, 1958–1978). Although coming from distinct perspectives, they all addressed the problem of identity in East-Central Europe, related to the Austrian borders and its relationships with neighbouring states, both in Western Europe, and in the Danube Basin.

The pan-European magazine’s sections, subjects and editorial content shifted over the years, demonstrating its open and consistent focus on cultural, social, political, and economic changes, both in Austrian and in Central European society.

In the third issue of 1974 an article appears in which Sebestyén takes the Cypriot conflict as a starting point to ‘warn’ the international community about the risks of a nationalistic policy and to show how, in contrast, dialogue between the different territorial

components and between different cultures, such as the culturally united Greek and Turkish, can generate peace⁵⁴. The fight against nationalism is the thread running through many articles, therefore, and can be linked to the dramatic ‘Swabians affair’⁵⁵.

Clearly, *Pannonia*’s focus on Hungary was constant since the very first issues: not only because of the inevitable, understandable, and emotional motives of the editor-in-chief, but also on account of the deep and lasting ties between Austria and Hungary that have been woven over centuries, consolidated by a long tradition of Magyar German-language journalism, dating back to the third decade of the 18th century⁵⁶. It is precisely in the wake of this tradition that Sebestyén’s work of promoting dialogue followed. Furthermore, this was exactly the intention behind the decision to publish, for the first time ever, several special issues of *Pannonia*, including a number of foreign magazines, fully translated into German. An edition of the Warsaw literary magazine ‘Odra’ came out in 1979⁵⁷, the first time a magazine from the Eastern Bloc was publicised in Austria. The same happened a few months later, in Autumn, with the publication of the Hungarian literary monthly ‘Uj Irás’⁵⁸. In Spring 1981 the magazine started a section specifically dedicated to Russian literature, an initiative launched following the invitation of an Austrian delegation to Moscow (the previous May), led by Sebestyén and composed of the Burgenland editor Rudolf Walter Rötzer, and by a Hungarian journalist who was the head of the Budapest editorial office, Janos Nemes⁵⁹. Such achievements were made possibly not only thanks to Sebestyén’s dedication, but also to editorial offices abroad

54 Sebestyén, “Nicosia! Nicosia!”, See also Lachs, “Viele Nationen, eine einzige Geschichte”

55 On Swabian refugees, and on the special relationship which bound Austria to Hungary, see Riesz, “Letze Chance Wiedersehen”.

56 See, for instance, Rényi, “Auf den Spuren des “Pester Lloyd””.

57 On the special edition of *Pannonia* in the cultural monthly *Odra*, see *Sonderdruck der Pannonia. Odra, Monatsschrift für Kultur, Wroclaw, Polen*, in “Pannonia”, no. 1 (Spring 1979), 49–81.

58 The monthly *Uj Irás* (New Script), was published for the first time in a 22-page special edition within the 3/1979 (Autumn) issue of *Pannonia*. It received good reviews – besides notable praise for the Austrian magazine for its editorial policy – from the Hungarian weekly *Budapester Rundschau* (17 December 1979). The *Budapester Rundschau*, a 12-page political-economic-cultural weekly in the German language, provided all the news and current affairs, successes, and political and economic problems “which affect the people living between the Danube and the Thies”.

59 Cf. the report published in the monthly publication edited by the Cultural Office of the Soviet Embassy in Vienna, in Strachow, “Sowohl ein Kochbuch”, 48.

and an internationally staffed editorial committee, fundamental to continuing the work of networking in the Mitteleuropa area.

In several of the articles appearing in *Pannonia*, albeit from different viewpoints and perspectives, there is an insistence on the importance of maintaining and continuing to strengthen the special relations between Austria and Hungary, where, despite the troubled past, there was still a strong presence of Swabians, the German-speaking minority, estimated at 200,000, in the autumn of 1981⁶⁰.

The orientation towards an East-Central Europe that lay within the borders of the former Danube Monarchy was also found in other periodicals, but hardly any of them treated the subject as consistently as the magazine *Pannonia*, under its editor-in-chief Sebestyén.

The desire for ‘understanding among nations’ was confronted with the enormous contrasts of a still divided Europe, but this was the very reason why the journal saw itself as a means of bridging the gap. This was a challenging task indeed, but then again, Austria itself played a substantial role, almost certainly thanks to its special, international legal status, which made the Alpine country, as the author Michael Scharang put it, “the spiritual Cold Pole of Central Europe”.

Pannonia hosted several political, economic, and cultural contributions, and in addition, literary or literature-related texts took up a large part of its issues. The number and importance of authors from all the East European countries was considerable; literary figures from Burgenland or other regions of Austria added to the overall picture, rather than standing in the foreground, except for Milo Dor and György Sebestyén. The promotion of foreign literature, chiefly East-Central European literature, was in a sort of shared custody with the International Pen-Club: one of its aims, as a matter of fact, was

60 Danube Swabians, or Danube Germans, is a collective term for the Germans who emigrated to the lands of the Hungarian Crown from the end of the 17th to the second half of the 19th century, settling in areas located along the middle course of the Danube in the Pannonian Plain. The settlements remained imperial crown land until the end of the 19th century, while the remaining but larger Danube Swabian settlement areas were incorporated into the Hungarian county administration. Nevertheless, after the Second World War, tens of thousands of Danube Swabians were expelled from Batschka, Slavonia, Syrmia and Banat and fled mainly to Germany and Austria, while in Hungary, half of the Hungarian Germans were expelled. The remaining Danube Swabians were marginalised, dispossessed, and, in many cases, deported to the Soviet Union. Cf. Seewann and Portmann, *Donauschwaben*. Hausleitner, *Die Donauschwaben 1868–1948*.

the cultural promotion of literature and bilateral and multilateral exchanges⁶¹.

Possibly inspired by the Pen Charter – which affirmed that “literature (although national in origin) knows no frontiers and must remain common currency among people (and between nations) in spite of political or international upheavals”⁶² – Sebestyén ought to be considered a forerunner in drawing attention to the writers and authors of East-Central Europe, together with Ernst Schönwiese.

61 This happened especially from the late 1950s onwards, when the Fund for Intellectual Freedom (FIF) was launched by the Hungarian-born British novelist, journalist, and critic, Arthur Koestler, later becoming the Fund for Exiled Writers (FEW). Organised in Germany, the U.S.A (New York), France (Paris), and of course, in England (London), the FIF, thanks to its London branch, worked with Pen in jointly promoting an important campaign for Hungarian refugees in the mid-1950s. Later, a resolution passed by a ballot during the 31st Congress in Rio (1960) led to the founding of the International Writers’ Fund, under the administration of Pen (the first director was David Carver, while a small group of international writers served as honorary chairs). The Fund supported the professional development of writers worldwide, via financial support for publishing, and attendance at congresses.

62 Forged amidst the harsh realities of World War II, the Charter of Pen International was definitively approved and ratified at the 20th International Pen Congress held in Copenhagen (Denmark) on 3 June 1948. Two resolutions had been previously presented at the first Congress after WWII (1946, in Stockholm): the first urged PEN members ‘to champion the ideals of one humanity living at peace in one world’; the second addressed the issue of censorship, sparking a lively debate on the wording and scope of the resolution, until the Congress in Zurich (1947), when delegates eventually came to an agreement, and the resolution became the foundation of the fourth article of the PEN Charter, entirely approved by the Assembly of Delegates at the Congress of 1948. The other three articles of the association are as follows: 2. In all circumstances, and particularly in time of war, works of art, the patrimony of humanity at large, should be left untouched by national or political passion; 3. Members of Pen should at all times use what influence they have in favour of good understanding and mutual respect between nations and people; they pledge themselves to do their utmost to dispel all hatreds and to champion the ideal of one humanity living in peace and equality in one world; 4. Pen stands for the principle of unhampered transmission of thought within each nation and between all nations, and members pledge themselves to oppose any form of suppression of freedom of expression in the country and community to which they belong, as well as throughout the world wherever this is possible. Pen is committed to a free press and opposes arbitrary censorship in times of peace. It believes that the necessary advance of the world towards a more highly organised political and economic order renders the free criticism of governments, administrations, and institutions imperative. Moreover, since freedom implies voluntary restraint, its members pledge themselves to oppose such evils of a free press as mendacious publication, deliberate falsehood and the distortion of facts for political and personal ends. See, <https://www.englishpen.org/the-pen-charter/> (viewed on 30 December 2020).

Since his election to succeed Alexander Lernet-Holenia as President of the Austrian Pen-Club on 20 December 1972⁶³, Schönwiese had become one of the most relevant contributors to an opening towards the Danubian countries of the Mitteleuropa area⁶⁴. Nonetheless, at the beginning of the 1970s, a bitter dispute broke out within the inner circles of the Austrian authors and writers' Association in Vienna and Graz, when several Styrian authors tried to establish a second recognised branch of the Pen Club, an 'autonomous Pen Centre' with its own headquarters in Graz (which they saw as an antipole to the conservative headquarters in Vienna)⁶⁵. This was an attempt on the part of these dissenters to express their diversity and the need to unite with the purpose of intervening in Austria's cultural and political events, especially in the face of the monopoly of power exercised in the official Austrian literary system by the Pen Club, which was repeatedly accused of being "a symbol of the conservative cultural establishment in this country"⁶⁶. The attempt was unsuccessful, however, and the application to establish a second Austrian Pen club was repeatedly rejected by PEN International⁶⁷, and despite

63 Founded in June 1923, the Austrian Pen-Club is the oldest authors' association in Austria. In 1938, with the annexation of the Alpine country to the German Reich, the local Pen-Club was dissolved and its assets confiscated. Re-established in 1947, thanks to the initiative of Robert Neumann, General Secretary of the Austrian Pen-Club in exile (Free Austrian Pen-Club, founded in 1939 in London), its first post-war president was Franz Theodor Csokor, until his death in 1969. His successors were: Alexander Lernet-Holenia (1969–1972), Ernst Schönwiese (1972–1978), Fritz Habeck (1978–1980), Erik G. Wickenburg (1980–1988, vice-presidents Sebestyén, Franz Richter, Hellmuth A. Niederle, Ingrid Weiser) and György Sebestyén (1988–1990).

64 "Informationen des Österreichischen Pen-Clubs", no. 1 (1973), 24. Also, see Richter, "Brücke über dem Abgrund."

65 Cf. LIT, Nachlass György Sebestyén, 120/S.109/24, fasc. *Materialsammlung PEN*.

66 "Der derzeitig österreichische Pen ein Symbol des konservativen Kulturbetriebes hierzulande ist", in *Gegen Kultur Konservatismus*, "Volksstimme", 3 November 1987.

67 The undersigned were: Ernst Jandl (Wien, President), Christine Haidegger (Salzburg, vice president), Joseph Haslinger (Wien, Vice President and General Secretary), Heimrad Bäcker (Linz, vice president), Marie-Thérèse Kerschbaumer (Wien, Vice President), Friederike Mayröcker (Wien), Elfriede Gersti (Wien), Gerhard Rühm (Wien–Köln), Wendelin Schmidt-Dengler (Wien), Friedrich Achleitner (Wien), Peter Handke (Wien), Peter Turrini (Wien), Barbara Frischmuth (Wien), Leo Navratil (Klosterneuburg), Michael Sharang (Wien), Alfred Kolleritsch (Graz), Wolfgang Bauer (Graz), Erich Fried (Wien-London), Robert Jungk (Salzburg), Hans Hollein (Wien), Klaus Hoffer (Graz), Ernst Borneman (Scharten, OÖ), Franz Innerhofer (Graz), Elfriede Jelinek (Wien), Helmut Qualtinger (Wien), Alfred Hrdlicka (Wien). *Letter from Graz Convention of Authors to Francis King* (International Pen Committee in London), 4 April 1986, in LIT, Nachlass György Sebestyén, 120/S.109/24, fasc. *Materialsammlung PEN*, pp.1–4. Also, see Roland Innerhofer, *Die*

conciliatory efforts by Sebestyén and Schönwiese⁶⁸, shortly after, as a sign of protest against the policy of the Pen Club, the “separatists” (including Peter Handke, Alfred Hrdlicka and Ernst Jandl), founded the “Graz Authors’ Assembly”(Grazer Autorenversammlung, February–March 1973).⁶⁹

In addition, Sebestyén – who was later elected President of the Austrian PEN Club (1988), led the authors and writers’ association on a new course, albeit for a short time (he died two years later after a long illness that had not, however, prevented him from working), creating a cultural network open to new trends, which he gradually expanded to include publishers, painters, photographers, and theatre actors – revealing himself to be a tireless cultural entrepreneur. Indeed, Sebestyén worked simultaneously on several fronts, in order to give transversality to his ever-widening network of contacts: these ranged from frequent collaborations with the Viennese Catholic weekly ‘Die Furche’⁷⁰, to activity with the socialist mayor of Vienna, Helmut Zilk; from the governors of Lower

Grazer Autorenversammlung (1973–1983). Zur Organisation einer “Avantgarde”, Böhlau, Wien–Köln–Graz 1985.

- 68 On the internal debate within the Austrian Pen club and the efforts to mediate the dispute, see Sebestyén, *Studien zur Literatur*, 136.
- 69 The split, caused by the Viennese literary avant-garde (originating from the so-called ‘Vienna Group’), was encouraged by the following authors (founding members of the new association): Friedrich Achleitner, Hans Carl Artmann, Christian Ludwig Attersee, Josef Bauer, Wolfgang Bauer, Heimrad Bäcker, Joe Berger, Gerald Bisinger, Otto Breicha, Günter Brus, Franz Buchrieser, Helmut Eisendle, Gustav Ernst, Valie Export, Gunter Falk, Barbara Frischmuth, Elfriede Gerstl, Friedrich Geyrhofer, Reinhard P. Gruber, Franz Haderer, Peter Handke, Wilhelm Hengstler, Fritz Herrmann, Klaus Hoffer, Ernst Jandl, Gert Jonke, Kurt Kalb, Franz Kaltenbeck, Alfred Kolleritsch, Peter Kraml, Wolfgang Kudrnofsky, Hubert Fabian Kulterer, Fritz Lichtenauer, Anestis Logothetis, Peter Matejka, Friederike Mayröcker, Otto Mühl, Günther Nenning, Hermann Nitsch, Heidi Pataki, Cora Pongracz, Reinhard Priessnitz, Peter Rosei, Gerhard Roth, Gerhard Rühm, Michael Scharang, Hans Scheugl, Alfred Schmeller, Ernst Schmidt jr., Waltraud Seidlhofer, Harald Sommer, Michael Springer, Dominik Steiger, Peter Vujica, Peter Weibel, Peter Weiermair, Oswald Wiener, Helmut Zenker. For a comprehensive overview of the ‘Vienna Group’, see Schmatz, “Viennese Actionism and the Vienna Group”, 59–60, and 69–73.
- 70 On this collaboration by the multifaceted author, see the heartfelt commemoration: Deutsch, “Von unendlicher Neugier”. “He has written dozens of books, screenplays, countless forewords and epilogues, magazine and newspaper essays, he has worked as a critic and commentator, dramaturge, translator and editor, he has worked as an editor and director. He brought “Pannonia” and “Morgen” to life. This European from Austria, this Austrian from Hungary, who perhaps had to run for his life in 1956, but certainly had to run for the freedom of his thinking, not only worked tirelessly before this term existed as a sign of quality, but above all he linked it with his own work”.

Austria Andreas Mauer and Siegfried Ludwig, of the Austrian People's Party (ÖVP), to the 'strong man' of Burgenland, Alfred Sinowatz (minister and later Chancellor), and his party's companion and governor of the region, Theodor Keri (SPÖ).

It should be stressed, then, that the Hungarian-born Austrian journalist was successful in implementing Article 2 of 'Pen International Rules', which, in paragraph 1, reads: "Pen Centres shall consist of those professional writers, duly elected to membership, who aim at promoting friendly cooperation between writers in every country in the interests of literature, freedom of expression and international good-will"⁷¹.

Archival Sources

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/ÖStA [Austrian State Archives]

BMfaA, AdR, BKA/AA, II-pol, Ungarn

Literaturarchiv (LIT) der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek (ÖNB), Wien [Austrian National Library]

Bibliography

"Tagung des Forschungsinstitutes für Fragen des Donauraumes." *Osteuropa* 6, no.6 (1956): 530.

Ackerl, Isabella and Friedrich Weissensteiner. *Österreichisches Personenlexikon der ersten und zweiten Republik*. Wien: Ueberreuter, 1992.

Angerer, Thomas. "Für eine Geschichte der österreichischen Neutralität. Ein Kommentar". In *Die Neutralen und die europäische Integration 1945 bis 1995*, edited by Michael Gehler and Rolf Steininger, 702–708. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, Institut für Zeitgeschichte der Universität Innsbruck, Arbeitskreis Europäische Integration, Historische Forschungen, Veröffentlichungen 3, 1999.

71 LIT, Nachlass György Sebestyén, 120/S/109/24, fasc. Materialsammlung PEN (International Pen, International Rules, March 1950).

Berger, Peter. “Jahrestagung des Forschungsinstitutes für den Donauraum”. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 11, no.1 (1963): 152–153.

Borhi, László. *Hungary in the Cold War, 1945–1956. Between the United States and the Soviet Union*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9786155053948>

Breuss, Susanne, Karin Liebhart, Andreas Pribersky. “Österreichische Identitäten am Beispiel von »Landschaft«.” In *Identitätswandel Österreichs im veränderten Europa. Nationale und kulturelle Identitäten Österreichs. Theorien, Methoden und Probleme der Forschung zu kollektiver Identität*, edited by Ruth Wodak, 34–37. Wien: Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften (IFK), 1995.

Busek, Erhard and Emil Brix. *Projekt Mitteleuropa*. Wien: Ueberreuter, 1986.

Castrycck-Naumann, Katja. “Introduction: Moving from Transnational to Transregional Connections? East-Central Europe in Global Contexts”. In *Transregional Connections in the History of East-Central Europe*, edited by Katja Castryck-Naumann, 1–22. München–Wien: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110680515-001>

Chołuj, Bożena. “Die Renaissance des Begriffes Mitteleuropa.” In *Europa-Studien. Eine Einführung. Die Europäische Union: Kultur, Politik, Wirtschaft, Recht*, edited by Timm Beichelt, Bożena Chołuj, Gerard Rowe, Hans-Jürgen Wagener, 111–124. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2006. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-90007-0_6

Csáky, Moritz. “Die Vielfalt der Habsburgermonarchie und die nationale Frage.” In *Nation, Ethnizität und Staat in Mitteleuropa* (Buchreihe des Instituts für den Donauraum und Mitteleuropa 4) edited by Urs Altermatt, 44–64. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 1996.

Deutsch, Reinhard, “Von unendlicher Neugier”, *Die Furche* 2 June 2010

Dörner, Christian and Barbara Dörner-Fazeny. *Theodor von Hornbostel, 1889–1973*, Wien: Böhlau, 2006.

Dubrović, Milan. *Veruntreute Geschichte. Die Wiener Salons und Literatencafés*. Berlin: Aufbau–Taschenbuch–Verlag, 2001.

Erschen, Mario. *Stillfried. Ein Name im Wetterleuchten der Geschichte*. Wien: Böhlau, 2013.

Esterhammer, Ruth, Fritz Gaigg and Markus Köhle. *Handbuch österreichischer und Südtiroler Literaturzeitschriften 1970–2004*, 749–756. Innsbruck–Wien: StudienVerlag, 2008.

Ettmayer, Wendelin. *Plädoyer für Mitteleuropa* (Schriftenreihe “Sicherheit und Demokratie”). Doppelheft 9/10, edited by Fritz Windhager, Wien: Verlag Sicherheit und Demokratie Verlag, 1985.

Europa und die deutsche Einheit. Beobachtungen, Entscheidungen und Folgen. Edited by Gehler, Michael and Maximilian Graf. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.

Fennes, Anton. “Das Burgenland als Medienlandschaft. Die Entwicklung der gedruckten und elektronischen Medien in Burgenland seit dem Jahre 1945.” In *Burgenland. Vom Grenzland im Osten zum Tor in den Westen* (Geschichte der österreichischen Bundesländer seit 1945), edited by Roland Widder, 217–276. Wien–Köln–Weimar: Böhlau, 2000.

Follner, Michaela. *Österreichs Spitzendiplomaten zwischen Kaiser und Kreisky. Biographisches Handbuch der Diplomaten des Höheren Auswärtigen Dienstes 1918 bis 1959*. Wien: Dokumentationsarchiv des Österreichischen Widerstandes, and Österreichische Gesellschaft für historische Quellenstudien, 2009.

Fröhlich-Steffen, Susanne. *Die Österreichische Identität im Wandel*. Wien: Braumüller, 2003.

Gehler, Michael. “»Europe«. Europeanisations and their Meaning for European Integration Historiography”, *Journal of European Integration History* 22, no. 1 (2016): 141–174. <https://doi.org/10.5771/0947-9511-2016-1-141>

Gehler, Michael. *Dokumente*. In idem, *Der lange Weg nach Europa. Österreich vom Ende der Monarchie bis zur EU, Darstellung II*, 213–425. Innsbruck–Wien–München–Bozen: Studien Verlag, 2002.

Górny, Maciej. “Użyteczność i granice. Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia jako narzędzie badawcze.” [Usability and boundaries. Central and Eastern Europe as a research tool] *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 120, no. 4 (2013): 801–808. <https://doi.org/10.12775/KH.2013.120.4.06>

Graf, Maximilian and Agnes Meisinger (Eds.). *Österreich im Kalten Krieg. Neue Forschungen im internationalen Kontext* (Zeitgeschichte im Kontext 11). Göttingen: Vienna University Press, 2016.

Granville, Johanna. "Of Spies, Refugees and Hostile Propaganda: How Austria Dealt with the Hungarian Crisis of 1956". *History* 91, no. 1 (2006): 62–90. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-229X.2006.00359.x>

Großmann, Johannes. *Die Internationale der Konservativen: Transnationale Elitenzirkel und private Außenpolitik in Westeuropa seit 1945*. München: De Gruyter Oldenbourg, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1524/9783110354263>

Hassel, Johann Georg Heinrich. *Vollständiges Handbuch der neuesten Erdbeschreibung*. Weimar: Verlag des geographischen Instituts, 1819.

Hausleitner, Mariana. *Die Donauschwaben 1868–1948. Ihre Rolle im rumänischen und serbischen Banat*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, Schriftenreihe des Instituts für donauschwäbische Geschichte und Landeskunde, 18; Quellen und Forschungen, 2, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.25162/9783515107631>

Horel, Catherine. "The rediscovery of Central Europe in the 1980s". In *The Fall of the Iron Curtain and the Culture of Europe*, edited by Peter I. Barta, 24–39, London: Routledge, 2013. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203550021>

Hummer, Waldemar. *Vom "Europäischen Hochschulraum" zum "Europäischen Forschungsraum"*. *Ansätze und Perspektiven einer europäischen Bildungs- und Forschungspolitik*. In *Bildung in Europa. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven*, edited by Manfred Prisching, 33–84. Wien: Verlag Österreich, 2005.

Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Außenpolitik, Außenpolitischer Bericht, 1988.

Janowski, Maciej. "»Multiple Sonderwegs«. The Specificity of Historical Development of East Central Europa in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century". *Acta Poloniae Historica*, no. 111. (2015): 5–27. <https://doi.org/10.12775/APH.2015.111.01>

Janowski, Maciej. "Pitfalls and Opportunities. The Concept of East-Central Europe as a Tool of Historical Analysis". *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire* 6, no.1 (1999): 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813795.001>

Jaworski, Rudolf. "Ostmitteleuropa. Zur Tauglichkeit und Akzeptanz eines historischen Hilfsbegriffs". In *Westmitteleuropa – Ostmitteleuropa*, edited by Winfried Eberhard, Heinz-Dieter Heimann, Hans Lemberg 37–45. München: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1992.

Jurić-Pahor, Marija. “The Alps–Adriatic Region: An Exploration of Ethnic-National Diversity and Cross-Border Dialogue”. In *A Shared Vision. Intellectual Dialogue – A Global Paradigm to Promote Linguistic and Cultural Diversity*, edited by Sonja Novak-Lukanovič et al., 189–217. Ljubljana: Slovenska nacionalna komisija za UNESCO, Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja, 2010.

Klemenčič, Matjaž. “Indigenous National/Ethnic Minorities in the Alps–Adriatic–Pannonian Region, 1921–1938”. *Journal of Ethnic Studies*, no. 62 (2010): 8–49.

Knobl, Kuno, „*Mit dem Osten reden*“, *Neues Österreichs*, 3 September 1964, 3

Lachs, Minna, “Viele Nationen, eine einzige Geschichte”, *Pannonia*, no. 2 (Summer 1974), 5–7.

Leidenfrost, Josef. “The Demise of “Minoritenplatz-Schleicherei”: Eighty-Four Months of Wende Higher Education Policy in Austria.” In *The Schlüssel Era in Austria*, edited by Günter Bischof and Fritz Plasser, 283–319. New Orleans–Innsbruck: University of New Orleans Press–Innsbruck University Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1n2txgb.16>

Luif, Paul. “Forum on ‘Central Europe’: Austria and Central Europe”. *Perspectives* 18, no. 2 (2010): 95–109.

Magris, Claudio. *Il mito asburgico nella letteratura austriaca moderna* [The Habsburg myth in modern Austrian literature], Torino: Einaudi, 1963.

Maier, Charles S. “Wessen Mitteleuropa? Das Zentrum Europas zwischen Erinnerung und Vergessen.” In *Identität und Nachbarschaft: die Vielfalt der Alpen–Adria–Länder*, edited by Manfred Prisching, 193–210. Wien–Graz: Böhlau, 1994.

Marjanović, Vladislav. “L’idée d’Europe centrale: une contribution de l’Autriche aux échanges Est-Ouest”. In *Une Europe malgré tout, 1945–1990. Contacts et réseaux culturels, intellectuels et scientifiques entre Européens dans la guerre froide*, edited by Fleury, Antoine and Lubor Jílek, 71–88. Brussels: Peter Lang, 2009.

Marjanović, Vladislav. *Die Mitteleuropa-Idee und die Mitteleuropa-Politik Österreichs 1945–1995*. Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang, 1998

Márkus, Beáta. “Behandlung der deutschen Minderheit Ungarns während und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. Das Fallbeispiel des Lagers in Mohács” In *Brüche – Kontinuitäten – Konstruktionen. Mitteleuropa im 20. Jahrhundert* (Tagungs-

band zur 5. Internationalen Doktorandentagung), edited by Réka Szentiványi and Béla Teleky (Hrsg.), 247–268. Wien: New Academic Press, 2017.

Maurer, Stefan. “»Hingerichtet und wir leben dennoch«. Das literarische Frühwerk György Sebestyéns im Spannungsfeld des Kalten Krieges.” In *György Sebestyén und seine Zeit*, edited by Haimo L. Handl, 23–55. Drösing: Driesch Verlag, 2016.

Miller, Alexei. “Central Europe. A Tool for Historians or a Political Concept?” *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire* 6, no.1 (1999): 85–89. doi.org/10.1080/13507489908568222

Mozetič, Gerald. “Mythos Mitteleuropa. Einige Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Identitäten.” In *Identität und Nachbarschaft: die Vielfalt der Alpen-Adria-Länder*, edited by Manfred Prisching, 171–192. Wien–Graz: Böhlau, 1994.

Müller, Dietmar. “Southeastern Europe as a Historical Meso-region. Constructing Space in Twentieth-Century German Historiography”. *European Review of History* 10, no.2 (2003): 393–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350748032000140868>

Müller, Michael G. “Where and When Was (East) Central Europe?” In *Domains and Divisions of European History*, edited by Johann P. Arnason, Natalie J. Doyle, 112–125. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.5949/liverpool/9781846312144.003.0007>

Naumann, Friedrich. *Mitteleuropa*, Reimer, Berlin 1915.

Niederle, Helmut A. “György Sebestyén und der österreichische Pen”, In *György Sebestyén und seine Zeit*, edited by Haimo L. Handl, 23–55. Drösing: Driesch Verlag, 2016.

Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815–1950, Vol. 13 (2009),

Rathkolb, Oliver and Friedrich Stadler (Eds.). *Verdrängte Kultur. Österreich 1918, 1938, 1968, 1988*, Wien: Institut für Wissenschaft und Kunst, 1990.

Rényi, Péter, Auf den Spuren des “Pester Lloyd”, *Pannonia*, no. 4 (December 1980): 26–27.

Reszler, André. “La signification présente de l’Europe du milieu.” In *Mitteleuropa passato e future*, edited by Associazione Giuliani nel mondo, 25–31. Padova: Cleup, 1986.

Richter, Franz. “Brücke über dem Abgrund. Der Präsident des Österreichischen Pen-Clubs.” In *Ernst Schönwiese. Sein geistiges Profil und seine literarische Bedeutung*, edited by Joseph Peter Strelka, 227–247. Bern: Peter Lang, 1986.

Riesz János, “Letzte Chance Wiedersehen mit Ungarn nach vierzig Jahren”. *Pannonia*, no. 3 (Autumn 1988): 20–21.

Rösicke, K. “Die geistige Vorgänge im Donaauraum und der nationale Mythos. Gespräch mit Pannonia-Chefredakteur György Sebestyén.” *Neueste Nachrichten*, 1–2 December, 1984.

Russel, John. “Art: Vienna Festival Exhibitions”. *The New York Times*, 17 June 1985.

Schlenger, Herbert. Der Donaauraum. *Zeitschrift für Ostforschung* 6, no. 2 (1957): 304. <https://doi.org/10.25627/195762541>

Schmatz, Ferdinand. “Viennese Actionism and the Vienna Group: The Austrian Avant-Garde after 1945”, *Discourse*, 14, no. 2 (1992): 59–73.

Schramm, Ingrid and Anna Sebestyén (ed.). *György Sebestyén. Der donauländische Kentaur. Ein subjektives Porträt*. Graz–Wien–Köln: Verlag Styria, 2000.

Schultz, Hans-Dietrich and Wolfgang Natter. “Imagining Mitteleuropa: Conceptualisations of ‘Its’ Space In and Outside German Geography”. *European Review of History: Revue européenne d’histoire* 10, no.2 (2003): 273–292. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350748032000140804>

Schweiger, Tobias. “Zur Repräsentation von “Landschaft”, “Kunst” und “Volkskultur” in Österreich-Bildbänden der Nachkriegszeit.” *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Volkskunde* 40 (2006): 397–433.

Sebestyén, György. “Nicosia! Nicosia!” *Pannonia*, no 3. (Autumn 1974): 5–8.

Sebestyén, György. *Die Türen schließen sich*. Wien–München–Basel: Desch, 1957.

Sebestyén, György. *Studien zur Literatur*. Eisenstadt: Edition Rötzer, 1980.

Sebestyén, György. *Vorläufige Behausungen. Gedanken zu Zeit, Leben und Literatur* (Herausgegeben von Anna Sebestyén). Wien: Wiener Journal Zeitschriftenverlag, 2000.

Sebestyén, György: “Warum ich für den Pen-Club bin. Ein Weltverband der Einsamkeiten...” *Die Furche*, 15 November 1975

Seewann, Gerhard and Michael Portmann. *Donauschwaben. Deutsche Siedler in Südosteuropa*. Potsdam: Deutsches Kulturforum Östliches Europa Verlag, 2020.

Sinnhuber, Karl A. “Central Europe – Mitteleuropa – Europe Centrale. An Analysis of a Geographical Term”. *Transactions and Papers* (Institute of British Geographers), n. 20 (1954), 15–39.

Sparwasser, Sebastian. *Identität im Spannungsfeld von Zwangsmigration und Heimkehr. Ungarndeutsche Vertriebene und die Remigration*. Wien: New Academic Press, 2018.

Strachow, Jewgeni. “Sowohl ein Kochbuch als auch phantastische Novellen.” *Sowjetunion Heute*, no. 11 (1981): 48.

Troebst, Stefan. “»Geschichtsregion«. Historisch-mesoregionale Konzeptionen in den Kulturwissenschaften.” *EGO Europäische Geschichte Online* <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/theories-and-methods/historical-meso-region>

Troebst, Stefan. *Erinnerungskultur Kulturgeschichte Geschichtsregion. Ostmitteleuropa in Europa*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2013.

Tüskés, Tibor. “Strahlungen einer kleinen Welt. Über die burgenländische Zeitschrift. Örség.” *Pannonia* no. 2. (1988): 13–14.

Verband Österreichischer Zeitungsherausgeber und Zeitungsverleger. Österreichs Presse Werbung Graphik, Handbuch 22 (1974).