would have welcomed critical examination of the evidence and the inferences drawn from it—it is vulnerable enough and the reviewer is well qualified. In other words, it would have been useful to have had the book be reviewed, rather than to have been faulted for not writing some other book addressed to different questions, based on different theories, and for coming to conclusions affirming very different ideological values from those apparently held by Konrad Ginther. These are revealed when he unfurls his Cold War colors and trots out the tired zero-sum litany equating peaceful coexistence with Soviet expansionism. In this, neutrality is somehow discredited because Soviet rhetoric gives it a place in its strategy.

THOMAS O. SCHLESINGER
Associate Professor Political Science

TO THE EDITOR:

There is a basic disagreement between Professor Schlesinger and me both about what matters if the issue of permanent neutrality is raised with regard to Austria and about whether such a disagreement should be made the basis of the review of a book dealing with the domestic roots of Austria’s foreign policy.

First I want to reaffirm the legitimate right of a reviewer to state his view that a book misses the essential point. Second, speaking of the Soviet doctrine of peaceful coexistence in terms of a national mythos as used by a Great Power herself should not be confused with cold war mentality; especially not by an author who accepted for his research question that a state needs an “image of its national mission” (p. 3) or a mythos, which he described with the words of W. Y. Elliot and N. A. McDonald as “an emotional attachment to historical origins, past sufferings and glories, and to common traditions, as well as to future hopes and fears” (p. 139).

Third, especially in view of the last words of this quotation and of present-day controversies in Austria, to deal with Austria’s neutrality as a national mythos without regard to the issue of peaceful coexistence as the national mythos of a Great Power very close to Austria, but to deal instead, for example, with Austrian minority and border problems at length, means to miss the essential point in the discussion of permanent neutrality in postwar Europe, at least as far as Austria is concerned.

KONRAD GINTHER