



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

Anglo-Austrian Cultural Relations between
1944 and 1955.
Influences, Cooperation and Conflicts.

Verfasserin

Isabella Lehner

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magistra der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, im Juli 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 312

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Geschichte

Betreuer: Univ.-Prof. Mag. DDr. Oliver Rathkolb

Eidesstattliche Erklärung

Ich erkläre eidesstattlich, dass ich die Arbeit selbständig angefertigt, keine anderen als die angegebenen Hilfsmittel benutzt und alle aus ungedruckten Quellen, gedruckter Literatur oder aus dem Internet im Wortlaut oder im wesentlichen Inhalt übernommenen Formulierungen und Konzepte gemäß den Richtlinien wissenschaftlicher Arbeiten zitiert, durch Fußnoten gekennzeichnet beziehungsweise mit genauer Quellenangabe kenntlich gemacht habe. Die vorliegende Arbeit wurde bisher weder in gleicher noch in ähnlicher Form einer anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt und auch noch nicht veröffentlicht.

Ort

Datum

Unterschrift

Acknowledgements

This thesis owes much to the generosity and cooperation of others.

Firstly, I am highly indebted to my supervisor Professor Oliver Rathkolb for his guidance and support.

I owe a special thank you to Dr. Jill Lewis and (soon to be PhD) Helen Steele for repeatedly inspiring and encouraging me. Furthermore, I would like to thank Mag. Florentine Kastner for her support. Thank you for a friendship beyond history.

Sincere thanks also go to the staff at The National Archives in Kew, and to the Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies at the University of London, especially Dr. Martin Liebscher, for assisting me during my research in London.

A very special thank you goes to Raimund! Without your inspiring ideas, support and understanding this thesis would never have been completed.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	9
1.1. Research Questions	10
1.2. State of Research.....	10
1.3. State of Source Material.....	13
2. Historical and Theoretical Framework	15
2.1. Historical Setting	15
2.1.1. British Planning for Post-War Austria	15
2.1.2. The Allied Occupation of Austria.....	17
2.1.3. The British Perspective on Cultural Activities	23
2.2. Theoretical Approach	26
3. The British Council.....	31
3.1. The British Council's Early Years.....	31
3.2. Changes and Post- War Perspectives.....	33
3.3. The British Council in Austria	35
4. The Anglo-Austrian (Democratic) Society	43
4.1. Excursus: Emigration and Exile.....	43
4.1.1. Austrian Self-Aid	44
4.1.2. The Austrian Centre	44
4.1.3. The London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists in Great Britain	46
4.1.4. The Free Austrian Movement	46
4.1.5. The Austrian Representative Committee	47
4.1.6. The Austrian Democratic Union	47
4.1.7. Legitimistic Organisations	48
4.1.8. Context and Outlook	48
4.2. The Foundation of the Anglo-Austrian (Democratic) Society	49
4.3. Membership	50
4.4. The Aims of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society	51
4.5. The Anglo-Austrian Society after the Second World War.....	52
4.5.1. Aid to Austria Appeal Committee.....	53

4.5.2. Gift Food Parcels Scheme	54
4.5.3. Children Reception Committee	54
4.6. Broadening the Society	56
4.7. Cultural Activities	58
4.8. The British Authorities Attitude Towards the Anglo-Austrian Society	58
4.9. Cultural Exchange.....	61
4.10. The Anglo-Austrian Society's Weaknesses	63
4.11. The Cultural Convention and the Anglo-Austrian Society	65
4.11.1. The Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom.....	65
4.11.2. The Cultural Convention from the Perspective of the British Council	68
4.11.3. Fighting for Recognition.....	69
4.12. Utilising Personal Connections	74
5. The Austro-British Society.....	78
5.1. Excursus: Austro-English Society.....	78
5.2. Planning for the Foundation of the Austro-British Society	79
5.3. The Foundation of the Austro-British Society	86
5.4. Membership	86
5.5. Establishing the Society	87
5.6. The Aims of the Austro-British Society	90
5.7. Cultural Activities	91
5.8. The Austro-British Society in Austria's Provinces	94
5.9 Criticisms and Interdependence	94
5.10. Changing Conditions.....	99
5.11. Excursus: Personnel Continuities	100
6. Conclusion	104
7. Bibliography	107
7.1. Primary Sources.....	107
7.2. Secondary Sources	108
7.3. Journal Articles	114

7.4. Additional Sources	115
Abbreviations	117
8. Appendix.....	118
8.1. The Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom.	118
8.2. German Abstract	124
8.3. English Abstract	124
Curriculum Vitae.....	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.

1. Introduction

The decision to conduct research on the cultural relations between Austria and the United Kingdom had been in the back of my mind for some time. Upon returning from my Erasmus year in Swansea in Wales, I chose to combine my pronounced personal interest in the culture of both countries with its contemporary history. After giving this some thought and examining the available publications and archive material in-depth, several elaborate research questions arose. To narrow it down for the framework of this *Diplomarbeit*, I have chosen to examine the relationship and interdependence between the British Council, the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society between approximately 1945 and 1955.¹

The connection between these three organisations can be best described as a triangular relationship. The British Council, which had been founded in 1934, was the official British overseas propaganda agency and took up its activities in Austria in early 1946. The Anglo-Austrian Society was the result of a cooperation between exiled Austrians and Britons and was founded in London in 1944. The Austro-British Society was established in Vienna in 1946.

While these three organisations occupy the centre stage of this thesis, there are two further actors on the British side that played an important role. These are the British Foreign Office (FO) and the British Element of the Allied Commission for Austria (ACA/BE). Subsequently, I am going to extend the concept of the equilateral triangle, as both the FO and the ACA/BE cooperated closely with the British Council.

For the sake of simplicity I will henceforth refer to the British Council as BC, to the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society as AADS, to the Anglo-Austrian Society after its change of name as AAS and to the Austro-British Society as ABS.

¹ The Anglo-Austrian Society was founded as the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society and later changed its name. For simplicity I will henceforth refer to it as the Anglo-Austrian Society in the introduction. The names Austro-British Society, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft and Britisch-Österreichische Gesellschaft all applied to the same organisation

1.1. Research Questions

While the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society cooperated on various aspects and enjoyed close relations, the societies' relationship with the British Council has to be investigated. Was this relationship characterised by competition, or did they collaborate on an amicable basis? Was there an honest appreciation of each other's activities? Were there certain triggers that caused tensions between the three organisations?

To what extent did the British Foreign Office interfere in the British Council's decision-making process and its activities? Did the FO interrelate with the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society? Did political motives provided the background for the cultural activities of the BC and of both Societies? Were there any personnel or instructional continuities between exile and post-war organisations? Did the international tensions in the nascent Cold War affect the cooperation between the three organisations?

To investigate these issues I will first describe these organisations' backgrounds, their aims and activities in this thesis. To illustrate the interrelation between the main players, I have decided to focus on two specific points of conflict. Firstly, I will outline the period up to the foundation of the Austro-British Society in 1946. Both the British Council and the FO were extremely involved in the planning and foundation of the Society. Secondly, I am going to focus on the discussions surrounding the ratification of the Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom in 1953. In the context of the Convention, the Anglo-Austrian Society desired official recognition by the Austrian and British authorities, which resulted in protracted debates amongst the functionaries of the organisations involved.

1.2. State of Research

As several studies have already investigated U.S, French and Soviet cultural influence in Allied-occupied Austria, my intention is to consider the British angle, which, to date, aspect, has not been dealt with in a satisfactory manner.

In recent decades a great number of publications have been released that have focused on various phases and perspectives of the occupation period. Before considering the issue of publications with a specific cultural focus, I will first emphasise some publications that can now be referred to as standard works. During the 1980s in particular, research into four-power occupation increased, as the opening of archives allowed access to new source material.

Amongst the most influential publications that contributed to the debate are Manfred Rauchensteiner's *Der Sonderfall – Die Besatzungszeit in Österreich 1945 bis 1955*, Günter Bischof's and Josef Leidenfrost's volume *Die bevormundete Nation*, as well as Gerald Stourzh's study about the State Treaty.² There are several examples for more recent publications that were published on the occasion of the anniversary of the signing of the Austrian State Treaty. These longitudinal studies include Stefan Karner's edited exhibition catalogue *Österreich ist frei!*, Arnold Suppan's edited volume *Der österreichische Staatsvertrag* and Oliver Rathkolb's monograph *Die Paradoxe Republik*, which also included international perspectives.³

A more general approach formed the basis of the comprehensive publication *Österreich unter Allierter Besatzung*, published by Alfred Ableitinger, Siegfried Beer and Eduard Staudinger.⁴ This volume contains an article by Josef Feichtinger about the British cultural policy in Austria, which, together with an article by Beer, proved to be a starting point for this thesis.⁵

² Manfred Rauchensteiner, *Der Sonderfall – Die Besatzungszeit in Österreich, 1945-1955* (Graz/Vienna: Verlag Styria, 1979); Günter Bischof, and Josef Leidenfrost (eds.), *Die bevormundete Nation. Österreich und die Alliierten 1949-1949* (Innsbruck: Haymon-Verlag, 1988); Gerald Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit. Staatsvertrag, Neutralität und das Ende der Ost-West-Besetzung Österreichs 1945-1954* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1988).

³ Stefan Karner, and Gottfried Stangler (eds.), *“Österreich ist frei!” Der Österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955* (Horn/Vienna: Berger, 2005); Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *Der österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955. Internationale Strategie, rechtliche Relevanz, nationale Identität*. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005). Oliver Rathkolb, *Die paradoxe Republik. Österreich 1945 bis 2005* (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2005).

⁴ Alfred Ableitinger, Siegfried Beer, and Eduard G. Staudinger (eds.), *Österreich unter Allierter Besatzung 1945-1955* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1998).

⁵ Johannes Feichtinger, “Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich,” in *Österreich unter Allierter Besatzung 1945-1955*, eds. Alfred Ableitinger, Siegfried Beer, and Eduard G. Staudinger (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1998), 495-529; Siegfried Beer,

Specific political, economical and the social aspects can be found in Gabriela Stieber's and Beer's studies about Styria and Carinthia.⁶ Further, more contemporary, descriptions of British cultural activities in Austria, can be found in books by Richard Hiscocks and Michael Balfour.⁷

The British Council itself occupies the centre stage in several publications. Principal examples are studies by Philip M. Taylor and Diane Jane Eastment, which both provided useful background information about the British Council's establishment and its policy throughout the Second World War.⁸ Frances Donaldson discussed the organisations history up to the 1980s.⁹ Anthony Haigh examined the British Council's cultural activities in Europe against the backdrop of cultural diplomacy.¹⁰ The concept of cultural relations provided the framework of J. M. Mitchell's study, which included the British Council as an example.¹¹

As a former AAS member Friedrich Scheu provided an insight into the activities of the Anglo-Austrian and the Austro-British Society.¹² The AAS has also been mentioned in several publications about Austrian exile movements in the United Kingdom, as for example in studies by Helene Maimann, Marietta Bearman and Reinhard Müller.¹³

“Die Kultur- und Informationspolitik der britischen Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945-1955,” in *Besetzte Bilder. Film, Kultur und Propaganda in Österreich 1945-1955*, ed. Karin Moser (Vienna: Verlag Filmarchiv Austria, 2005), 119-132.

⁶ Siegfried Beer (ed.), *Die „britische Steiermark“* (Graz: Selbstverlag der Historischen Landeskommission für Steiermark, 1995); Gabriela Stieber, *Die Briten als Besatzungsmacht in Kärnten 1945–1955* (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Kärntner Landesarchivs, 2005).

⁷ Richard Hiscocks, *The Rebirth of Austria* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953); Michael Balfour and John Mair, *Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria. 1945–1946* (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956).

⁸ Philip M. Taylor, *The Projection of Britain. British overseas publicity and propaganda 1919–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Diana Jane Eastment, “The policies and position of the British Council from the outbreak of the war to 1950,” PhD. diss., University of Leeds, 1982.

⁹ Frances Donaldson, *The British Council. The First Fifty Years* (London: Cape, 1984).

¹⁰ Anthony Haigh, *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1974).

¹¹ J. M. Mitchell, *International Cultural Relations. Key Concepts in International Relations: 3* (London/Boston/Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986).

¹² Friedrich [Frederick] Scheu, *The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society* (London: Published by The Anglo-Austrian Society, 1969).

¹³ Helene Maimann, *Politik im Wartesaal. Österreichische Exilpolitik in Großbritannien. 1938 bis 1945* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1975); Marietta Bearman, Charmian Brinson, Richard Dove, Anthony Grenville, and Jennifer Taylor (eds.), *Out of Austria. The Austrian Centre in London in World War II*. (London/New York, Tauris Academic Studies, 2008); Reinhard Müller (ed.), *‘Fluchtpunkte England’ Spuren der österreichischen Emigration in Großbritannien 1938 bis 1945*. Katalog zur Ausstellung an der Universitätsbibliothek Graz (Graz,

As can be seen from the summary above, a great deal of research into the Allied occupation has been carried out during recent decades. Yet, there are still aspects that have been insufficiently investigated. I do not claim to describe the complete history of British cultural activities in post-war Austria in this thesis, but will rather pick out particular elements and outline these. Subsequently, my aim is to contribute to the ongoing discussion, and, furthermore, fill a very specific gap in the research.

1.3. State of Source Material

Due to its limited nature, the amount of publications on the British cultural activities in post-war Austria can be easily summarised. The manifold archive material, however, has turned out to be a tremendous advantage and has provided interesting information. Subsequently, for the most part, this thesis is based on primary sources.

The majority of the sources consulted are held in The National Archives (TNA) in Kew, London; these have provided detailed information about the British Council's activities in Austria. In addition, I have examined a great number of documents from the Foreign Office, the Cabinet and the British Element of the Allied Commission for Austria. The archive material includes internal as well as general correspondence and annual reports.

The decision to work on the interrelation between the British Council and the two societies has been partly induced by the archive material. The sources illustrated that there seemed to be an ongoing debate about the societies amongst the British authorities. For further information about the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society, I consulted the Anglo-Austrian Society's archive, held in the Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies (IGRS) at the University of London.

Universitätsbibliothek Graz, 1996); Reinhard Müller, "Einige österreichische Exilorganisationen in Großbritannien," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.literaturepochen.at/exil/multimedia/pdf/exilorganisationenreinhard.pdf>.

The archive material from the British Council and the Foreign Office on one hand, and from both societies on the other hand, helped to understand the respective approaches and each organisation's way of looking at things. Therefore, it was possible to obtain viewpoints from each of the actor's perspective.

The selected archive material has only been partly sifted through before me. For instance, Feichtinger and Beer have drawn on a similar selection of sources from The National Archives. The major part of the archive material has, however, neither been used before, nor been published. Due to the vast amount of source material I have collected, especially regarding the activities of the British Council, it is intended to make use of it in a future comprehensive study.

Quotations from original sources are declared as such and left unchanged. Typing errors have been corrected in original quotations.

2. Historical and Theoretical Framework

2.1. Historical Setting

In the following chapter I will discuss the British plans for post-war Austria. I will, furthermore, touch upon the occupation period and outline this on the basis of significant events that occurred up to the year 1955. Finally, the British occupation authorities approach to culture will be addressed.

2.1.1. British Planning for Post-War Austria

At the outset, the issue of Austrian only played a minor role in, otherwise extensive, British considerations for the post-war period. The British government, nevertheless, gradually began to attach more importance to Austria. This was mainly due to the country's geographical position and related to British economic, strategic and political interests in Central and Southeast Europe.¹⁴ The question about the future of Austria was clearly ancillary to the German question; for this reason a specific Austrian Desk in the Foreign Office, headed by Michael Cullis, was only created as the war was coming to a close in 1945.¹⁵

Britain had accepted Austria's Anschluss to Germany in March 1938 for a multitude of reasons. Reinhold Wagnleitner has asserted, that factors such as Austria's economic problems, escalating conflicts on the domestic front and the existence of the Austro-fascist regime all contributed to the British government's decision to recognise the Anschluss de facto and de jure.¹⁶ According to Guy Stanley, the British government aimed at "avoid[ing] any specific commitment to change, while on the other hand, avoiding any obligation to uphold the status quo."¹⁷ Furthermore, Stanley observed that the British policy towards Austria gradually began to change between autumn 1940 and 1943, when the Moscow

¹⁴ Reinhold Wagnleitner, "Die Britische Österreichplanung," in *Österreich und die Sieger. 40 Jahre 2. Republik – 30 Jahre Staatsvertrag*, eds. Anton Pelinka, and Rolf Steininger (Vienna: Braumüller, 1986), 67–78, here 67.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid., 68.

¹⁷ Guy Stanley, "Great Britain and the Austrian question 1938–1945," PhD. diss., University of London, 1973, 87.

Declaration was signed. This correlates with Alice Hills' suggestion that the British position on the Austrian question was characterised by "ambiguity, confusion and prevarication."¹⁸ She also asserted that the British policy was heavily influenced by the behaviour and activities of exiled Austrians in Britain.¹⁹

The Cabinet and the Foreign Office slowly began to discuss the future of Austria in 1943. In the spring of that year the diplomat Geoffrey Harrison drafted a memorandum about Austria.²⁰ The Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden supported Harrison's ideas, and forwarded the memorandum to all Cabinet members. The proposal included four potential solutions for the "Austrian problem":

- (1) "The association of Austria with Germany, either as an integral part of the Reich or on a federal basis;
- (2) The inclusion of Austria in a south German confederation;
- (3) The restoration of Austria as a free and independent State; and
- (4) The inclusion of Austria in a Central or Eastern European confederation."²¹

While the first and the second options would have strengthened Germany, and as the third option – and with that the chance of survival of an independent Austria – was doubted, the fourth option seemed best, at least for the moment. Harrison's memorandum can be understood as a first step towards the Moscow Conference, as in June 1943 he outlined a further draft that was later used for the Moscow Declaration's paragraph on Austria.²² At the Conference, held from 18 October to 11 November 1943, the Allies coordinated the further course of action in Europe. They came to the decision to foster the re-establishment of an independent Austria. In the Declaration the Austrian issue was touched upon as follows:

¹⁸ Alice Hills, *Britain and the occupation of Austria: 1943–1945* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), 30.

¹⁹ The activities of Austrian exile organisations in Great Britain will be discussed further down. Hills, "Britain and the occupation of Austria," 26–30.

²⁰ Stourzh, "Um Einheit und Freiheit," 11–12.

²¹ Memorandum by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 25 May 1943, CAB 66/37/18, The National Archives (TNA), Kew.

²² Stourzh, "Um Einheit und Freiheit," 13.

“The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first free country to fall a victim to Hitlerite aggression, shall be liberated from German domination. They regard the annexation imposed on Austria by Germany on March 15th 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any charges effected in Austria since that date. They declare that they wish to see re-established a free and independent Austria and thereby to open the way for the Austrian people themselves, as well as those neighboring states which will be face with similar problems, to find that political and economic security which is the only basis for lasting peace. Austria is reminded, however that she has a responsibility, which she cannot evade, for participation in the war at the side of Hitlerite Germany, and that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation.”²³

In the course of the Moscow Conference the Allies made the decision to establish the European Advisory Commission (EAC).²⁴ The EAC, based in London, was assigned the task of making provisions for a post-war Europe. At the Teheran Conference, held from 28 November to 1 December 1943, the British, U.S. and Soviet governments appointed their representatives to the EAC. The French were added to the EAC in November 1944. The Commission was active until its dissolution as a consequence of the Potsdam conference, held from 16 July to 2 August 1945. The EAC agreed with the Moscow Conference’s resolution to restore “a free and independent Austria.”²⁵

2.1.2. The Allied Occupation of Austria

The European Advisory Commission’s spectrum of tasks included the planning of the Allied governance body for Austria. The Agreement on the Control

²³ Cary Travers Grayson, *Austria’s International Position. 1938-1953. The Re-establishment of an Independent Austria* (Genève, Droz, 1953), 183.

For the full text of the Moscow Declaration see: “Moscow Conference, Joint Four-Nation Declaration, October 1943,” last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1943/431000a.html>.

²⁴ Günter Bischof, *Austria in the First Cold War, 1945-55. The Leverage of the Weak* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999). 28.

²⁵ Grayson, “Austria’s International Position,” 55.

Machinery in Austria, which became generally known as First Control Agreement, was decided on 4 July 1945.²⁶ The Allied Commission for Austria²⁷ (ACA), where all four powers were presented equally, was made the highest authority dealing with matters such as the political administration and the control of Austria. The ACA was headed by the Allied Council, which was constituted by high commissioners from each of the Allied powers.²⁸ It consisted of an Executive Committee, an Allied secretariat, directorates, sub-committees and working parties, the Vienna Inter-Allied Command and the Vienna Allied Command Sub-Committees.²⁹ The Commission's tasks, as specified in the First Control Agreement, included Austria's definite separation from Germany, the establishment of a central administration, the preparation for free elections, as well as the control of the elected government.³⁰

While the four high commissioners were the highest authorities in their respective occupation zones, they had to obtain approval from their colleagues in the Allied Control Council on questions regarding the whole of Austria. Each resolution had to be decided unanimously, which became more and more difficult as the years went on, especially against the backdrop of the emerging Cold War.³¹ William Bader has pointed out that it should not be forgotten that the most important events of Austria's immediate post-war history, like for instance, the establishment of the provisional government, the general election in November 1945, and the Second Control Agreement, all took place before the late summer of

²⁶ "Agreement on Control Machinery in Austria," 4 July 1945, in Grayson, "Austria's International Position," 217-221.

²⁷ The Allies decided to name it the Allied Commission, to highlight a distinction to the German Allied Control Commission. Balfour and Mair, "Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria," 309.

²⁸ The Allied Council held meetings at least biweekly, and the chair rotated monthly. Stieber, "Die Briten als Besatzungsmacht in Kärnten," 25; Stourzh, "Um Einheit und Freiheit," 32.

²⁹ Harold M. Hawkins, *Allied Commission for Austria. Background, Principles, And Procedures. A Guide*. (Vienna, 1950), 3.

³⁰ "Agreement on Control Machinery in Austria," 4 July 1945, in Grayson, "Austria's International Position," 217-221.

³¹ For an excellent overview of Austria in the early Cold War, see Bischof, "Austria in the First Cold War,"; Audrey Kurth Cronin, *Great Power Politics and the Struggle over Austria, 1945–1955* (Ithaca/New York, Cornell University Press, 1986); James Jay Carafano, *Waltzing Into the Cold War. The Struggle for Occupied Austria* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2002).

1946. From that point on the relationship between East and West began to deteriorate and the world gradually drifted into the global Cold War.³²

Austria's zonal arrangement proved to be a major point for discussion for the EAC, and was, amongst other things also addressed at the Yalta conference, held from 4-11 February 1944.³³ The question of Vienna's borders delayed the agreement for several months. The zones were finally defined in the Zonal Agreement on 9 July 1945.³⁴ The Soviet zone of occupation included Lower Austria (with the borders from 1937), Burgenland and the Mühlviertel in the North of Upper Austria. The U.S. zone contained the South of Upper Austria and Salzburg. The British zone consisted of Styria, Carinthia, and East Tyrol, and the French zone included Tyrol and Vorarlberg. While the first district in Vienna was under joint administration, the other districts were divided between the four powers. The Soviets controlled the 2., 4., 10., 20. and 21. districts. The U.S. occupied the 7., 8., 9., 17., 18., and 19. districts. The French the 6., 14., 15. and 16. districts. The British zone included the 3., 5., 11., 12. and 13. districts.³⁵

It is important to point out that prior to the ratification of these two agreements a provisional government under Chancellor Karl Renner had already been formed at the end of April 1945. Soon after Soviet troops had entered Austria they had stumbled across Renner, and in the following entrusted him with the formation of a government. It was composed of members of the Social Democratic Party (SPÖ), the People's Party (ÖVP; previously called the Christian Social Party) and the Communist Party (KPÖ), and was recognised by the Soviets on 29 April, two days after the proclamation of the Second Austrian Republic.³⁶ At that time the Western occupation powers had not yet entered Austria, and Germany's surrender would take place several days later, on 8 May. Hence, the Western Allies, in particular the British, were rather sceptical and believed that the provisional government was in fact a Soviet, and therefore communist,

³² William B. Bader, *Austria Between East and West. 1945–1955* (Stanford University Press: Stanford, 1966), 58.

³³ Grayson, "Austria's International Position," 59-61.

³⁴ "Agreement on Zones of Occupation in Austria and Administration of the City of Vienna," 9 July 1945, in Grayson, "Austria's International Position," 222-224.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ "Proklamation über die Selbständigkeit Österreichs," StBGl Nr. 1/1945, 1 May 1945.

controlled puppet government.³⁷ The Allies subsequently refused to recognise it, and ignored to ratify it in the First Control Agreement. To obtain official acceptance, Renner gave in and expanded its government team to include politicians from all over Austria in the course of the Provincial Conference in September 1945.³⁸ In addition, he cleared the way for general elections. The Western powers acknowledged the provisional governments willingness to change, and eventually recognised it on 20 October 1945.³⁹

Gerald Stourzh has argued that, paradoxically, this recognition proved to be the starting point for a “period of total control.”⁴⁰ He also stated that the Allies’ common denominators in the year 1945 were, firstly, the desire to re-establish an independent Austria in the terms of the Moscow Declaration, and secondly, the perception that after seven years of Nazi domination and indoctrination, legal powers needed to be imposed upon the Austrians from above.⁴¹

The first general elections were eventually held on 25 November 1945, and Leopold Figl of the victorious ÖVP was made chancellor. To appease both the Western and the Eastern occupation powers, the government consisted of representatives from all three parties. While the coalition government received official recognition from the Allies, its field of activities was nevertheless rather limited in the beginning. The government, for example, had to obtain Allied approval for every single legislative and administrative action.⁴² This was only suspended with the ratification of the Second Control Agreement on 28 June 1946.⁴³ As a result, simple legislative measures no longer needed the unanimous

³⁷ The British Labour government under Clement Attlee not only adopted a critical attitude regarding the communist government members, but also became suspicious of the SPÖ-ÖVP cooperation under Soviet influence. See Reinhold Wagnleitner, “Großbritannien und die Wiederrichtung der Republik Österreich,” PhD. diss., Universität Salzburg, 1975, 361; Guy Stanley, “Die britischen Vorbehalte gegenüber der provisorischen Regierung Renner 1945,” *Zeitgeschichte* 2 (1975/1976), 38-46.

³⁸ Prior to the Provincial Conference in September 1945 the Renner government only included members from eastern Austria. What is more, its authority only extended to Vienna and the Soviet occupation zone. See Grayson, “Austria’s International Position,” 74-75.

³⁹ Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 33.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid., 33-34.

⁴² Grayson, “Austria’s International Position,” 93.

⁴³ “Abkommen zwischen den Regierungen des Vereinigten Königreiches, der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, der Union der Sozialistischen Sowjetrepubliken und der Französischen Republik über den Kontrollapparat in Österreich vom 28. Juni 1946,” (Zweites Kontrollabkommen) in

approval of all four Allied Council members, although it was still required for constitutional laws.⁴⁴ The Second Control Agreement brought several further changes, for instance, it permitted the Austrian government to establish diplomatic relations with member states of the United Nations.⁴⁵

When the Second Control Agreement was ratified no one had thought it would provide the basis for the Allied occupation regime until the implementation of the State Treaty on 27 July 1955. Stourzh has pointed out that the Austrian Foreign Minister Karl Gruber had already approached William Mack, the British Political Representative in Vienna, in February 1946 and conveyed a draft concerning the re-establishment of an entirely independent Austria.⁴⁶ However, the negotiations for the State Treaty turned out to be more difficult than any of those involved governments had anticipated in 1946. The issue of the State Treaty was discussed at several conferences between 1947 and 1953.⁴⁷ Yet, the decision-making process was repeatedly delayed by one of the Allied governments – mainly the Soviet Union – for various reasons. The hostile relationship between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in the early Cold War added to the delay. The tense atmosphere became apparent in the course of the events of 1948, the Czech coup d'état and the Berlin blockade. By 1948 Austria had however already anchored itself in the Western sphere of influence, and the introduction of the Marshall Plan had contributed to this. As Robert Knight remarked, “by 1948 the Austrian government could be reasonably sure that the Americans were prepared to pay to maintain her Western orientation.”⁴⁸

After Stalin's death in March 1953 the international situation slowly began to shift towards a policy of “peaceful coexistence” and détente. Saki Ruth

Stephan Verosta, *Die Internationale Stellung Österreichs. Eine Sammlung von Erklärungen und Verträgen aus den Jahren 1938 und 1947* (Vienna: Manzsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1947), 104-113.

⁴⁴ Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 48.

⁴⁵ This permission granted official diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom and ultimately provided the framework for the signing of the Cultural Convention in 1953. For discussions surrounding the Cultural Convention see chapter 4. Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 50.

⁴⁶ Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 41.

⁴⁷ According to Stourzh, there were 260 individual sessions between 1947 and 1953. Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 782-790.

⁴⁸ Robert Knight, “British policy towards occupied Austria 1945–1950,” PhD. diss., University of London, 1986, 203.

Dockrill has argued that, “the majority of Western leaders did not believe that the Kremlin’s new leadership [note: Georgy Malenkov] would inaugurate a profound change in Soviet policy.”⁴⁹ This speculation was eventually confirmed, as an actual change in Soviet foreign policy in regards to Austria only occurred with Khrushchev’s coming to power at the end of March 1953. Julius Raab, who became chancellor of Austria in 1953, seized the opportunity and approached the Soviet Union to lobby for mutual consent regarding the still outstanding State Treaty.⁵⁰ Summit talks between the Soviets and an Austrian delegation were held in Moscow in April 1955, which ultimately led to the signing of the Austrian State Treaty on 15 May 1955.⁵¹ This agreement was made possible by Austria’s promise not to join any military alliance and to declare perpetual neutrality.⁵² Dockrill has asserted that the Austrian settlement was delayed because the Allies had attached more importance to the German question, and the development of the Cold War had complicated the situation. According to her assessment “the Austrian problem became a hostage to great-power politics.”⁵³ Audrey Cronin’s description is similar; she has argued that “Austria increasingly became an instrument rather than an object of great power policy.”⁵⁴

According to Siegfried Beer, the Allied occupation period, in regards to British policy, can be divided into five different phases:

1. Planning for Austria (1943-1945)
2. New beginning and direct control (May to October/November 1945)
3. Democratisation and consolidation (November 1945 to June 1946)
4. Self-government and emancipation (July 1946 to 1948/49)

⁴⁹ Saki Ruth Dockrill, “Austria in Britain’s Foreign Policy from the Second World War to 1955,” in *Der österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955. Internationale Strategie, rechtliche Relevanz, nationale Identität*, eds. Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 249-264, here 256.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 257.

⁵¹ Stourzh, “Um Einheit und Freiheit,” 788.

⁵² “Bundesverfassungsgesetz vom 26. Oktober 1955 über die Neutralität Österreichs,” BGBl. Nr. 211/1955, 4 November 1955.

⁵³ Dockrill, “Austria in Britain’s Foreign Policy,” 263.

⁵⁴ Cronin, “Great Power Politics and the Struggle over Austria,” 19.

5. Symbolic presence of the British (1950 to 1955)⁵⁵

The first phase was characterised by the Moscow Declaration and the establishment of the EAC. The second phase commenced with the end of the Second World War and lasted until the first general elections in Austria. From that moment on the third phase began and spanned to the ratification of the Second Control Agreement. This initiated the fourth phase, which extended to 1949, when the British gradually began to reduce their troops from Austria. The integration of the ACA/BE into the British embassy in 1950 signified the beginning of the fifth phase, which lasted until the signing of the State Treaty and the complete withdrawal of the British troops.⁵⁶

2.1.3. The British Perspective on Cultural Activities

Beer has highlighted the fact that the occupation period can be depicted in a variety of ways, depending on the respective Allied Powers' point of view the occupation period can be depicted in a variety of ways.⁵⁷ Therefore I will hereinafter touch on specific British aspects regarding the occupation period with a focus on the cultural approach.

The Allied Commission for Austria was divided into thirteen different Divisions: Military, Naval, Air, Economic, Finance, Reparation and Restitution, Internal Affairs, Labour, Legal, Prisoners of War and Displaced Persons, Political, Transport, and Education.⁵⁸ Specific Divisions of the British Element of the ACA that dealt with cultural affairs will be considered in the following section.

⁵⁵ Siegfried Beer, "Britische Zonenpolitik," in *"Österreich ist frei!" Der Österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955*, eds. Stefan Karner, and Gottfried Stangler (Horn/Vienna: Berger, 2005), 77-81, here 77-80.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Siegfried Beer, "Die britische Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945-1955. Von der Militärdiktatur zur Rehabilitation," in *Wiederaufbau in Österreich 1945-1955. Rekonstruktion oder Neubeginn?*, ed. Ernst Bruckmüller (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 2006), 55-89, here 55.

⁵⁸ It appears that the Education Division was added after the ratification of the Second Control Agreement. It should also be noted that in the course of the occupation period some changes were made and several divisions amalgamated. However, the allocation of tasks remained the same. "Agreement on Control Machinery in Austria," 4 July 1945, Article 4, in Grayson, "Austria's International Position," 217-221; Hawkins, "Allied Commission for Austria," 24.

Culture and cultural propaganda fell within the remit of the Political Division and the Education Division. J.W. Nicholls was the first director of the Political Division and was followed by M.H.A. Cheetham in 1946. This Division was in charge of foreign affairs, and dealt with questions regarding frontiers and so on. It consisted of the Political Branch, the Information Services Branch and the Public Relations Branch.⁵⁹ The Education Division emerged as its own division from the Education Branch of the International Affairs Division in 1947 and was directed by C. W. Baty. The responsibilities of this Division involved denazification measures in schools and universities, as well as controlling the content of literature and schoolbooks. The Education Division was divided into the Co-ordination, Liaison and Youth Movement Branch, the University, Schools and Adult Education Branch, and the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Branch.⁶⁰ The British Council in Austria was not attached to the ACA and thereby to any of these Divisions, but was instead subordinated to the office of the British Political Advisor William Mack.

To illustrate the British attitude towards culture I will refer to two contemporary studies by Richard Hiscocks and John Mair.⁶¹ While Hiscocks held the position of the first British Council Representative in post-war Austria, Mair served in the Political Division of the ACA/BE between 1945 and 1948. Due to the authors' personal involvements, both accounts contain valuable background information. Mair, without doubt, shared his view with many others within the occupation authorities when arguing:

“After being cut off for years from all cultural contacts other than those approved by Nazi Germany, Austria now found herself subjected to a flood of cultural propaganda by all four occupying Powers, and through them, brought indirectly into contact once again with world opinion.”⁶²

⁵⁹ Stieber, “Die Briten als Besatzungsmacht in Kärnten,” 26.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 27

⁶¹ Hiscocks, “The Rebirth of Austria”; Balfour and Mair, “Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria” (The book has two parts, John Mair wrote about Austria and Michael Balfour about Germany.)

⁶² Balfour and Mair, “Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria,” 372.

The perception that international cultural propaganda had reached Austria like a decuman wave can be considered a reoccurring theme in both contemporary publications and the archive material. A further leitmotif was the Allies perception that Austria was an extremely cultural nation. Mair seemed to have been impressed that the Austrians, “the heirs of a rich artistic legacy” as he called them, were determined to maintain this legacy “from the earliest days of the occupation.”⁶³ He traced this back to the fact that:

“[...] Vienna was one of the great capitals of Europe, with a cultural and historical tradition which even Nazism and six years of war could hardly be expected to have destroyed. The Austrians themselves, and the Viennese in particular, were known to be a gay and friendly people whom it should be a pleasant task to help on their road back to normal life.”⁶⁴

Hiscocks painted a similar picture. He outlined that the Austrians were keen on culture, despite having a rough trot in a time of acute shortage of vital necessities. He argued:

“In spite of these conditions, performances at the opera and the theatre were sold out. Food, clothing, and cigarettes were scarcely obtainable, so the public spent their money on good entertainment.”

Furthermore, Hiscocks claimed that the creative artists were fully aware of the importance of their work. Entertainment was understood as a distraction from an otherwise difficult everyday life. In this regard Hiscocks reported:

“Amidst political uncertainty, material destruction, and deprivation, actors and musicians gave their best with strong official encouragement, and the people left their cold, damaged homes and empty larders to enjoy the good things that life still had to offer.”⁶⁵

⁶³ Ibid., 373.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 368.

⁶⁵ Hiscocks, „The Rebirth of Austria,“ 174.

When it came to the reconstruction of public buildings, like for instance museums, Hiscocks was critical. In his opinion, already limited financial and material resources could have as well been used for the construction of dwellings in order to ease the housing shortage.⁶⁶ However, he admitted that the reconstruction of buildings with a symbolic value had a “psychological effect on the Austrian people.”⁶⁷

Despite the occupation powers’ cultural efforts, Mair argued that the Austrians, and in particular the Viennese, were not particularly drawn to these cultural offerings. He traced this back to the Austrians’ self-perception as a nation with an outstanding cultural heritage. Subsequently, Mair alleged that the “Viennese [...] showed no inclination to be dazzled by what was so lavishly provided for them.”⁶⁸ Yet, it should be pointed out that this assertion was not necessarily the opinion of the Austrian or the Viennese majority. After all Hiscocks’ and Mair’s personal experiences, in their respective social environments in post-war Austria, had without doubt shaped their perceptions. Accordingly, both authors placed a special emphasis on the elites rather than the masses when discussing the Austrians receptiveness to the Allied, and in particular the British, cultural efforts.

2.2. Theoretical Approach

To understand the activities of the British Council, the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society it is important to look at these against the theoretical backdrop of cultural relations. Eckart Conze argued that such an approach would “help [...] to identify the mental and cultural underpinnings of international policies and international relations.”⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Ibid., 184.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Balfour and Mair, “Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria,” 373.

⁶⁹ Eckart Conze, “States, International Systems, And Intercultural Transfer,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 196-205, here 199.

At the outset the issue of terminology has to be addressed. Upon examination of the relevant primary sources, a lack of consistency regarding the use of certain expressions became immediately obvious. Terms used include: foreign relations, foreign affairs, international cultural relations, cultural diplomacy, cultural imperialism, cultural propaganda, cultural transfer, and cultural exchange. The actors involved understood most of these descriptions as interchangeable. While the wide range of terms seems reasonable in the contemporary environment, I consider it necessary to attempt a more precise approach.

First I want to tackle the definition of culture, as this is a very broad and rather complex theoretical term. The definition of culture varies depending on the respective context; therefore I have decided to place it in the framework of international relations. Akira Iriye's description of culture is useful here: "Culture in the study of international relations may be defined as the sharing and transmitting of consciousness within and across national boundaries [...]." ⁷⁰ This definition can be complemented by John Mitchell's assertion that "culture is an expression of national identity and therefore a factor in international affairs." ⁷¹ The subject of the nature of cultural relations also has to be mentioned. Here, too, I am applying a concept by Iriye:

"Cultural relations may be defined as interactions, both direct and indirect, among two or more cultures. Direct interactions include physical encounters with people or objects of another culture. Indirect relations are more subtle, involving such things as a person's ideas and prejudices about another people, or cross-national influences in philosophy, literature, music, art, and fashion." ⁷²

These direct or indirect interactions require varying actors who pursue different goals. Depending on the actor the objectives can serve political purposes.

⁷⁰ Akira Iriye, "Culture and International History," in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, eds. Michael J. Hogan, and Thomas G. Paterson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 214-225, here 215.

⁷¹ Mitchell, "International Cultural Relations," 2.

⁷² Iriye, "Culture and International History," 242.

Regarding this, I consider Eckart Conze's description of the influence of state actors:

“State as actors in international relations can act politically to spread culture or they can use culture as an instrument of state policy, as a means to achieve or support political objectives.”⁷³

In addition, Conze argues that governments “can use the transfer of culture as a means to enhance stability, security or even hegemony.”⁷⁴ This, for example, corresponds to the British Council. As a semi-official body it was, on one hand, funded by the government, but on the other hand not controlled by it.⁷⁵ Yet, there is no doubt that the BC's policy went along with the official one of the Foreign Office and the British government. After all, immediately after the BC took up its activities in post-war Austria it focused on re-education, a policy that conformed to the denazification measures of the British occupation authorities.

However, it would be short-sighted to explain cultural relations as a mere interaction between states or governments. Its complexity goes beyond that; therefore, the interrelation of state and non-state actors has to be explained in the context of cultural diplomacy. There are many different theoretical approaches towards cultural diplomacy, and several authors, such as Mitchell and Volker Depkat, have defined it as the unique task of governments.⁷⁶ To my mind it is essential to think outside of the box, as non-state actors can equally function as cultural transmitters. I will use Oliver Schmidt's rather broad definition of cultural diplomacy. He argued:

“I define cultural diplomacy as the spectrum of activities undertaken by government or by non-governmental organizations acting as contractual cosponsors of public agencies, to portray a nation to the citizenry of another

⁷³ Conze, “States, International Systems, And Intercultural Transfer,” 199.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Mitchell, “International Cultural Relations,” 73.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 3; Volker Depkat, “Cultural Approaches to International Relations. A Challenge?,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 175-197, here 177-178.

nation. The self-portrayal aims to heighten awareness and sympathy of other peoples toward that nation, enhance its prestige, back up political and economic foreign relations, or reinforce loyalty of citizens living abroad. Cultural diplomacy includes the promotion and transmission of cultural media such as film, literature, music or art, as well as exchanges of experts and visitors from all walks of life.”⁷⁷

This definition proves applicable to the actors that are central to this thesis, whose activities were embedded in the framework of cultural diplomacy. The British Council, the Anglo-Austrian Society, and the Austro-British Society either aspired to cultural transfer or cultural exchange to achieve their objectives. This calls for a differentiation between cultural transfer and exchange. Conze argued that intercultural transfer “should be considered broadly and not only as the transfer of culture, but as a transfer between cultures.”⁷⁸ Hans Lüsebrink asserted that cultural transfer goes beyond a particular cultural sector, but instead affects a great number. He argued:

*“Kulturtransfer – oder ‘interkultureller Transfer’ – [...] betrifft also nicht einen bestimmten kulturellen Sektor, sondern die Übertragung von Ideen, kulturellen Artefakten, Praktiken und Institutionen aus einem spezifischen System gesellschaftlicher Handlungs-, Verhaltens- und Deutungsmuster in ein anderes.”*⁷⁹

According to Lüsebrink, cultural transfer consists of three processes: *Selektionsprozesse*, *Vermittlungsprozesse* and *Rezeptionsprozesse*. Three different mediators, namely individuals, institutions or media, can conduct these *Vermittlungsprozesse*.⁸⁰ The British Council can, in my opinion, serve as an example of such a process in an institutional framework. Lüsebrink, furthermore, argues that the driving force of cultural transfer processes can be based on

⁷⁷ Oliver Schmidt, “Small Atlantic World. U.S. Philanthropy and the Expanding International Exchange of Scholars after 1945,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 115-134, here 127.

⁷⁸ Conze, “States, International Systems, And Intercultural Transfer,” 200.

⁷⁹ Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink, *Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Interaktion, Fremdwahrnehmung, Kulturtransfer* (Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 2008), 131-133.

⁸⁰ Lüsebrink, “Interkulturelle Kommunikation,” 129.

economical interests, political or ideological targets, or emotional factors.⁸¹ This corresponds with Armin Klein's assertion of the aims of cultural policy. He argues that cultural policy could be based on four different objectives, namely on aesthetics, educational policy, social policy and economics.⁸² While the latter three can be assigned to the British Council, only the educational objective related to the AAS and the ABS.

Jessica Gienow-Hecht proposed that cultural imperialism could be understood as a form of cultural transfer. In her opinion:

“In its most basic form cultural imperialism comprises the assumption that one nation deliberately attempts to impose its culture, ideology, goods, and way of life on another country.”⁸³

While this concept seems applicable to the activities of the semi-official British Council, it does not appear compatible with the Anglo-Austrian and the Austro-British Society. Both Societies can be described as actors in a cultural exchange process. According to their constitutions and objectives, neither desired a one-way transfer, and instead explicitly worked towards bilateral cultural exchange.

⁸¹ Ibid., 149-141.

⁸² Armin Klein, *Kulturpolitik. Eine Einführung* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2003), 156-158.

⁸³ Jessica Gienow-Hecht, “Cultural Transfer,” in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, eds. Michael J. Hogan, Thomas G. Paterson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 257-278, here 258.

3. The British Council

In this section, I will briefly touch upon the history of the British Council.⁸⁴ The Council was founded as the official British overseas propaganda agency, with the aim of spreading British ideas abroad. Due to its geographical position on the borderline between East and West and its history as a highly cultural nation, Austria became a special area of operation in the post-war period. The BC hoped to play a vital role in the country, mainly by transmitting culture and promoting educational ideals. In this chapter I will first outline the founding of the BC, mention its policy during the Second World War, and then address the Council's activities in Austria.

3.1. The British Council's Early Years

After the First World War, a committee was appointed by the then British Foreign Secretary George Curzon, to reflect on how "a greater spirit of solidarity among British communities abroad" could be fostered, and, furthermore, how "British ideas" could be spread and "appreciated by foreign nations."⁸⁵ In 1920 the committee submitted a report that proposed institutes in foreign countries where lectures on English literature, history and art would be given. It also suggested opening reading rooms to provide not only books but also periodicals and newspapers, and the establishment of student exchanges.⁸⁶ However, the Treasury and the Cabinet rejected these suggestions for various reasons. On the one hand the Treasury did not prove itself able to supply long-term financing, and on the other hand the government refused to see the benefit of a cultural organisation.

In the following years several associations emphasised the importance of cultural propaganda and highlighted its potential economic benefits. Philip Taylor asserted that the success of commercial organisations, such as the Empire

⁸⁴ My intention is to dwell on the British Council's activities in post-war Austria in a later and more detailed study. Thus, this chapter raises no claim to completeness.

⁸⁵ Donaldson, "The British Council," 15

⁸⁶ Ibid.

Marketing Board and the Travel Association of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, paved the way for the British Council.⁸⁷

At the end of the 1920s, there was an increasing tendency amongst many European countries, like for example Germany, France and Italy, to conduct cultural diplomacy abroad.⁸⁸ These countries recognised the opportunity for spreading culture by means of language teaching. The British Foreign Office observed this trend closely, and as a result recognised the prospective value of a British cultural organisation that could operate across the globe. The FO's hindsight was also closely linked to the rising political instability in Europe throughout the 1930s, and the incipient decline of Britain's world power status. Later British overseas propaganda can subsequently be understood as a form of counter-propaganda, which aimed to convince foreigners that Britain's global power was not deteriorating. After perennial debates about the benefits of cultural diplomacy, the actual foundation of the British Council can, I believe, be described as a turning point in the British government's foreign policy.⁸⁹

In December 1934, The British Committee For Relations With Other Countries was founded, but the word "Committee" was soon replaced by "Council"; and in 1936 the FO announced the abbreviation of the organisation's name to British Council.⁹⁰ In a statement from 1935 the aims of the Committee – as it was then called – were outlined as follows:

"To make the life and thought of the British people more widely known abroad; and to promote a mutual interchange of knowledge and ideas with other peoples. To encourage the study and use of the English language, both in foreign countries and the Crown Colonies and Dependencies; to assist overseas schools in equipping themselves for this purpose; to enable students from overseas to undertake courses of education or industrial training in the United Kingdom. To bring other peoples into closer touch

⁸⁷ Taylor, "The Projection of Britain," 95-98, 103-104.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 83, 126-127, 139.

⁸⁹ For the British Council's activities in the framework of cultural diplomacy, see Haigh, "Cultural Diplomacy in Europe," 119-131.

⁹⁰ Donaldson, "The British Council," 1.

with British ideals and practice in education, industry and Government; to make available to them the benefits of current British contributions to the sciences and technology; and to afford them opportunities of appreciating contemporary British work in literature, the fine arts, drama and music.”⁹¹

From the beginning, on the Council’s outline was created with long-term aims in mind, accompanied by a noticeably “pro-British” message.⁹² This was mainly implemented because the BC thought that a pro-British outlook would result in political and economic benefits for Britain.⁹³

However, the British Council was to generally avoid activities that would reveal political propaganda, because the organisation’s aim was to communicate political messages in an indirect manner. It was believed that unobtrusive political propaganda would be more effective with the Council’s target group.⁹⁴ The BC aimed to address “well-informed individuals”, precisely the “educational, cultural and governing elites” of foreign countries, in order to reach a wider audience through them.⁹⁵ However the BC never intended to put pressure on others to “think British”, instead it hoped its target group would do so, after attending for example an event at a Council Institute.⁹⁶

3.2. Changes and Post- War Perspectives

At the beginning of the Second World War the British Council was absorbed by the Ministry of Information (MOI), but the name British Council remained in order to ease the continuance of its work after the war. While the MOI took over propaganda activities, like media and press relations, the Council continued its educational work, even under the control of the Ministry.⁹⁷ Many Council officials rejected the BC’s incorporation to the MOI, especially as the staff from

⁹¹ Memorandum and Articles of Association. 1934–1935, BW 2/121, TNA, as cited in Taylor, “The Projection of Britain,” 153.

⁹² Eastment, “The policies and position of the British Council,” 3.

⁹³ Ibid., 4.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 3.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 6.

both organisations did not share the same opinion on many topics. Consequently, the relations between the two bodies were “stormy from the outset.”⁹⁸

The unexpected death of the BC’s chairman George Lloyd in 1941 and the issue of succession, instigated a fundamental discussion about the future of the organisation. The MOI was not particular keen on the BC’s continuance, and the Treasury refused to see why it should provide funds for cultural activities when the money was instead much more needed for the war economy.⁹⁹ As influential politicians, such as Winston Churchill and Anthony Eden, supported the BC, the organisation’s survival was ultimately ensured.¹⁰⁰ During the last years of the war, the BC’s budget was increased due to additional government funds. This illustrates that the Council’s work was eventually considered as a contribution to the war effort, and that the long-term benefit of such a cultural organisation had been acknowledged.

During the course of the Second World War, the FO and the BC began to reflect on future activities in Europe. Prior to the actual end of the war, the Council actively prepared to work in liberated countries and Western European countries were given first priority. In this regard, Alexander Cadogan, serving as the Permanent Under-Secretary at the FO from 1938 to 1946, emphasised that “direct political influence in most of the countries of Eastern Europe are likely to be limited.”¹⁰¹ Besides, he argued:

“Indirect means of influence such as the long-term work of the British Council, will, therefore be very valuable. We should certainly operate in all the enemy countries of Europe, except Germany, as soon as opportunity offers. [...] We should like the Council to work in due course in Austria [...].”¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Ibid., 10.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 26.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 25.

¹⁰¹ Cadogan to Robertson, 3 January 1945, FO 924/88, TNA.

¹⁰² Ibid.

The BC discussed the extent and the nature of its future activities in great detail. The organisation was fully aware of the significance of its post-war activities, and it acknowledged that its work would be an important contribution to the self-projection of Britain after the war. The BC took the view:

“The Council considers that the need for cultural publicity and information is urgent and that its return in goodwill may well prove an important factor in the future position of Great Britain in Europe [...].”¹⁰³

3.3. The British Council in Austria¹⁰⁴

The conditions, which the British Council encountered in Austria after the end of the war, were different from those it had been accustomed to in other countries.¹⁰⁵ After years of Nazi indoctrination and cultural isolation, the BC was eager to “fill the ideological vacuum in Austria with British ideas.”¹⁰⁶

In 1942, the British Council had already “consider[d] plans for its work in central Europe after the war” and touched upon the topic that suitable staff would be needed for Germany and Austria in this regard.¹⁰⁷ However, it took the Council until the beginning of 1945 to initiate serious discussions about its future activities in Austria. In January 1945, the BC approached William Mack, who then was the Deputy Commissioner of the ACA/BE, in order to investigate the Council’s opportunities. In a letter to the Foreign Office, Mack noted the following.

“[...] provided the things go reasonably well we may expect a considerable revulsion of feeling in favour of democratic and especially

¹⁰³ Memorandum, the British Council, April 1945, BW 2/95, TNA.

¹⁰⁴ This chapter is to a certain extent based on the paragraph “The British Council in Early Cold War Austria” in Isabella Lehner, Max Chrambach, Konstantin Freytag-Loringhoven, and Paola Varotto, “From entrenching to overcoming the Iron Curtain: The changing goals of Western cultural diplomacy in the first phase of the Cold War (1945 –1975),” *Zeitgeschichte* 6 (2011), forthcoming.

¹⁰⁵ Further information on the British cultural activities in the British zone of occupation: Johannes Feichtinger, and Eduard G. Staudinger, “Aspekte des kulturellen Wiederaufbaus in der Steiermark zwischen Kooperation und Kontrolle,” in *Die „britische“ Steiermark*, ed. Siegfried Beer (Graz: Selbstverlag der Hist. Landeskomm. für Steiermark, 1995), 499-527; Feichtinger, “Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich,” 495-529.

¹⁰⁶ Eastment, “The policies and position of the British Council,” 242.

¹⁰⁷ Blake to Crossman, 10 September 1942, BW 2/94, TNA.

British ideas, and a country which has been completely starved of British culture – especially literature and language teaching – should provide fertile ground.”¹⁰⁸

In addition, Mack pointed towards future relations between the British Council and the ACA/BE. He suggested that the Council must not be attached to the ACA/BE, but instead should operate under the Political Division.¹⁰⁹ This was partly implemented to preserve the Council’s independence and purport the organisation’s apolitical character. Moreover, the decision to attach the BC to the Political Division was made for practical reasons. It was obvious in advance that the BC would be dependent upon the British occupational authorities and the Army for rations, fuel, patrol housing, furniture and travel facilities.¹¹⁰ The BC’s long-term aims were another reason to implement this. The Council feared, that after the end of the occupation and the withdrawal of the British authorities the BC would be “too closely associated in the minds of the Austrians with [the] instrument of control.”¹¹¹ The Council’s perception concerning this was:

“[...] in the case of Austria it would be especially necessary for the Council Representative to work in close co-operation with the Allied Commission, but this co-operation should be unobtrusive since the apparent independence of the Council is helpful to its work.”¹¹²

The BC commenced with planning its forthcoming activities in Austria in the following spring. The London-based FO and BC officials extensively debated on issues such as financial feasibility, the scale and the character of the BC’s activities and the necessity of professionally qualified staff.¹¹³ To investigate the prevailing situation the BC sent its officers J. H. Vinden, A. F. Dunlop and

¹⁰⁸ Mack to Gurney, 31 January 1945, FO 924/196, TNA.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹¹¹ Wickham to Gurney 10 April 1945, FO 924/196, TNA.

¹¹² Council’s Work in Austria, March 1945, FO 924/196, TNA.

¹¹³ Possibilities of the British Council operating in Austria, handwritten note (probably by Gurney), March 1945, FO 924/196, TNA; Montagu-Pollock to Mack, 15 May 1945, FO 924/196, TNA.

Michael Grant to Vienna in winter 1945.¹¹⁴ Upon his return from the exploratory visit Michael Grant from the BC's Foreign Division noted that in Vienna "everybody is quite spontaneously shouting for British culture."¹¹⁵ He rated the BC's chances in Austria as follows:

"[...] the state of world has given us our first chance in history of achieving the far from negligible result of scouring a foothold in Viennese educated circles."¹¹⁶

By the beginning of 1946, the British Council had managed to establish a temporary place of residence in Vienna.¹¹⁷ By the end of April 1946 the Vienna branch had moved to the premises on the Freyung, Vienna I., although the official opening only took place at the beginning of November.¹¹⁸ The BC's bureaus were intentionally and demonstrably independent from the headquarters of the ACA/BE at Schloss Schönbrunn. As previously decided, the BC was attached to the Political Division under Mack, and cooperated with the Information Services Branch. However, the BC was not directly subordinated to the ACA/BE.¹¹⁹

In accordance with the BC's general policy, the Council should at least appear to be an independent institution on the surface. Besides, the FO argued that during the occupation an independent representation, like an embassy or consulate, could not be possible.¹²⁰ Siegfried Beer has suggested that the structural separation between the cultural sector, represented by the Council, and the propaganda sector, connected with the British military government should be

¹¹⁴ Report on Exploratory Visit to Austria, by Dunlop, November 1945, FO 924/196, TNA; Report on Four Weeks in Austria, December 1945 – January 1946, by Grant, 23 January 1946, FO 924/456, TNA; Report of J. H. Vinden's Exploratory Visit and Preliminary Activity in Establishing a British Council Office in Vienna, 27 January 1946, BW 13/1, TNA.

¹¹⁵ Report on Four Weeks in Austria, December 1945 – January 1946, by Grant, 23 January 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Report of J. H. Vinden's Exploratory Visit and Preliminary Activity in Establishing a British Council Office in Vienna, 27 January 1946, BW 13/1, TNA.

¹¹⁸ Annual Report 1946/47, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹¹⁹ Feichtinger, "Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich," 503.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 502.

understood as a message, targeted at the Austrians, that culture should ideally be independent from the state.¹²¹

In addition to the Vienna branch, the BC took up activities in Graz in May and in Klagenfurt in June 1946, both located in the British zone of occupation. However, the official opening ceremonies of the Klagenfurt and Graz bureaus did not take place until October 1946 and February 1947 respectively.¹²² In 1947, an office in the French zone in Innsbruck was added, and in addition the Council was allowed to lecture in Salzburg and Linz, which were both part of the U.S. zone.¹²³ However, in the early occupation period the BC was neither allowed to operate in the Soviet zone, nor was there any official contact with Soviet cultural representatives.

In the first few months after the BC had set up its offices, the organisation's branches focused on establishing libraries, organised public events, such as book and art exhibitions, inviting British writers, scientists, musicians, theatre and ballet companies, and starting to promote language teaching.¹²⁴

Johannes Feichtinger claims that the particular phase where the BC tried to display British high culture, for example by the use of guest performances from British artists, was narrowed to the year 1946.¹²⁵ The Council subsequently altered its methods and the content of its work, and instead of expensive guest performances, the BC's focus shifted to a re-orientation and re-education policy as part of the British security policy.¹²⁶ On closer examination, this assertion is only partly correct. While the display of high culture was certainly decreasing over the course of the late 1940s and early 1950s, the BC did not terminate its cultural activities. Besides, contrary to Feichtinger's assertion, the BC's policy had included re-education and re-orientation right from the beginning. In fact, the eradication of remnants of Nazi culture was part of the British security policy and also implemented by the BC.

¹²¹ Beer, "Die Kultur- und Informationspolitik der britischen Besatzungsmacht," 121.

¹²² Annual Report 1946/47, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹²³ Feichtinger, "Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich," 518.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 508.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

The British Council's first representative in Austria, Richard Hiscocks, characterised the BC's work in regards to denazification as follows:

“[...] Council work in Austria should be reviewed against the background of Allied denazification. The process has created a vacuum in the minds of many Austrians, particularly young Austrians. The urgency of the need for equally thorough constructive work to replace Nazi doctrines cannot be exaggerated. Here the Council has an opportunity that will not recur and is diminished in scope with every day's delay in taking effective action. In no other country, except in Germany potentially, has the Council such a chance and such a responsibility at the present time.”¹²⁷

Britain's self-portrayal as a successful world power was certainly determined by an illusion of a “cultural hunger in regard to Great Britain.”¹²⁸ As noted in many British Council documents, the organisation was bursting with self-confidence. The Education Branch from the ACA/BE already noted in December 1945 that “a unique opportunity exists to sell the British way [...] in Austria.”¹²⁹ However, it appears that the self-confidence of the British occupation powers was exaggerated to a certain extent. The Britons had quickly realised that they found themselves in a country with an exceptional cultural tradition; therefore, they had to showcase their greatest cultural artefacts. After his visit to Vienna in November 1945, A. F. Dunlop described the situation:

“In Vienna the Council is faced with a city of great cultural tradition and high standards, which claims, rightly or wrongly, to be the cultural centre of Europe.”¹³⁰

The BC characterised its primary tasks correspondingly:

¹²⁷ Memorandum on the Extension of British Council Activities in Austria, by Hiscocks, 17 April 1946, FO 924/456, TNA; In addition see: Re-education in Austria, by Hiscocks, 1 February 1947, FO 924/609, TNA; For the British Council's activities in (West) Germany see: Gabriele Clemens, *Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland. 1945-1949. Literatur, Film, Musik und Theater* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997).

¹²⁸ Letter from ACA (BE) to Vinden, 12 December 1945, BW 13/1, TNA.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Report on Exploratory Visit to Austria, by Dunlop, November 1945, FO 924/196, TNA.

“The Council’s main task in Austria can be summarised as the satisfying of the cultural needs, so far as British interests are concerned of a country which in the past has always considered itself one of the cultural leaders of Europe.”¹³¹

With the beginning of the Cold War, the British Council’s policy shifted from re-education towards Western orientation.¹³² The developments in the emerging global conflict were closely observed by the BC, and due to the “international uncertainty” and the events in Czechoslovakia and Berlin in 1948, the British Council rated Austria as “significant”.¹³³ This was due to the country’s “position as the Eastern realm of Western European civilisation.”¹³⁴ The BC emphasised the value of “concrete signs of interest in Austria on the part of the Western powers.”¹³⁵ In general, the BC realised that the Cold War “added considerably to the Council’s responsibilities”, and that its assigned tasks were extended to defend “Western civilisation against the inroads of communism by presenting a positive alternative.”¹³⁶ The BC even abolished its official non-political policy and argued it “must be influenced by and contribute to political as well as cultural ends.”¹³⁷ Yet, the political – anti-communist – character of the Council’s cultural and educational work was to remain obscure to the audience. The BC aimed at supporting transfers in the technological, scientific and cultural fields, hoping “to retain a strong Western orientation in Austrian intellectual life.”¹³⁸

During the early 1950s, the British Council underwent several crucial changes. The ratification of the Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom in 1953 and the subsequent appointment of the BC as the British government’s agent provided the mandatory legal framework for the BC’s

¹³¹ Annual Report 1946, The British Council Austria, FO 924/456, TNA.

¹³² For the British Council in early Cold War Austria see: Isabella Lehner, “From entrenching to overcoming the Iron Curtain,” in *Zeitgeschichte* 6 (2011), forthcoming.

¹³³ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹³⁴ Annual Report 1949/50, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹³⁵ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹³⁶ Future of the British Council, 26 July 1951, CAB 129/47, TNA.

¹³⁷ Annual Report 1949/50, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

activities in a post-occupation Austria. At the same time, the British Council was sorely affected by financial difficulties. Apart from immense costs in both occupied countries Austria and Germany, Britain's financial resources were seriously depleted after the war. The true extent of the country's economic problems became obvious in 1947, after British exports plummeted and the currency fell into a state of crisis.¹³⁹ Britain's weakened financial situation also had negative effects on the BC. After the Council staff in Austria had already been reduced in 1947, further cutbacks had to be made in the early 1950s in the wake of the Drogheda Committee.¹⁴⁰ The Committee's final report triggered a lively debate in diplomatic circles as it had proposed the BC's withdrawal from all European countries. While the suggestion to abandon Austria completely was not pursued, the report's proposal can be linked to the gradual reduction of the British Council's staff and with that a reduction of the organisation's scope of activities. The BC's financial issues and the repeated curtailments resulted in the closure of the Klagenfurt branch in 1949, the Innsbruck bureaus in 1955 and the Graz offices in 1956.¹⁴¹

The Drogheda Committee had also recommended the prioritisation of educational over high-cultural activities. The BC initiated this policy gradually. Instead of organising cultural events, it began concentrating on teaching English, on organising language summer schools and fostering the exchange of students and academics. As the BC could no longer provide several services due to financial restrictions, it increasingly cooperated with the Anglo-Austrian Society

¹³⁹ Victor H. Rothwell, "Großbritannien und die Anfänge des Kalten Krieges," in *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage. Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945-1952*, ed. Josef Foscith (Göttingen/Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 88-110, here 102; D. Cameron Watt, "Großbritannien, die Vereinigten Staaten und Deutschland," in *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945-1949*, eds. Josef Foscith, and Rolf Steininger (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1985), 15-25, here 24.

¹⁴⁰ Overseas Information Services: Report of the Drogheda Committee, Note by Eden, 13 November 1953, CAB 129/64, TNA.

¹⁴¹ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA; Annual Report 1948/49 The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA; Annual Report 1954/44, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA; Annual Report 1955/56, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

and the Austro-British Society.¹⁴² Subsequently, the BC made an effort to exert a dominating influence through them.¹⁴³

The signing of the Austrian State Treaty in May 1955 and the subsequent independence of the country changed the conditions of the BC's activities. With the end of the occupation and the withdrawal of Allied troops from Austria, the BC recognised that the "background and the structure of the Council's work changed."¹⁴⁴ The British, the Americans and the Soviets alike cut back on their cultural work as a consequence of the end of the occupation. In contrast, the French decided to expand their activities.¹⁴⁵ The events of 1955 did not signify a turning point for the British Council. Its policies and the renewed focus on educational activities had commenced earlier in the course of the Drogheda report.

¹⁴² For a more detailed account of the British Council's interrelation with the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society, see the following chapters.

¹⁴³ Feichtinger, "Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich," 528.

¹⁴⁴ Annual Report 1955/56, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

4. The Anglo-Austrian (Democratic) Society

The Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society (AADS) was founded in July 1944 in London. The society shortened its name to Anglo-Austrian Society (AAS) in April 1946. Before tackling the specific issue of the Anglo-Austrian Society, I will first give an outline of other Austrian exile organisations in Great Britain. This contextualisation is necessary to understand the setting of the Society's early activities. While several of these organisations only existed for a short period of time, about a dozen experienced greater longevity.¹⁴⁶

4.1. Excursus: Emigration and Exile

With the outbreak of the Second World War in September 1939, around 60,000 German and Austrian refugees had fled to Great Britain.¹⁴⁷ About half of these émigrés were Austrians, with around 90% having emigrated due to their Jewish heritage and 10% for political reasons.¹⁴⁸ The first émigré cliques soon formed, and the establishment of exile organisations quickly followed.

The following examples provide a brief overview and background description of selected organisations. These were based on political camps, namely the socialist, the communist, the conservative and legitimists.¹⁴⁹ Even though the communists did not exert a significant influence during Austria's First Republic – indeed nor in Austria's Second Republic – they maintained several major exile organisations in Great Britain.

¹⁴⁶ Reinhard Müller, "Einige österreichische Exilorganisationen in Großbritannien," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.literaturepochen.at/exil/multimedia/pdf/exilorganisationenreinhard.pdf>.

¹⁴⁷ Angus Calder, *The People's War. Britain 1939 – 1945* (London: Pimlico, 1969, reprinted 2008), 130.

¹⁴⁸ These categories are naturally overlapping to a certain degree. Charmian Brinson, "'A Very Ambitious Plan' The Early Days of the Austrian Centre," in *Out of Austria. The Austrian Centre in London in World War II*, eds. Marietta Bearman et al. (London/New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008), 6-21, here 6.

¹⁴⁹ Franz Goldner argued that the Austrian émigrés could be assigned to two different groups: One group originated from the legitimist and conservative camp, and had previously gathered around the authoritarian governments under Dollfuss and Schuschnigg. The other group was composed of former Social Democrats, who had already emigrated after the civil war in 1934, and of the more radical Revolutionary Socialists. Interestingly enough Goldner completely ignores the communists in his categorisation. Franz Goldner, *Austrian Emigration 1938 to 1945* (New York: Ungar, 1979), 2.

4.1.1. Austrian Self-Aid

The Austrian Self-Aid was founded by a fraction of the Austrian Communist Party in April 1938. It was the first Austrian relief committee in Great Britain after the Anschluss, and was later incorporated into the Austrian Centre. The Austrian Self-Aid was connected to the Group of Austrian Communists in Great Britain, which had representatives in most Austrian refugee organisations in Britain. This group was one of the main opponents of the London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists. The Council of Austrians in Great Britain was founded as a non-party committee in September 1938. Its sphere of activities included supporting refugees in various matters, such as applying for passports and finding employment. It also cared for interned refugees as well as for Austrian soldiers in the British Army.

4.1.2. The Austrian Centre

On the initiative of the Council of Austrians in Great Britain the Austrian Centre – Association of Austrians was founded in February 1939, as a kind of umbrella organisation of all Austrian refugee organisations. Even though its aim was to function as a non-party organisation, its main proponents were communists. The organisation soon grew, and in March 1939 they opened the first residence of the Austrian Centre in London, which accommodated a restaurant, a library, and a reading room, and a theatre. They also provided language and occupational retraining courses, organised events and lectures, and published a great number of journals. By May 1942, the organisation had more than seventy employees, and 3.000 registered members.¹⁵⁰ Further similar Centres were opened in Belfast, Birmingham, Bournemouth, Bristol, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle, Reigate and York.¹⁵¹ The Austrian Centre was without doubt one of the central meeting places for Austrian emigrants in Britain.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Reinhard Müller, "Einige österreichische Exilorganisationen in Großbritannien," last accessed 2 July 2011,

<http://www.literaturepochen.at/exil/multimedia/pdf/exilorganisationenreinhard.pdf>.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Maimann, "Politik im Wartesaal," 55.

In its early years, the Centre continued the relief work and the activities of the Council of Austrians in Great Britain. Furthermore, it provided advice for Austrian refugees in dealing with British authorities, and helped many people find their missing relatives and friends amongst the Austrian refugees.¹⁵³ In the beginning political activities were only possible on a small scale, mainly because the Centre feared that its communist members would be under suspicion of being enemies. This may be explained by the fact that in the first phase of the Second World War, Britain feared German invasion. As a result, German-speaking people were viewed with distrust, suspected of infiltrating the country as spies. These so called “enemy aliens” were divided in three different groups, in class “A” security risks, in class “B” people that could be trusted, which included the majority of the refugees, and in class “C” loyal anti-Nazis.¹⁵⁴ People classified as security risks were interned in camps until the year 1940; only then they were released and allocated to jobs that contributed to the war effort.¹⁵⁵

Communists were connected to the ideologies by the Soviet Union, which was an ally of Germany in the first years of the war. This changed with the German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941. Subsequently, the Soviet Union joined the Western Allies, and the members of the Austrian Centre could take up a more political role.¹⁵⁶ Prior to that, the Centre’s members had focused on culture and aimed “to establish a distinctive Austrian cultural identity”.¹⁵⁷ This was connected to the communists’ self-perception about Austria as an independent nation, which was based on Alfred Klahr’s theory about the Austrian nation. While this proved to be the theoretical as well as strategic background for the communists’ activities in exile, it was also one of the main contentious points between the communists and the socialists. The reestablishment of an independent Austrian nation was out of the question for many exiled Austrian socialists in the immediate phase after the Anschluss in March 1938.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵³ Bearman et al., “Out of Austria,” 1.

¹⁵⁴ Calder, “The People’s War,” 130-131.

¹⁵⁵ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 19-20.

¹⁵⁶ Bearman et al., “Out of Austria,” 1.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 2.

¹⁵⁸ Otto Bauer had still argued for an all-German democratic revolution when he in exile in 1938, and Karl Renner had, after all, even supported the idea of the Anschluss after its implementation.

4.1.3. The London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists in Great Britain

The establishment of a socialist exile organisation in Britain took place as late as September 1941. Before then, the leading members of the party had chosen exile in Brussels and Paris. In the course of the German invasion of France, they moved their main centres to London and New York. Subsequently, the London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists in Great Britain was set up in 1941 as a branch of the group in New York. It was closely connected to its main figures Oscar Pollak and Karl Czernitz, who were strictly opposed to communist organisations. Helene Maimann describes the relationship between the exiled communists and socialists in London as “open hostility”.¹⁵⁹ Some other members of the London Bureau were Walter Wodak, Wilhelm Rosenzweig, Karl Ausch and Marie Jehoda.¹⁶⁰

The Austrian socialists in Britain were by no means united. The League of Austrian Socialists in Great Britain, under the guidance of the former Member of Parliament Marie Köstler, seceded from the London Bureau at an early stage.¹⁶¹ The extent of the socialists’ internal fragmentation and its issues with the communists cannot be described here in any detail. However, it has to be mentioned that one of the main problems of the socialists was that they appeared rather late on the exile organisation scene in London. By 1941, numerous organisations were already set up in Britain, and many people had organised their lives around these existing organisations. Besides, the socialists’ lack of a proper concept goes back to the period between 1934 and 1938, when the people in charge in Vienna and Brno could not overcome their ideological differences regarding the future direction of the party.

4.1.4. The Free Austrian Movement

The Free Austrian Movement (FAM) was founded in December 1941 and aimed to unite all Austrian exile organisations in Britain. By the end of 1942, 27 different organisations joined the FAM, as well as some prominent individuals,

¹⁵⁹ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 24.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 88.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 122.

such as Oskar Kokoschka, Robert Neumann and Anna Mahler.¹⁶² The movement's long-term aim was the reestablishment of a free and independent Austria. By the beginning of 1941, fifteen different organisations joined, and by 1945 this had increased to 38. Even though the FAM aimed to bring together various political ideologies, most of the members came from a communist or conservative background. The socialist exile organisation never joined the FAM and called it a communist and monarchist organisation.¹⁶³ In 1944, a Free Austrian World Movement (FAWM) was founded, which aimed to bring Austrian exile organisations all over the world together.¹⁶⁴

4.1.5. The Austrian Representative Committee

The Austrian Representative Committee was founded in November 1943, immediately after the Moscow Conference.¹⁶⁵ Even though the Allies had set the reestablishment of Austria as one of their objectives, none of the Austrian exile organisations in Britain was officially recognised by the British authorities. The Austrian Representative Committee was initiated by the Austrian socialists and included representatives from the bourgeois-democratic and Christian exile societies. This somehow suggests a change in socialists' policy, as well as an attempt to overcome their former isolation amongst the exile organisations. However, the communists were not invited to join the committee.

4.1.6. The Austrian Democratic Union

The Austrian Democratic Union, which was founded in September 1941 in London, was an exile organisation that can be categorised as conservative. The Union had around 200 members, and many of them were industrialists, merchants and bankers. Amongst the organisations members were the Austrians Julius Meinl III., Emil Müller-Sturmheim, and Friedrich Hertz. Yet, the organisation also had

¹⁶² Ibid., 19-20.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 125.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 184.

¹⁶⁵ Reinhard Müller, "Einige österreichische Exilorganisationen in Großbritannien," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.literaturepochen.at/exil/multimedia/pdf/exilorganisationenreinhard.pdf>.

some British members. The Unions ultimate aim was an “independent and democratic Austria”.¹⁶⁶

4.1.7. Legitimistic Organisations

Further examples of organisations are the Austrian League, a legitimist organisation around Witold Schey and Otto Hecht, and the Association of Austrian Christian Socials, a small group around Karl Herzfeld, Ludwig Weiser and Josef Otto Lämmel.¹⁶⁷ The legitimist organisations, which gathered around the former diplomat George Franckenstein, did not pay attention to the situation of the refugees, but instead developed federative-restorative plans for the post-war period.¹⁶⁸

4.1.8. Context and Outlook

It seems to me that it is important to outline the circumstances of the aforementioned exile organisations in Britain, in order to understand the setting of the Anglo-Austrian Society. Before describing the Society in more detail, I think that it is necessary to point out that all the afore-mentioned exile organisations were dissolved in the immediate post-war period. The Austrian Centre, for instance, had to close its main centre in London in the beginning of 1947. The withdrawal from Britain was mainly due to the fact that some of the Austrian emigrants had either gone back to Austria, had moved to a different country or integrate with the British community. However, both the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society exist to the present day.

The Foreign Office kept an eye on all the organisations in the course of the war. The various exile organisations’ plans for a future post-war Austria also drew the focus of the FO’s attention. The British authorities were particularly suspicious about the involvement of members that openly declared themselves as communists. This continued to have an effect after the war; subsequently people involved in communist organisations were – in the eyes of the British – not

¹⁶⁶ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 100.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 101.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 94.

particularly welcome in post-war Austria. To give just one example, the communist Eva Kolmer from the Austrian Centre, who was on the proposed membership list of the Austro-British Society in 1946.¹⁶⁹ Her name was dropped by order of the FO, as they did not approve of her involvement.

While the post-war involvement of the Anglo-Austrian Society's socialist orientated members were tolerated and classified as less dangerous, most communists were rejected across-the-board. This was in part due to the conservative attitude of most FO officials, but also because communist organisations had no chance of survival due to the nascent Cold War.

4.2. The Foundation of the Anglo-Austrian (Democratic) Society

The Moscow Declaration of November 1943 proved to be the starting point for the discussions about the foundation of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society. Friedrich Scheu argued that the foundation of such a Society had been in the back of the mind of several Austrian émigrés and their British friends for a while.¹⁷⁰ They hoped that the establishment of an organisation composed of people from both countries, would make a contribution towards “spreading the message of a democratic Austria.”¹⁷¹ As a result, Austrians and Britons together founded the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society on 12 July 1944.

It would be remiss not to mention the AADS' partner organisation and provide a brief excursus at the outset. The Anglo-Austrian Music Society (AAMS), which was been established in 1942, aimed to promote Austrian music and musicians in exile.¹⁷² In the broadest sense, the AAMS can be described as an “agent for Austrian musical tours in the United Kingdom”, and for that reason it

¹⁶⁹ Eva Schmidt-Kolmer briefly returned to Austria in 1945, before relocating to the Soviet occupation zone in Germany due to her communist outlook. She later successfully practised as a paediatrician in the GDR.

¹⁷⁰ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 4.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

¹⁷² Due to space restrictions, I will not go into detail about the Anglo-Austrian Music Society in this thesis. The AAMS' aims were: 1. “To encourage co-operation between Austrian and British musicians. 2. To provide opportunities for music-lovers of both countries to meet and share their mutual interests. 3. To give assistance to gifted young musicians to enable them to continue their studies and to appear in public.” Letter from Cooper to the director of the Vienna State Opera [note: Franz Salmhofer] 7 December 1945. Box 23, Archives of the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Anglo-Austrian Music Society [AAS/AAMS].

acted on a “commercial basis”.¹⁷³ Even though both societies were independent of each other, they shared mutual interests, carried out activities together and remained very close throughout. The Anglo-Austrian Society and the Anglo-Austrian Music Society amalgamated their administrations in 1946, yet the two societies never merged.¹⁷⁴

The Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society was meant to be a solely political organisation in the beginning. Most members - both Austrian and British - came from a socialist background, and, according to Maimann, the establishment of the society can be understood as a positive response to the foundation of the Austrian Representative Committee.¹⁷⁵ The socialist’s aspired to propagate their political aims to the British public, in order to repress the FAM’s influence and to “spread the message of a democratic Austria”.¹⁷⁶ It could be argued that the AADS was created as a consequence, in order to implement these aims.

One of the Society’s main objectives was to win over British politicians and influential personalities, in order to arouse interest in the future development of Austria. Beyond that, the AADS aimed to counteract the possible influence of the KPÖ in post-war Austria.¹⁷⁷ Hence, the members involved with the AADS originated from various political backgrounds, although not from the communist camp.

4.3. Membership

The AADS’s full members were either British or Austrian citizens, yet affiliated membership was open to people of any origin.¹⁷⁸ It seems that the society’s target group initially consisted of exiled Austrians, however this changed after the war ended. Subsequently, many members were of either British origin, or Austrians descendant.

¹⁷³ Annual Report 1951/52, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

¹⁷⁴ See the Anglo-Austrian Music Society’s homepage for further information, “Anglo-Austrian Music Society,” last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.aams.org.uk/index.htm>.

¹⁷⁵ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 196.

¹⁷⁶ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 4.

¹⁷⁷ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 196.

¹⁷⁸ Constitution of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

Some of the Society's members that provided support from the beginning were; the journalist and socialist Friedrich Scheu, the socialist lawyer Wilhelm Rosenzweig, the Secretary of the Austrian Democratic Union Emil Müller-Sturmheim, as well as the British Labour MPs George Russell Strauss and John Hynd.¹⁷⁹ Further founder members included the Labour politician Barbara Castle, the Liberal MP Tom Horabin, the sociologist Friedrich Hertz, Julius Meinl III., and Marianne Pollak.¹⁸⁰ However, none of these members were really prominent Austrian socialists during this period. This was due to the fact that – on the surface at least – the society wanted to avoid a socialist domination. Furthermore, the London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists never appeared as a partner organisation, although the Austrian Representative Committee did.¹⁸¹

4.4. The Aims of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society

According to the society's constitution, its main objectives were:

1. "To spread cultural understanding of the importance of Austrian democracy for peace and progress.
2. To promote closer contact between British and Austrian democrats; to further cultural relations between Britain and Austria; and to promote in the liberated Austrian Republic knowledge and understanding of British democratic ideas and institutions."¹⁸²

After the Society changed and shortened its name in 1946, only one minor amendment was made to these objectives, namely, the word "cultural" in the first sentence was dropped.¹⁸³ The Society wanted to achieve its aims by:

"[...] organising meetings, lectures, exhibitions, social gatherings, by publishing pamphlets and articles, by the eventual exchange of teachers

¹⁷⁹ John Hynd, the Society's Honorary Treasurer, became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster after the political turn and the election of the new Labour government in post-war Britain.

¹⁸⁰ Scheu, "The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society," 4.

¹⁸¹ Maimann, "Politik im Wartesaal," 197.

¹⁸² Constitution of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, undated, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁸³ Constitution of the Anglo-Austrian Society, undated, Box 18, [AAS/AAMS].

and students and the establishment of summer schools in Great Britain and Austria.”¹⁸⁴

From the Society’s aims and its proposed activities, it follows that the immediate short-term objective was spreading awareness of the Austrian cause.¹⁸⁵ The AADS clearly intended to play long-term role, and contemplated becoming more active after Austria’s liberation.

4.5. The Anglo-Austrian Society after the Second World War

Before the end of the war, the AADS was mainly involved in organising or taking part in events. One such event was a meeting to commemorate the anniversary of the foundation of Austria’s First Republic in November 1944 in London. Speakers at this event were amongst others Stafford Cripps, by then Minister of Aircraft Production and the Austrian socialist Oscar Pollak.¹⁸⁶

After the end of the war, and after the establishment of the provisional government in Austria, the Society immediately offered their congratulations to the new government via the Soviet Ambassador in London.¹⁸⁷ According to Maimann, the Society also lobbied for recognition of the Renner government.¹⁸⁸

The AADS soon realised that its emphasis had begun to shift as a result the end of the war; economic support of Austria and the establishment of cultural contacts became its primary tasks.¹⁸⁹ The first major event, which was organised by the Society post bellum, was a concert at the Royal Albert Hall by the London Symphony Orchestra with Adrian Boult as conductor. The Society’s executive committee decided to devote the profits of the concert to charitable purposes, in

¹⁸⁴ Constitution of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, undated, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁸⁵ Maimann argued that the Anglo-Austrian Society’s objectives were rather moderate, especially compared to the political aims of other exile organisations. Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 197.

¹⁸⁶ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 7.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 8.

¹⁸⁸ Maimann, “Politik im Wartesaal,” 197.

¹⁸⁹ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 10.

particular, to starving Austrian children and to victims of concentration camps. For this reason the Aid to Austria Fund was created.¹⁹⁰

4.5.1. Aid to Austria Appeal Committee

Closer cooperation between the AADS and its communist rival organisations only became possible in the post-war period. The Austrian Relief Fund of the Free Austrian Movement and the Aid to Austria Fund of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society were merged in early 1946. This resulted in the Aid for Austria Appeal Committee, which became the new organisational basis.

As illustrated in a leaflet calling for support for the Aid to Austria Now fund, the Society referred to the “old” Vienna “known as a cultural centre.”¹⁹¹ This was done in order to appeal to people’s emotions, so that they would donate money. In a nutshell, the message that was spread was that the children of the “gifted” were starving:

“[...] the children of her [note: Austria’s] gifted and courageous people, lovers of progress in all the arts, including the art of living, and threatened with extinction, or at best with the stunting effects of starvation and malnutrition.”¹⁹²

The leaflet finished with a further appeal for donations:

“Let us show the Austrians that the British people believe in the contribution that Austria can make it to the European family of nations in the future and will help to keep her children alive to make it.”¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 12.

¹⁹¹ Unfortunately, it was not possible to identify the recipients and the audience of the leaflet. However, it can be assumed that the target group exceeded the usual Society members, as the reference to the “old Austria” seems like an introduction to people who were unfamiliar with the history of the country. “Aid to Austria Now,” date unknown (probably October 1946), Box 9, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹² “Aid to Austria Now,” date unknown (probably October 1946), Box 9, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹³ Ibid.

The success of this call for donations was outstanding. By 1947, more than £30,000 were collected, which was then transferred to Switzerland where food was bought via the International Red Cross, which then sent the food to Austria. The main recipients were children, hospitals and tuberculosis patients.¹⁹⁴ The Aid to Austria Appeal operated until its dissolution in April 1947.¹⁹⁵ However, this was not the only form of direct aid made available by the AADS.

4.5.2. Gift Food Parcels Scheme

In autumn 1946 the AADS launched the Gift Food Parcels Scheme, which gave people in Britain the opportunity to send parcels to friends in Austria at the intercession of the Society.¹⁹⁶ People could order parcels from the AADS, which were then sent to Austria via South Africa, and later Australia. Within the first four weeks of this scheme about 800 orders for parcels were placed with the Society. This great response was due to an appeal that was made in a newspaper.¹⁹⁷ Yet, although the great response to this scheme was praised by the AADS, the organisation had to admit to problems regarding lengthy delivery times.¹⁹⁸

4.5.3. Children Reception Committee

The idea of inviting Austrian children to Britain was first considered, when the Aid to Austria Appeal and the Gift Food Parcel Scheme were still in operation. As a result, the Austrian Children Reception Committee was set up in December 1946, with the aim of assisting “in the relief of Austrian children in need.”¹⁹⁹ Subsequently Austrian children were invited to visit Britain for a recuperative holiday of several weeks, staying on average for three-months. The children, who

¹⁹⁴ The food was condensed milk, sugar and butter/margarine. Annual Report 1946-47, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹⁵ It is not clear whether the Aid to Austria Appeal was dissolved completely, or if the Anglo-Austrian Society took over and continued the relief work for a while. Information about this varies in different source material. Leitgedanken: Zum Besuch in Wien des Sekretärs der Gesellschaft, 23 March 1947, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹⁶ The parcels were called “Liebesgabenpakete” in German. Annual Report 1946-47, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹⁷ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 17.

¹⁹⁸ Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

were selected by Austrian Health Authorities, all together stayed in guesthouses, schools or camps, before living with British families.²⁰⁰

The first party of Austrian children, which arrived in England in August 1947, consisted of 100 children, 50 girls and 50 boys. Friedrich Scheu pointed out that the children were “undernourished and poorly clothed”, and they were subsequently provided with new shoes and clothing, and with medical – especially dental – aid.²⁰¹ In return, in 1949 the responsible Austrian authorities decided to invite British children to spend a holiday in the Austrian Alps.²⁰² From 1947 onwards the number of British and Austrian children, who visited Austria and Britain respectively, continued to increase. In 1947, in the first year of the scheme, 100 Austrian children took part. This increased to 472 children in 1948, 546 in 1949, 526 in 1950, 552 in 1951, 668 in 1952, and to give another example, 1731 in 1955.²⁰³

This scheme can clearly be understood as an indication of how the AADS wanted to fulfil its aims. From the foundation of the Society onwards, it was believed that exchange between different countries and cultures – in this case Austria and Britain – would contribute to mutual understanding. Therefore the Society attached great importance to the Austrian Children Reception Committee. As stated in the Anglo-Austrian Society’s report from 1948-49, the self-perception of the Committee was that “these schemes will prove an invaluable means of creating and fostering mutual understanding and friendship between the two countries.”²⁰⁴

²⁰⁰ Austrian children had been sent to towns all over Britain, including Bletchley, Halifax, High Wycombe, Liverpool, Oxford, Sheffield, Newport, and Luton. Before the children’s arrival, the foster parents had been issued a report including information on personality and interests. During the journey and the stay in Britain, university students and two older people accompanied the children.

²⁰¹ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 20.

²⁰² Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

²⁰³ These numbers include both, Austrian children visiting Great Britain, and British children visiting Austria. Figures about the number of participants of the Reception Committee for Austrian Children are available up to 1968. Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 21; Table - Anglo-Austrian Society Children’s Holiday Scheme 1952–61, Box 10, [AAS/AAMS].

²⁰⁴ Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

On closer examination of this committee, a great number of questions arise. Most of the Austrian and British children spent about three weeks in the host country. For a young child these foreign influences can be either very exciting or incredibly frightening. Besides the language barrier, unknown food and unfamiliar customs could have been irritating. It would be interesting to find out whether this experience of a different culture had a long-term influence on the children that took part, on education and occupation choices, for example. Unfortunately, closer examination of this would go beyond the scope thesis.

4.6. Broadening the Society

With the normalisation of the relations between Britain and Austria, and improved economic conditions in the latter country, the focus of the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society shifted once more. Material aid – as described above – became less necessary, and the AADS began to concentrate on the promotion of cultural contact.

In 1946 the Executive Committee discussed whether the AADS should broaden its remit and open up to a wider audience. The society feared appearing “too leftish” as for a period of time no member of the Austrian People’s Party was represented in the executive or on the board. However, the AADS did not want “prominent Monarchists” or persons that “were prominent in the Dollfuss-Schuschnigg era.”²⁰⁵ Instead the AADS preferred a “progressive minded” member of the People’s Party.²⁰⁶ Yet, the Society remained hesitant about opening up to the communist camp.²⁰⁷

In April 1946 the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society changed its name to the Anglo-Austrian Society (AAS). The amendment to its name was connected to the end of the war and the establishment of Austria’s Second Republic. An independent and democratic Austria had been the Society’s designated target. The society dropped the word “democratic” shortly after this had been achieved. The AAS also underwent a partial reorganisation, and three new honorary presidents

²⁰⁵ Pro Memoria for Mr. L. J. Edwards, MP, April 1946, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Pro Memoria for Oscar Pollak, undated, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

were appointed. These were, the Austrian representative in Britain Heinrich Schmid, the Labour MP John Hynd, and the Tory Roundell Cecil Palmer, who had been Minister of Economic Warfare and head of the Special Operations Executive. In addition, the MP Tom Horabin was appointed chairman and Otto Harpner general secretary.

The AAS's executive committee was broadened to include people from different political and occupational backgrounds. Members included the Labour MP Barbara Ayrton Gould, C. Bonacina, the socialist Emmy Freundlich, Air Commodore and MP A. V. Harvey, the sociologist Friedrich Hertz, the writer and conservative Josef Otto Lämmel, the MPs Jenny Lee and K. Lindsay. Further notable members were the socialist Alfred Magaziner, the entrepreneur Julius Meinl IV., Emil Müller-Sturmheim, the MP D. Renton, the explorer and politician Edward Arthur Alexander Shackleton, the socialist Friedrich Scheu, the former British ambassador to Vienna Walford Selby, the MP W. N. Warbey and Austrian diplomat Walter Wodak.²⁰⁸

The AAS's main driving force - also with regarding to the reorganisation and renaming – was the Austrian lawyer Otto Harpner. He became secretary in 1947 and subsequently devoted most of his life to the Anglo-Austrian cause.²⁰⁹ Otto Harpner was the son of the famous barrister Gustav Harpner.²¹⁰ The latter had not only been the official lawyer of the Social Democratic Party in the First Republic, but had also represented many individual members of the socialist party and well-known people. Otto continued to run his father's solicitors office until 1938, when he was banned from his profession due to his Jewish heritage. Consequently, he and his family immigrated to Great Britain in summer 1938.²¹¹ During the Second World War Otto Harpner was engaged in legal matters and

²⁰⁸ Harpner to Chaput de Saintange, 12 March 1947, FO 1020/1180, TNA.

²⁰⁹ Charmian Brinson, "‘Between Our Two Peoples’: The Archives of the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Anglo-Austrian Music Society," in *Refugee Archives. Theory and Practice*. The Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies Vol. 9, ed. Andrea Hammel (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), 95-108, here 97.

²¹⁰ For more details see Gustav Harpner's biography: Ilse Reiter, *Gustav Harpner. 1864–1924. Vom Anarchistenverteidiger zum Anwalt der Republik* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2008).

²¹¹ Reiter, "Gustav Harpner," 548-549.

exile politics, and was initially involved with a group of Austrian lawyers associated with the Austrian Democratic Union, before working for the AAS.

4.7. Cultural Activities

Under Harpner's guidance, the Anglo-Austrian Society started to work closely with the Anglo-Austrian Music Society. In subsequent years, the two societies jointly organised or sponsored a great number of cultural events. For example, in 1947 the Society organised a three-week season of the Vienna State Opera at the Royal Opera House in Covent Garden in London. The Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra, which was described by the Society as the best propaganda tool for Austria, performed a concert in London in 1947. The Orchestra returned for seven concerts in autumn 1948, which were conducted by Wilhelm Furtwängler and Josef Krips.²¹² The two Societies also organised a concert by the Vienna Boys' Choir.

The content of the lectures organised by the Anglo-Austrian Society demonstrate the focus on cultural topics. To give some examples, Richard Hiscocks, the British Council Representative in Austria, lectured about "Anglo-Austrian Cultural Relations", the conductor Josef Krips gave a paper about "Musical Revival in Austria" and Ernst Buschbeck, the Director of the State Collection of Paintings in Vienna, addressed "The History of the Austrian Art Collection."²¹³ In addition to the vast number of lectures on cultural topics, lectures about economy, science and law were also held. During the 1950s, a wide range of events took place under the auspices of the AAS, including, for example, an exhibition of Austrian books in October 1951, which was accompanied by a lecture about "Modern Austrian Literature" by Hilde Spiel.²¹⁴

4.8. The British Authorities Attitude Towards the Anglo-Austrian Society

²¹² Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Chronological register of the Anglo-Austrian Society's events, January 1951 – May 1953, Box 10, [AAS/AAMS].

The British authorities, and in particular the Foreign Office, were critical of the AAS from the beginning on. This was linked to the fact that the FO was, generally speaking, rather sceptical about all Austrian exile organisations. What is more, the FO thought there was something strange in the fact that the political camps were scattered amongst the various expatriate circles, and that cooperation between these organisations was rarely possible.

Prior to the Society's reorganisation, the FO criticised the ambiguity of the AAS's activities, as these were "cultural", "political" as well as "charitable".²¹⁵ However, the FO's main point of criticism was the Society's party character. At the beginning of 1947, Johnstone noted the following about the AAS:

"It has [...] a fairly pronounced party character though, according to Dr. Harpner, steps are now being taken [...] to make it representative of all political views from Conservative to Communist."²¹⁶

This issue was also discussed at the British Council office in Vienna. Indeed, the BC representative even advised the FO not to cooperate with the AAS:

"[...] Hiscocks has asked us to avoid close relations with the Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society until it is organised on a non-party basis."²¹⁷

Subsequently, the Foreign Office settled on the shared attitude of a "passive tolerance" towards the Society.²¹⁸ The AAS's increasingly problematic financial situation was also debated within the Foreign Office. The diplomat Cullis, an expert on Austria, took the view:

"I am all for doing what we can to help foster Austrian cultural activities in this country, but it is not for me to say how far we should encourage the

²¹⁵ Johnstone to Montagu-Pollock, 2 January 1947, FO 924/609, TNA.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

²¹⁷ Johnstone to Montagu-Pollock, 2 January 1947, FO 924/609, TNA

²¹⁸ Note by Hilton-Young, Austrian Cultural Activities in the UK: Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, 16 January 1947, FO 924/609, TNA

British Council or anyone else to make funds available for this purpose.”²¹⁹

Nicholls from the Control Office for Germany and Austria (COGA) modified the FO’s utterly critical view and proclaimed:

“[...] I do not think that there is any question of formally ‘recognising’ the Society, but we have tried to indicate that it will enjoy what support we are able to give to any such body.”²²⁰

The British authorities remained critical about the obvious political background of several of the Anglo-Austrian Society’s members. Yet, they gradually began to acknowledge the value of the Society’s cultural activities and its overall usefulness. The British Council described this in the following way in 1952:

“[...] Anglo-Austrian Society in London does some very useful work in exchanges of school children and, through its allied body the Anglo-Austrian Music Society, in acting as an agent for Austrian musical tours in the United Kingdom on a commercial basis.”²²¹

The Foreign Office and the British Council’s aversion to the AAS was closely linked to the Society’s leading powers Otto Harpner and John Hynd. It appears that conservative-minded British officials were not particularly fond of these two socialists. The British Council even excoriated the AAS’s secretary Harpner on a personal level. While the BC’s officials kept the personal contact with Harpner on a polite level, they actually disliked him. In 1953, the BC described Harpner’s reputation as follows:

“[...] there is no doubt that Dr. Harpner, with his considerable talent, is not liked in many circles in Vienna and is trusted in fewer. His lecture

²¹⁹ Note by Cullis, Austrian Cultural Activities in the UK: Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, 21 January 1947, FO 924/609, TNA

²²⁰ Nicholls to Cheetham, 19 March 1947, FO 1020/1180, TNA

²²¹ Annual Report 1951/52, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

under the auspices of the Vienna Society was on the whole well supported, and was attended by the Socialist Vizekanzler [note: Schärf], but it is very improbable that, if the Austrian Government developed its cultural relations programme with the United Kingdom, it would wish to work through the Society or its present Secretary.”²²²

The British went as far as discrediting Harpner’s personal involvement in the AAS and challenging his career. In fact, the BC representative even ascribed Harpner’s pomposity to his father’s success. Wickham implied:

“[...] Dr. Harpner’s father was a well-known lawyer during the first Republic and [his] son’s influence depends much more on his father’s services than on his own merits [...]”.²²³

While there was some substance to that assertion, Harpner’s incredible commitment to the Anglo-Austrian Society cannot be ignored. Yet, his personal involvement with the Society proved to be a major point for discussion, especially regarding the extensive debate surrounding the (non-)recognition of the AAS within the framework of the Cultural Convention. While this will be explained in more detail below, it must be noted that the British Council’s position was that of a “remaining distrust of Dr. Harpner.”²²⁴ In addition, the BC considered Harpner a “persona non grata in Vienna.”²²⁵

4.9. Cultural Exchange

The Anglo-Austrian Society’s aforementioned events took place within the framework of “cultural exchange” between Great Britain and Austria. The AAS believed that it was “an important task [...] to make the cultural exchange between both countries genuinely reciprocal.”²²⁶ Yet, the AAS criticised the “one-sidedness” of the cultural exchange between the two countries, and related this to

²²² Annual Report 1952/53, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

²²³ Wickham to Deputy Controller, 29 December 1953, BW 13/9, TNA.

²²⁴ Wickham to Deputy Controller, 22 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

²²⁵ Haigh to Nicholls, 24 April 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²²⁶ Annual Report 1947-48, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

the precarious financial situation.²²⁷ The Society used the terms “cultural exchange or “cultural interchange” to define its own cultural activities.²²⁸ In a memorandum from 1949, the Society outlined its opinion about cultural interchange, and criticised not only the one-sidedness of the British Council, but also the Austrian government for not contributing to this process. It reads as the follows:

“Up to now British Council work in Austria has chiefly been done by the British Council, though, without any doubt, the activity of the Austro-British Society proved a great help and advantage. [...] As a matter of principle, the British Council makes it its first objects to spread British culture abroad and not foreign culture in Great Britain.”²²⁹

From the AAS’s point of view, the criticism of the British Council’s “one-sidedness” seems reasonable. After all, one of the Society’s main objectives was to act as an intermediary between the people of Austria and Britain. Therefore, exchange was one of its central aims, as, for instance, indicated by the Society’s name. In contrast, the British Council’s objective had never been to bring foreign culture to Britain. Instead, the Council was solely established to project British culture abroad. For that reason, the Society’s criticism of the Council’s “one-sidedness” seems unjustified. Subsequently, the concept of “cultural exchange” can only be applied to the Anglo-Austrian Society, and as well to the Austro-British Society. The activities of the British Council can instead be described as “cultural transfer.”

The AAS also levelled criticism against the Austrian government for its insufficient contribution to the “cultural interchange.” Furthermore, the Society indirectly addressed its own problematic financial situation, by pointing out that the Austrian government should make a financial contribution to the Society’s work.

²²⁷ Pro Memoria III., December 1946, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

²²⁸ Pro Memoria I., December 1946, Box 29 [AAS/AAMS]; Memorandum on the occasion of the visit of the Secretary of the Anglo-Austrian Society to Vienna, probably 1949, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

²²⁹ Memorandum on the occasion of the visit of the Secretary of the Anglo-Austrian Society to Vienna, probably 1949, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

“[...] the Anglo-Austrian cultural interchange has shown a great tendency towards onesideness. This is to be regretted very much as over here, without any doubt, the interest of Austrian culture proves to be very great. [...] Under normal circumstances there can scarcely be any doubt that on the whole Austria has to pay for the Austrian cultural work in Great Britain.”²³⁰

Even though the Society acknowledged post-war Austria's difficult economical situation, it nevertheless insisted on the future importance of “cultural propaganda”, particularly in regards to tourism. In this context the AAS noted:

“Although it must be admitted that conditions in Austria are far from normal in all money matters, time has come for Austria to get conscious of the fact that she can no longer rely in these things only on money collected in Great Britain. Besides it is high time to realise that cultural propaganda, apart from its political importance, is the most efficient touristic propaganda.”²³¹

While the Austro-British Society will be discussed later, its attitude towards “cultural exchange” will be briefly considered in this context. In contrast to the AAS, which repeatedly raised the issue of the suitable terminological concept for its activities, the ABS presumably did not consider such a debate necessary. Although this cannot be completely ruled out, the available archive material does not indicate such a discussion within the ABS. It appears that the actual implementation of cultural activities was given priority over the debate on how these should be defined.

4.10. The Anglo-Austrian Society's Weaknesses

Due to the fact that the AAS was not officially recognised by neither the British or the Austrian government, it did not qualify for any subsidies. As a result the AAS

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ Ibid.

derived its income from its cultural activities. As these could not cover their expenses entirely, the Society's financial situation was quite difficult most of the time. Regarding its weakness the Society remarked:

“Our work is, however, limited by our financial capacity; it has been greatly hampered by lack of funds and, in particular, by lack of a suitable centre for social contacts between British and Austrian friends, for lectures, concerts, and meetings.”²³²

The Society's financial problems and the wish to open of an Anglo-Austrian house were the main themes in the AAS's documents between the late 1940s and the mid 1950s. The AAS frequently struggled with its budget, as the cost of activities regularly exceeded the income from membership subscriptions and the proceeds from events.²³³ The AAS worked towards the establishment of an Anglo-Austrian house for several years. The reason for this was the Society's belief that it would be able to derive a large income through such a house. In a letter to Horabin the AAS position was described as follows:

“[...] the best way to subsidize a Society of our kind is to help us with the purchase of a house. We could run in such an ‘Anglo-Austrian House’ a Club with a Club Restaurant. I am convinced that for this there would be a genuine demand.”²³⁴

The Society even sent a public letter to the newspaper “The Times” in January 1948.²³⁵ The letter, which was signed by the honorary presidents Heinrich Schmid and Lord Francis Pakenham, not only outlined the Society's work, but also referred to the Society's financial problems. Furthermore, an appeal was made to raise £5,000 to cover the expenses for an “Anglo-Austrian Friendship House”, which would include a restaurant with Viennese cooking, facilities for an Austrian-Club and offices for the Anglo-Austrian Society itself.²³⁶ It should be

²³² Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

²³³ Brinson, “Between Our Two Peoples,” 100.

²³⁴ Anonymous letter to Horabin, 26 October 1947, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

²³⁵ “An Anglo-Austrian Centre,” *The Times*, 17 January 1948.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*

emphasised that this suggestion for an Austrian house bears a striking resemblance to the communist Austrian Centre, which had to close in 1947 due to a lack of demand. The AAS never had any links with the Austrian Centre, which had, in fact, had offered an Austrian restaurant amongst other facilities.

4.11. The Cultural Convention and the Anglo-Austrian Society

The ratification of the Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom in 1953, proved to be a turning point for both, the British Council and the Anglo-Austrian Society.²³⁷ Both countries aimed to provide an official framework for cultural relations through the Convention. In the following, I will first of all outline the background of the Cultural Convention, then briefly emphasise its relevance for the British Council and will lastly go into detail about the debate surrounding the AAS's claim for recognition within the framework of the Convention.

4.11.1. The Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom

The Austrian Chancellor Leopold Figl, the Minister of Education Ernst Kolb and the British High Commissioner Harold Caccia signed the Cultural Convention on 12 December 1952.²³⁸ The Convention came into force on 25 April 1953, after both countries exchanged the ratification documents at 10 April 1953.²³⁹ The purpose of the Convention was:

“[...] promoting by friendly interchange and cooperation the fullest possible understanding in each of their respective countries of the

²³⁷ Prior to this Convention, Austria had signed Cultural Conventions with France in July 1947 and with Belgium in 1953. Hiscocks stated that Austria had also signed a Convention with Italy in 1952. According to the Austrian Foreign Ministry, the Convention with Italy was actually signed in 1954. Hiscocks, “The Rebirth of Austria,” 164; “List of Cultural Conventions,” last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.bmeia.gv.at/aussenministerium/aussenpolitik/auslandskultur/kulturabkommen/kulturabkommen.html>.

²³⁸ See the appendix for the full wording of the Cultural Convention.

²³⁹ Haigh to Nicholls, 24 April 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

intellectual, artistic and scientific activities as well as of the ways of life of the other country.”²⁴⁰

This was to be accomplished by means of books, periodicals, concerts, exhibitions, dramatic and musical performances, radio and film. Furthermore, the establishment of professorial chairs, readerships, lectureships at universities, and thereby courses on the language, literature and the history of each country, were encouraged. As a result of the Convention it was also intended to:

“[...] establish and assist cultural Institutes in the territory of the other [...]. The term ‘Institute’ shall include academic and cultural centres, Anglo-Austrian associations, libraries, film libraries, gramophone libraries and other organisations dedicated to the purpose of the present Convention.”²⁴¹

Within the framework of the Cultural Convention regular meetings of Austro-British Mixed Commissions were introduced. The first meeting took place in October 1953 in Vienna. Apart from discussion about the Convention’s articles, the debate emphasised the subject of education. Special attention was drawn to the exchange of teachers and university professors, scholarship programmes, and summer schools. The Austrian Section of the Commission also touched upon the necessity of an Austrian organisation that would deal with individual exchanges in the cultural field. Subsequently the chairman of the British Section remarked that an Austrian Cultural Institute in London was desired, mainly to act as a counterpart to the British Council.²⁴²

The Mixed Commission’s second meeting took place in October 1954 in London. The subjects for debate were principally the same as in the first meeting in 1953. For instance, topics like the establishment of an Austrian Institute in

²⁴⁰ “Cultural Convention between the Austrian Federal Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,” BGBl. Nr. 60/1953, 18 June 1953.

²⁴¹ Ibid., Article II.

²⁴² Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom. First Meeting of the Mixed Commission, Vienna. 7-9 October 1953, BW 13/12, TNA.

London and the work of the British Council in Austria gained centre stage. In addition, the question of exchange schemes appeared on the agenda.²⁴³

It is important to keep the theoretical concepts of cultural exchange and cultural transfer in mind, when examining the impact of the Cultural Convention. Prior to the signing of the Convention, official cultural contacts between Austria and the United Kingdom can be described as a one-sided cultural transfer. The British Council officially carried out this transfer, by presenting British culture in Austria. However, as the Council's general policy only allowed cultural transfer in one direction, some kind of Austrian counterpart organisation was required after the signing of the Convention. As there was no official Austrian body that comparable to the British Council, some kind of Austrian institute in the United Kingdom became necessary. The non-official and politically dominated Anglo-Austrian Society did not qualify as an official body within the scope of the Convention. The extensive debate surrounding this will be outlined later on.

One might argue that the main importance of the Convention was the transformation of a system of one-sided cultural transfer into an official cultural exchange on both sides. However, while this might be the case for official organisations that under government authority, this cannot be applied to the cultural relations between Austria and Great Britain in general. The Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society had already exercised bilateral cultural exchange for several years. Both societies had prominent political members, occasionally received financial support from official authorities and worked together with the British Council on several occasions. Yet, neither society was recognised as an official body; in fact they were not even consulted regarding the preparations for the Cultural Convention.

At this juncture, I want to point out an article in the *Wiener Tageszeitung*, which used the signing of the Cultural Convention as an opportunity to summarise previous British cultural activities in Austria.²⁴⁴ The article outlined established contacts, namely the ISB and the British Council, and argued that both

²⁴³ Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom. Second Meeting of the Mixed Commission, London, Agenda, 27-29 October 1954, BW 13/12, TNA.

²⁴⁴ "London schlägt eine Brücke nach Wien," *Wiener Tageszeitung*, 14 December 1952.

organisations had undertaken cultural activities for several years before the signing of the Convention.²⁴⁵ However, the article conveyed the idea that the Austrian side had not previously made any efforts to contribute to the mutual exchange.

I believe that, to a certain extent, the Cultural Convention can be understood as a turning point in official cultural relations between Austria and Great Britain. The practice of cultural transfer in particular was transformed into a process of cultural exchange. Yet, the authorities had failed to recognise the unofficial Anglo-Austrian networks that had been operating for several years.

4.11.2. The Cultural Convention from the Perspective of the British Council

The conclusion of the Cultural Convention was a matter of great importance for the British Council. From the beginning of its activities in Austria, the BC worked in close cooperation with the British Element of the Allied Commission for Austria. The BC was fully aware that such a connection would be missing in a post-occupied Austria; therefore, the organisation espoused the ratification of the Convention. After all, the BC's cultural and educational activities had for many years resembled those that were to be enshrined in the Convention. Besides, the Council hoped that the Convention would secure its organisation's legal position for the foreseeable future. In this regards, this the Council representative noted:

“The terms of the Convention emphasise the exactly equal and reciprocal relationship aimed at the Austro-British cultural contacts, and as a result of the nomination of the Council as the executive organ of Her Majesty's Government for the purposes of the convention, strengthening of the position of the Council as such may be expected and more emphasis can be laid on the acknowledged place in Austrian public life [...].”²⁴⁶

The BC was, as expected, officially approved within the scope of the Convention. This was hardly surprising, as there was no other British organisation on the

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Annual Report 1952/53, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

British that would have been equally qualified for this purpose. In 1954 the BC was assured that its activities were legally protected and that its status “had been secured by the ratification of the Cultural Convention.”²⁴⁷

4.11.3. Fighting for Recognition

About a month before the ratification of the Cultural Convention, John Hynd from the AAS approached Anthony Nutting, the then under-secretary of state for foreign affairs, and drew attention to the society’s cultural activities.²⁴⁸ Shortly after this contact, the AAS’s members John Hynd, Otto Harpner and David Renton were received by Nutting to discuss the Society’s position in regards to the Convention.²⁴⁹ The Anglo-Austrian Society’s deputation raised concerns regarding the composition of the proposed Mixed Commission. Furthermore, the delegation suggested that a member of the AAS should become a permanent member of the Mixed Commission. Nutting countered this, pointing out that the society could only provide a co-opt member, if at all. Besides, he referred the AAS members to the Austrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as responsibility for nominations would be in the area of the Austrian government’s competence. In the course of the meeting Nutting also tried to make clear that the British Council was already “adequately meeting the task” of transferring “British exports of culture to Austria.”²⁵⁰ Harpner seemed to be disappointed about this statement and argued:

“[...] not only the Society, but also the interests of the Anglo-Austrian culture, would suffer since the Society had so far dealt with all the export of Austrian culture to Britain”.²⁵¹

The AAS hoped to gain official recognition under the Convention, yet it is uncertain whether the Society wanted to be recognised on the British or on the Austrian side. The AAS’s position in this matter was vague from the beginning,

²⁴⁷ Annual Report 1953/54, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

²⁴⁸ Hynd to Nutting, 26 March 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁴⁹ Hainworth to Johnstone, 9 May 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

and it appears that it did not favour a specific side, but instead worked towards official recognition on both sides.

By May 1953 the British and the Austrian authorities had already internally decided not to recognise the AAS. Nutting made clear that: “the Society could not be entrusted with carrying out any British obligations under the Convention.”²⁵² Zeisel, a *Sektionschef* from the Austrian Ministry of Education, took a similar view and spoke on behalf of the Austrian government:

“[...] the Anglo-Austrian Society has not been, and will not be, considered as a possible official representative for Austrian work in the cultural field in England.”²⁵³

The British Council representative Wickham endorsed this proposal and argued:

“[...] it is rather for the Austrians than for us to decide what use shall be made of the Society in London for the purpose of giving publicity to Austrian culture in Britain. [...] [O]ur policy is to be helpful to the Society without identifying ourselves with it.”²⁵⁴

Yet, the Society was not informed about this and was tantalised with vague responses and hollow promises. Subsequently, it continued to fight for official recognition through other channels. First, the AAS approached the Austrian Embassy in London, described the situation and painted a rosy picture of the recent meeting with Nutting. The Foreign Office remarked that the AAS “tried to give the impression that the Foreign Office were anxious that [the] Austrian Government should employ them as [an] Agent.”²⁵⁵ However the Embassy double-checked these claims with the FO, and felt vindicated in rejecting the AAS as a “suitable Agent for the Austrian Government” under the Convention.²⁵⁶ The AAS’s misrepresentation of facts was without success.

²⁵² Wickham to Officiating Controller, 22 May 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁵³ Ibid.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Foreign Office to Vienna, Telegram, 27 May 1945, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

After this fruitless attempt, the Anglo-Austrian Society decided to approach the Austrian authorities face to face. Hynd and Harpner visited Vienna at the end of May 1953, and saw the Chancellor Julius Raab, the Vice Chancellor Adolf Schärf and the Minister of Education Ernst Kolb, upon his visit. According to Harold Caccia, Hynd had “pressed” the Austrians to choose one of the following possibilities:

- a) “To set up an institute in the United Kingdom which could fulfil the functions provided for in the Convention.
- b) To nominate the Anglo-Austrian Society as their agent; or
- c) As a compromise to nominate a Cultural Attaché on the staff of the Austrian Embassy in London with instructions to direct and work through the Anglo-Austrian Society until such time as an institute were founded.”²⁵⁷

The second possibility proved to be highly unlikely, as the Austrian and British authorities had already internally agreed against the nomination of the AAS. Establishing an Austrian institute was without doubt the ultimate goal in the long-term, however, the Austrian government had not budgeted for this so far. Appointing a cultural attaché was given a great deal of consideration, yet the Austrians decided against it, mainly as they feared that this would look like an interim solution.

From the Society’s point of view, the visit to Vienna had a positive outcome. Hynd reported at an AAS Committee Meeting some months later that he had “formed the impression that full cooperation could be expected from the Austrian Government”.²⁵⁸ Yet, the AAS was left in the limbo for some time.

British and Austrians information policy was to not share much information with the AAS. Hence, Hynd approached Nutting at the end of November 1953 and vented his displeasure about the situation. Hynd requested

²⁵⁷ Caccia to Foreign Office, 5 June 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁵⁸ Minutes of the Anglo-Austrian Society Executive Committee Meeting, 28 October 1953, attached to: Hynd to Nutting, 28 November 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

information regarding the future course of events and stressed the AAS's disappointment:

“[...] the Committee felt very disappointed that we had not heard anything further from either the Foreign Office or the Austrian Authorities in the matter, and particularly that we had not received any particular information of any kind on the first meeting of the British-Austrian Mixed Commission [...].”²⁵⁹

The decision to approach Nutting originated from an AAS Committee Meeting a month earlier where the AAS had discussed particular articles of the Cultural Convention and commented on the first meeting of the Mixed Commission in October.²⁶⁰ The Society seemed to have been deeply disappointed that it did not receive an invitation to the meeting.

The Society's disenchantment and its persistent lobbying for official recognition, from either the British or the Austrian side, is closely connected to the AAS's precarious financial situation. The hope that official acknowledgement would also bring financial support was at the back of the Society's mind for some time. From the standpoint of the Society, the viability of future activities was dependant on official acknowledgement and financial support. Harpner correspondingly remarked:

“[...] as long as it was not known whether financial support from the Austrian Government would be forthcoming, the Society would have to be very careful in planning future activities.”²⁶¹

Nutting of the Foreign Office brusquely answered Hynd's enquiry from late November about the Cultural Convention.²⁶² Moreover, Nutting argued that providing information fell within the British Council's remit and for that reason

²⁵⁹ Hynd to Nutting, 28 November 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁶⁰ Minutes of the Anglo-Austrian Society Executive Committee Meeting, 28 October 1953, attached to: Hynd to Nutting, 28 November 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² Nutting to Hynd, 3 December 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

referred the AAS to Enid McLeod from the BC's European Division. She however, repeatedly had to point out that matters concerning the AAS were not in the British but the Austrian government's area of competence.²⁶³ Wickham, the British Council representative in Vienna endorsed this and maintained that only the Austrians could invite the AAS to participate in the Mixed Commission.²⁶⁴ Whilst Wickham acknowledged the value of the AAS's cultural activities, he was nevertheless critical of the society. He described the situation in the following way:

“[...] at the moment, the position of the Anglo-Austrian Society in London is one of some difficulty. How far their concert promotion activities, which are technically run by the Anglo-Austrian Music Society rather than by the Anglo-Austrian Society as such, duplicate with the work of normal commercial agencies I do not know, but I do know that Dr. Harpner is a little inclined to exaggerate the amount of work carried out by the Society [...].”²⁶⁵

Furthermore, Wickham linked the non-recognition of the AAS to its leading personalities Harpner and Hynd. As already outlined further up, Harpner was the victim of constant side blows amongst British officials. Even Wickham commented in this connection:

“Therefore, even discounting the personal unpopularity of both Dr. Harpner and Mr. Hynd in official Austrian circles, I very much doubt whether [...] the Anglo-Austrian Society will be given official recognition.”²⁶⁶

As the contact between the AAS and the Austrian authorities had almost reached a deadlock and the Society had not received any information regarding its recognition, Harpner once again paid a visit to Vienna at the beginning of 1954.²⁶⁷

²⁶³ Phillips to Wickham, 21 December 1953, FO 924/1013, TNA.

²⁶⁴ Wickham to Phillips, 29 December 1953, BW 13/9, TNA.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ Wickham to Deputy Controller, 13 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

However, Matsch from the Austrian Foreign Office could not give him the desired answer. Instead, Matsch announced that the establishment of an Austrian Institute in London was to be consolidated and that the decision was imminent.²⁶⁸

The discussions about the (non-)recognition of the AAS under the Cultural Convention had already been going on for almost a year, and the debate was very going round in circles. Wickham proposed the following solution:

“My own view is that we should try to encourage the Austrians to appoint a Cultural Attaché for all official liaison purposes as soon as possible, as I think this would end our difficulties and most of their troubles, while the relations with the Society would clearly be a matter to be determined by the Cultural Attaché in agreement with his Ambassador.”²⁶⁹

Lothar Wimmer, then Austrian Ambassador to Great Britain, contributed to the ongoing discussion about the AAS and informed the British official Phillips that a solution to the problem was urgently required.²⁷⁰ Furthermore, Wimmer remarked that he had already pressed the Austrian government to appoint a cultural attaché and that he was hoping for an early reply.²⁷¹

The Austrian government adhered to its previous statement that the AAS would not under any circumstances receive official recognition under the terms of the Cultural Convention. Matsch from the Austrian Foreign Office assured the British Council that the Austrians would not depart from its plan, and would definitely not invite any AAS members to serve on the Mixed Commission.²⁷² Yet, Matsch argued that he could not eliminate the possibility that the Austrians would subsidise the AAS in the future.²⁷³

4.12. Utilising Personal Connections

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Phillips to Wickham, 15 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

²⁷¹ Phillips to Wickham, 22 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

²⁷² Wickham to Deputy Controller, 25 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

²⁷³ Ibid.

The Anglo-Austrian Society's leading persons Harpner and Hynd utilised their personal contacts with Austrian socialists, namely Adolf Schärf, Bruno Kreisky and Oscar Pollak, to promote the society. The AAS had two reasons for repeatedly approaching Austrian politicians. On one hand, it was working towards official recognition under the terms of the Cultural Convention and participation on the Mixed Commission. On the other hand, the AAS needed financial aid and hoped to receive this from the Austrian authorities or from the SPÖ. The Austrian official Musil mentioned to Wickham:

“[...] that he was under considerable pressure from Vizekanzler Schaerf and Staatssekretaer Kreisky, both members of the S.P.O., to grant a subsidy to the Society and he asked for reconsideration of the matter by the Ministry of Education.”²⁷⁴

The Anglo-Austrian Society also repeatedly approached the Austrian government to inquire about the establishment of an Austrian institute in London. The AAS obviously feared that an official cultural institute would mean the end of the Society's monopoly on the presentation of Austrian culture in Britain. In a letter to the Austrian vice-chancellor Adolf Schärf, Harpner outlined the “dangers” of the foundation of an official cultural institute.²⁷⁵ Harpner also referred to the British Council in this letter, and argued that at least the lower ranks of the British Council were in favour of an official Austrian institute, as in their view the success of the society's work was understood as a criticism of the Council's own activities.

The AAS argued against the establishment of an Austrian cultural institute in Britain, because the society itself wanted to be recognised as the official cultural mediator. A certain kind of jealousy can be ascribed to the AAS in this regard. It believed that the Austrian government owed the society a debt of gratitude for promoting the case of a distinct Austrian nation and culture during the Second World War. A member of the society gave their opinion:

²⁷⁴ Wickham to Deputy Controller, 28 January 1954, BW 13/9, TNA.

²⁷⁵ Harpner to Schärf, 23 April 1954, Box 10, [AAS/AAMS]; Exactly the same letter was sent to the Federal Minister Waldbrunner on 26 April 1954, Box 10, [AAS/AAMS].

“It is beyond my power to understand that the Anglo-Austria Society is, just at the juncture of world history, left to fight its own way through. It appears wrong from the British and from the Austrian view. [...] With our other friends I fought for Austria and Austro-British friendship at a time when not all Austrians fought on the ‘right side’.”²⁷⁶

The Anglo-Austrian Society’s continuing attempt to ask the Austrian authorities for money was based on a subsidy of £2,000 that the Society had previously received.²⁷⁷ The documents reveal that the Society made the most of its personal contacts with Austrian politicians to enquire about funding, but also kept in touch by regularly forwarding the society’s progress reports to federal ministers in Austria.²⁷⁸ The correspondence between the AAS and Austrian politicians, such as Leopold Figl, Adolf Schärff and Karl Aush, reveals an amicable interrelationship throughout the 1950s.

However, ultimately the Anglo-Austrian Society did not achieve its goals. The AAS was not appointed under the terms of the Cultural Convention, nor did it acquire assurance regarding financial subsidies. The British Council summarised the AAS situation in the following way:

“In London the Anglo-Austrian Society has continued to obtain Austrian official support, largely for party political reasons [...]. Its desire to obtain representation on the Mixed Commission was not achieved and there can be no question of this being regarded as the official Austrian cultural representative in the United Kingdom. Its work has remained useful, but the Austrians are not yet quite clear how to include it in their future plans.”²⁷⁹

²⁷⁶ Anonymous letter (probably from Harpner) to Horabin, 26 October 1947, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

²⁷⁷ The Anglo-Austrian Society received further funds from the Austrian authorities in subsequent years. Figl to Hynd, 23 April 1951, Box 10, [AAS/AAMS].

²⁷⁸ The Anglo-Austrian Society had previously received a loan in the amount of £200. The loan was granted by Adolf Schärff “*im Namen der österreichischen Arbeiterbewegung*.” Gesprächsnotiz, 4 April 1946. As cited in: Reinhold Wagnleitner (ed.), *Diplomatie zwischen Parteiproporz und Weltpolitik. Briefe, Dokumente und Memoranden aus dem Nachlaß Walter Wodaks. 1945-1950.* (Salzburg: Wolfgang Neugebauer Verlag, 1980), 99-100.

²⁷⁹ Annual Report 1953/54, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

After three years of discussion an Austrian Institute was finally established in London in 1956.²⁸⁰ The AAS was neither consulted nor even properly informed with regard to the actual opening of the institute. Yet the AAS continued its cultural and educational activities and remains active up to the present day.

²⁸⁰ The Austrian Institute in London was renamed to Austrian Cultural Forum in 2001. "Austrian Cultural Forum, London," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.acflondon.org/history>.

5. The Austro-British Society

The Austro-British Society was founded in Vienna in June 1946, as a sister society of the London-based Anglo-Austrian Society. The relevant archive material reveals that the establishment and activities of the ABS were discussed in detail by members of the Foreign Office and the British Element of the ACA. Hence, I will first outline the debates that surrounded the planning of the ABS, and will then describe its activities and its relationship with the British authorities, and in particular the British Council.

5.1. Excursus: Austro-English Society

The Austro-English Society, a predecessor of the Austro-British Society, was founded in Vienna in December 1928 and was active until its dissolution in 1939.²⁸¹ The society aimed to foster “cultural relations between the people of Austria and the British Empire”, and furthermore hoped to “promote a better understanding of Austria” in Britain.²⁸² While the Austro-English Society’s main objectives were of a cultural nature, it also aimed to encourage “the study of the history, the political and economic developments [and] the social conditions [...] of the British Commonwealth.”²⁸³ The Society aimed to achieve a “mutual understanding” through:

- a) “Lectures in the Society, at Universities and Colleges, in university Extension Classes, and by Radio. Supply of diapositives and films;
- b) Publication and spreading books and printed matter serving the aim of the Society;
- c) Arranging or promoting studying or educational tours;
- d) Arranging exhibitions, concerts, theatricals, recitals and the like;
- e) Arranging or promoting of British holiday courses in Austria;

²⁸¹ Note, 9 September 1945, FO 741/12, TNA.

²⁸² Paulovsky to Williams, 27 October 1945, FO 741/12, TNA.

²⁸³ Ibid.

- f) Provision of an English library and of a reading room with a large number of British periodicals and newspapers within the Austrian National Library.”²⁸⁴

The Austro-English Society even maintained an English library, and provided periodicals and the latest newspapers. Furthermore, it invited prominent British and Austrian scholars to give lectures on a variety of topics. The president of the Society was Albert von Mensdorff-Pouilly-Dietrichstein²⁸⁵, supported by the British diplomat Eric Phipps and the industrialist Hugo Meinl who acted as vice-presidents. The university professor Karl Luick and Richard Reisch, from the National Bank of Austria, were amongst the members of the executive committee. Prominent honorary members included William Beveridge, the diplomat Georg Frankenstein and the novelist John Galsworthy.²⁸⁶

5.2. Planning for the Foundation of the Austro-British Society

The interwar Austro-English Society had without doubt formed the basis for the Austro-British Society. Louis Paulovsky, an English professor at the University of Vienna, was heavily involved in the Austro-English Society and espoused the establishment of an anglophile Society in September 1945. At that time the Political Advisor William Mack argued it was “too early to start such things”, as in his opinion there were not enough people interested.²⁸⁷ However, Paulovsky was not the only one who supported the formation of such a Society. F. X. Kandl from the Anglo-Austrian Bank Ltd. notified the British consul A. M. Williams in October 1945, that there “was a widespread desire for the formation of a body for the furtherance of the Anglo-Austrian relations.”²⁸⁸ Almost simultaneously, Oscar Pollak approached the ACA/BE and proposed to establish a Vienna branch of the

²⁸⁴ Ibid.

²⁸⁵ Josef Schöner noted about Mensdorff’s eventual attitude towards England in his diary on 20 April 1945: “[...] *ich erinnere mich, daß er noch vor zwei Jahren im Jockey-Club höchst ns. Reden führte und weidlich auf England geschimpft hat.*” Eva-Maria Csáky, Franz Matscher, and Gerald Stourzh (eds.), *Josef Schöner, Wiener Tagebuch 1944/1945* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, Böhlau Verlag, 1992), 167.

²⁸⁶ Paulovsky to Williams, 27 October 1945, FO 741/12, TNA.

²⁸⁷ Note, 9 September 1945, FO 741/12, TNA.

²⁸⁸ Kandl to Williams, 24 October 1945, FO 741/12, TNA.

London-based Anglo-Austrian Society.²⁸⁹ Pollak, the editor-in-chief of the *Arbeiterzeitung*, had been a member of the London society since its foundation and remained in close contact with the AAS upon his return to Vienna in September 1945. He argued that all other Allied Powers had already established “associations for the promotion of friendly relations” and that a “corresponding Austro-British association” was missing.²⁹⁰ The Foreign Office did not reject the actual establishment of a society, argued, however, against its connection with the AAS.²⁹¹ The FO agreed with Mack that there would not be enough suitable individuals to guarantee a “non-political and non-official Anglo-Austrian Society.”²⁹²

The Foreign Office’s initial rejection did not negatively affect the AAS’s plans for a partner organisation. Tom Horabin from the AADS, and William Warbey, a supporter of the Society, visited Vienna with a delegation from the British parliament in November 1945.²⁹³ During their stay they attended a meeting where initial decisions about the society, for example, the name Austro-British Society, were made.²⁹⁴

By February 1946 six different groups had plans to found an anglophile society in Vienna:

1. “The Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society, representative Oscar Pollak.
2. The Anglo-Austrian Society, representative Herr Kandl of the Anglo-Austrian Bank.
3. The Social Club, proposed by Captain Hermann Bublay. [...]
4. The Austro-British Society, representative, Mr. Hlawacek.
5. The Oesterreichisch English Gesellschaft, representative Professor Paulovsky [...].

²⁸⁹ Mack to Troutbeck, 27 October 1945, FO 371/46656, TNA.

²⁹⁰ Pollak to Mack, 16 October 1945, FO 371/46656, TNA.

²⁹¹ Note by Cullis, Establishment of Vienna branch of Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society in London, 12 November 1945, FO 371/46656, TNA.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Scheu, “The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society,” 10.

²⁹⁴ Minutes, Austro-British Society Meeting, 28 November 1945, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

6. The Anglo-Austrian Society proposed by Herr Böhm of the Austrian Resistance Movement.”²⁹⁵

Several of these anglophile groups submitted preliminary membership lists for decision to the British authorities. The society that was proposed by Kandl, would include, for example, Cardinal Innitzer, the university rector Ludwig Adamovich, the composer Friedrich Wildgans, the theatre director Raoul Aslan, the painter Herbert Böckl and the writer Otto Friedländer, as well as, Prince Taxis, Graf Hoyos and Ernst von Hohenberg, the son of Archduke Franz Ferdinand.²⁹⁶ Hlawacek’s list of proponents that would support an Austro-British Society included, for instance, the communist city councillor Viktor Matejka, the communist and driving force of the Austrian Centre Eva Kolmer, the conservative jurist and editor Egon Seehfehlner, the People’s Party politicians Lois Weinberger and Hans Pernter, the theatre director Raoul Aslan, the actor Willy Forst, the actress Hedwig Bleibtreu and the composer Edmund Eysler.²⁹⁷

The names on the proposed membership lists launched a great deal of discussion amongst the British authorities. Regarding the political and social background of these people the Foreign Office noted:

“[...] whether or not it is the case that the combined interest in this country [note: Austria] and in cultural activity is to be found more among Conservative and aristocratic elements in Austria, but it would not be altogether unnatural if such people had had better opportunities to indulge these tastes. If [...] representatives of the Left Wing parties qualify equally well we should be only too glad.”²⁹⁸

In addition, the Political Advisor Mack levelled criticism against the inclusion of Cardinal Innitzer. Mack noted:

²⁹⁵ Williams to Director, Political Division ACA/BE, 22 February 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

²⁹⁶ Ingrams to Bowen, 28 January 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

²⁹⁷ Intelligence Section, ISB to Nicholls, 30 January 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

²⁹⁸ Note by Cullis, Proposed Formation of Anglo-Austrian Society, 14 February 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

“Incidentally Cardinal Innitzer is not, repeat not, a suitable person to head the list of sponsors or to be a sponsor at all. We could not allow him to have any connection with an Anglo-Austrian Society.”²⁹⁹

The proposed involvement of Innitzer was not the only matter that came under fire. The Foreign Office did not approve of a “primarily cultural organisation” being “monopolised for political ends.”³⁰⁰ After all, the FO wanted a “single widely represented body”, which would be useful for the “British Council’s purposes.”³⁰¹ To become accepted by the British officials, any anglophile Society needed to be “suitably non-party and properly representative of the various people interested.”³⁰²

As the Foreign Office regarded the foundation of several anglophile Societies undesirable, it argued in favour of an amalgamation.³⁰³ Mack outlined this somewhat colourfully, describing that his “idea was to collect these conflicting groups in one place and bang their heads together until they coalesced.”³⁰⁴ The idea of consolidating the various proposed Anglophile societies was supported by the ACA/BE and the Austrian Government, especially by Foreign Minister Karl Gruber. Mack noted that Gruber was “anxious” to “get a Society started”, as the other Allies had already founded cultural societies.³⁰⁵ It was thanks to Oscar Pollak that the societies got together in order to “solve the conflicting claims of all the various groups.”³⁰⁶ Subsequently, the foundation of a *Britisch-Österreichische Gesellschaft*, based on a selection of the initial six Anglophile groups, was proposed. The Society issued an invitation for the foundation meeting, scheduled for 30 March 1946.³⁰⁷

²⁹⁹ Mack to Montague-Pollock, 21 March 1946, FO 924/456 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

³⁰⁰ Note by Cullis, Proposed Formation of Anglo-Austrian Society, 14 February 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

³⁰² Mack to Montague-Pollock, 21 March 1946, FO 924/456 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

³⁰³ Montagu-Pollock to Mack, 4 March 1946, FO 924/456 (as well as FO 1020/1082), TNA.

³⁰⁴ Mack to Montague-Pollock, 21 March 1946, FO 924/456 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

³⁰⁵ Ibid.

³⁰⁶ Controller ISB to Mack, 30 March 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³⁰⁷ Invitation, *Britisch-Österreichische Gesellschaft*, March 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

The committee of proponents included the lecturer Ernst O. Bock, the painter and vice-chancellor of the Academy of Fine Arts Herbert Böckl, the pro-vice-chancellor of the Technical University Adalbert Duschek, the Member of Parliament Ernst Fischer, the Minister of Education Felix Hurdes and Vice-Chancellor Adolf Schärf. Further proponents were Josef Marx from the academy of music, editor-in-chief Oscar Pollak, the lawyer Wilhelm Rosenzweig, the international law expert Alfred Verdross and Edmund Weber.³⁰⁸

As this meeting had already been scheduled for the end of March, the Political Advisor Mack intervened with the Society and advised them to postpone the inauguration “in order to enable a revised list for sponsors to be prepared.”³⁰⁹ The major point for discussion was whether to include active politicians, especially communists, in the constituent committee or not.³¹⁰ Mack’s suggestion was to “omit active politicians altogether.”³¹¹ Furthermore he stated:

“It would obviously be inadvisable to propose the removal of Fischer [...] while leaving the two Ministers from the other parties. [...] [The] inclusion of politicians made it almost impossible to exclude a communist.”³¹²

The Foreign Office in London countered this and argued against the exclusion of politicians from the constituent committee.³¹³ The FO was without doubt fully aware that this would mean the involvement of a communist with the Society. However, the Foreign Office’s point of view was that “the presence of a Communist [would] not result in the introduction of Communists in a disproportionate number.”³¹⁴ Whether the Foreign Office did not oppose the inclusion of a communist politician, because they had no objection against him, or

³⁰⁸ Ibid.

³⁰⁹ Wilberforce to Nicholls, 3 May 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 371/55309), TNA.

³¹⁰ Pollak argued that the postponement of the inaugural meeting was due to the fact that Mack did not approve of a communist member. Pollak to Wodak, 30 March 1946, As cited in: Wagnleitner, “Diplomatie zwischen Parteiproporz und Weltpolitik,” 92-93.

³¹¹ Mack to Foreign Office, 16 May 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 371/55309), TNA.

³¹² Ibid.

³¹³ Telegram from London to Vienna, 24 May 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 371/55309), TNA.

³¹⁴ Ibid.

whether they decided to tolerate one communist member, as a token communist, in order to appease the main political parties is debateable. After all, the KPÖ provided one federal Minister, namely Karl Altmann, at that time. Ernst Fischer was eventually dropped from the proposed list of proponents, and later replaced by the communist city councillor Viktor Matejka.

The association of the composer and declared communist Friedrich Wildgans with the Austro-British Society was, interestingly enough, never a matter for debate.³¹⁵ Wildgans held the position of musical referee under the communist city councillor Viktor Matejka from 1946 to 1949.³¹⁶ The British authorities and the ABS probably valued Wildgans' musical achievements more than his political involvement.

Discussions about the politicisation of the ABS took place amongst the members of the London-based Anglo-Austrian Society as well. In April 1946 the AAS spoke out against a political counterpart in Vienna. It stated:

“[...] it would be better to make the Vienna Society not too political, otherwise the Communists would always press for using their opposite body here and the People's Party might find our Society too left-wingish.”³¹⁷

In May the same year the Anglo-Austrian Society's position seems to have changed. The Foreign Office noted that Hynd held the opinion that “politicians as such should take a full place” in the Austro-British Society.³¹⁸ Besides, Hynd contacted the Control Office stating his wish for an immediate foundation of the ABS.³¹⁹ It is unclear why the Society changed its position towards the inclusion of

³¹⁵ Wildgans was a member of the KPÖ from 1945 to 1950. He turned his back on the Moscow orientated Austrian Communist Party after the Tito-Stalin split in 1948. In 1950 Wildgans became a member of the SPÖ. The British probably tolerated him because he was a Titoist rather than a Stalinist. See Michael Kraus, “‘Kultura’ Der Einfluss der sowjetischen Besatzung auf die österreichische Kultur 1945 – 1955,” *Diplomarbeit*, Universität Wien, 2008, 256; Leopold Brauneiss, “Friedrich Wildgans: Leben, Wirken und Werk,” *Diplomarbeit*, Universität Wien, 1988, 51.

³¹⁶ Kraus, “Kultura,” 254; Brauneiss, “Friedrich Wildgans,” 130.

³¹⁷ Pro Memoria for Edwards, MP, April 1946, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³¹⁸ Mack to Foreign Office, 16 May 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 371/55309), TNA.

³¹⁹ Nicholls to Deputy Commissioner, 2 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

politicians at some point between April and May. One possible explanation might be that it pressed forward with the establishment of the Austro-British Society because it needed a counterpart in Vienna. A cooperation partner in Vienna would have eased the implementation of the Anglo-Austrian Society's relief work and its cultural activities. The AAS noted:

“In the long run it is very difficult indeed, especially in the cultural field, to work for Anglo-Austrian understanding without an opposite body sitting in Austria.”³²⁰

In addition to the issue of whether politicians should be associated with the Austro-British Society or not, the British authorities had one further criticism; the proposed membership list of the Austro-British Society's constituent committee had “made no provision for any British membership.”³²¹ To counter any further delays of the establishment of the Austro-British Society, Oscar Pollak relented and submitted a revised list. Instead of a constituent committee, which would have been dissolved after the Society's foundation anyway, he proposed a permanent honorary committee, an executive committee and honorary presidents.

According to Pollak's proposal, the Austro-British Society's three honorary presidents would be W. H. B. Mack, Felix Hurdes and Theodor Körner. The Honorary Committee would include, amongst others, Ludwig Adamovich, Herbert Böckl, Raoul Aslan, Bruno Pittermann, Johann Böhm, Edmund Eysler, Franz Novy, Friedrich Wildgans, Josef Marx, Josef Krips, and Adalbert Duschek. Some of those proposed for the Executive Committee were, Alfred Verdross, Oscar Pollak, Josef Afritsch, Edmund Weber, Franz Schneider, Wilhelm Rosenzweig, Ernst O. Bock and Herman Bublay.³²²

The Foreign Office and the British Element of the ACA were not completely satisfied with this proposed membership list and insisted on two further changes. Firstly, they decided to omit Bublay, because his wife had been a

³²⁰ Pro Memoria for Edwards, MP, April 1946, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³²¹ Nicholls to Deputy Commissioner, 2 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³²² Attachment, Nicholls to Deputy Commissioner, 6 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

“well known Nazi.”³²³ Both the Minister of Education Felix Hurdes and Oscar Pollak supported Bublay’s exclusion.³²⁴ Secondly, the list drew criticism because the proposed committee still lacked British citizens. This issue had already been brought up earlier and Nicholls, from the ACA, finally solved the issue after discussions with Hurdes and Pollak.³²⁵ Apart from these changes, the British authorities approved of the amended list:

“[...] the Austrians have proposed a good and representative list of names, and I am satisfied that it is not unduly weighted on the side of academic figures.”³²⁶

5.3. The Foundation of the Austro-British Society

Following months of discussions the Austro-British Society was founded on 22 June 1946 at a gathering held in Vienna’s Town Hall.³²⁷ At the first meeting the society’s constitution was decided and pronounced, and the membership fees were discussed. Furthermore the honorary and the executive committees were officially elected and approved.³²⁸

5.4. Membership

Felix Hurdes, Theodor Körner and William H.B. Mack were voted the Society’s honorary presidents, and the university professor Alfred Verdross was elected head of the standing committee. These, amongst others, delivered opening speeches at the inaugural meeting.

The members of the Honorary Committee were Ludwig Adamovich, Raoul Aslan, Herbert Böckl, Johann Böhm, H. Brissanden, Franz Dörfel, Adalbert Duschek, Edmund Eysler, Hans Hintermayer, Johanna Kautetzky, Josef Krips,

³²³ Winterton to Street, 7 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³²⁴ Nicholls to Deputy Commissioner, 6 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³²⁵ Winterton to Street, 7 June 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³²⁶ Ibid.

³²⁷ Announcement British-Österreichische Gesellschaft, June 1946, FO 1020/1082 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

³²⁸ Agenda, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft, June 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

Wolfgang Lasky, Joseph Marx, Viktor Matejka, Franz Novy, Hans Pernter, Bruno Pittermann, K. Rackham, Egon Seefehlner, C.L. Verney, Josefine Weissel, Friedrich Wildgans, A. M. Williams, Julius Wirl, Stefan Wirlandner.

The society's chairmen were the city councillor Josef Afritsch, the controller of the ISB Charles de Vere Beauclerk, the director of the Political Division of the ACA/BE J W. Nicholls, the lecturer Oscar F. Bock, the British Council representative Richard Hiscocks, the editor-in-chief Oscar Pollak, the lawyers Wilhelm Rosenzweig and Franz Schneider, as well as Richard Rowntree and Edmund Weber.³²⁹

By the beginning of July 1946, only a few days after its foundation, the Austro-British Society had already received 164 applications for membership, of which about 60 were ascribed to students.³³⁰ Membership had reached 450 by September, and increased to 646 regular members and 548 members of the student's section by December 1946.³³¹ However, is it unclear whether these figures included Anglo-Austrian Society members too, as members of the ABS automatically became members of the AAS and vice versa.

5.5. Establishing the Society

The first committee meeting of the ABS took place on 5 July 1946 in the Palais Pallavicini in Vienna.³³² Amongst the members present were Rosenzweig, Bock, Verdross, Schneider and a Mr. Smith from the British Council. Bock and Pollak were voted secretaries and Schneider chosen as the Society's treasurer. Organisational issues and discussions about membership applications, registration forms, bank accounts and general preparatory work appeared on the agenda.

³²⁹ Proponentenverzeichnis und Vorschlag über die Aufteilung der Ausschüsse. Attached to: Agenda, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft, June 1946, FO 924/456, TNA.

³³⁰ Committee Meeting of the Austro-British Society, 5 July 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³³¹ Beauclerk to Mair, 26 September 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA; Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³³² The Palais Pallavicini, Josefsplatz 5, Vienna I., was featured in Carol Reed's film "The Third Man" (1949) as the location of Harry Lime's apartment. "Der Dritte Mann", directed by Carol Reed (1949; Arthaus, Kinowelt Home Entertainment GmbH, 2006), DVD.

Working committees for students, English teachers and English students were also established.³³³

A subject of discussion raised by the British Council official Smith was the relationship between the BC and the Austro-British Society. Smith argued:

“[...] it seemed [...] necessary to examine carefully the relative function of the Austro-British Society and the British Council, as there seemed to be some risk that they might start duplicating activities.”³³⁴

Furthermore, the meetings attendees deliberated on the connection between the BC, the ABS and the ISB.

“[...] it is important to get the relative functions of the British Council, Austro-British Society and ISB straightened out [...] as otherwise it looks as though there will be some confusion.”³³⁵

This issue emerged because Rosenzweig had outlined the Austro-British Society's plan to supply newspapers. Smith countered and stressed that only the BC would be able to obtain newspapers and periodicals at that moment, and that a British Council reading room and library would be opened shortly anyway.³³⁶ However, future cooperation on this matter was not ruled out. Beauclerk, the controller of the ISB, did in fact not see any “danger of a clash of interests” between the organisations.³³⁷ He argued that:

“The role of both the British Council and the ISB can be that of servicing agents to the Society. For instance, the ISB should be able to help them with newspapers, whereas the British Council might be of more assistance

³³³ Tagesordnung, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft, Vorstandssitzung, Attached to: Committee Meeting of the Austro-British Society, 5 July 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³³⁴ Committee Meeting of the Austro-British Society, 5 July 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³³⁵ Ibid.

³³⁶ Ibid.

³³⁷ Beauclerk to Wilkinson, 16 July 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

in obtaining certain books, or in facilitating the arrangements for visiting lectures etc.”³³⁸

The Information Services Branch’s position was to give the ABS scope for development in the early phase, await its development, and work together where required in the future. Beauclerk realised that all the actors involved could benefit from a prospective cooperation and acknowledged its importance. He stated that a liaison “would only be complimentary to the work being done by the British Council and ourselves [note: ISB].”³³⁹ Furthermore, Beauclerk emphasised that the British authorities, and in particular the ISB “should not try to restrict their [note: the ABS’s] activities or in any way [...] tie them down.”³⁴⁰

Both the Austro-British Society and the Anglo-Austrian Society regarded the British Council as an important supporter of its activities. In a memorandum, dated October 1946, the AAS noted that “the newly found Vienna Society [note: ABS] can expect great support from the British Council in its activities.”³⁴¹

The British Council side took a similar view of the situation. The BC representative Hiscocks described that the ABS worked in “close conjunction with the Council” and, furthermore, pointed out that the ABS had used the BC’s “lecture hall for many of its meetings.”³⁴² This was because in the early phase after its foundation, the Austro-British Society struggled to find suitable accommodation in Vienna. Therefore, meetings were held “wherever temporary premises [could] be found.”³⁴³ After residing in Schreyvogelgasse 3, Vienna I., the ABS moved its office to Seilerstätte 16, Vienna I.³⁴⁴ In October 1953 the Vienna branch moved its offices to the Council premises in order to save costs; nonetheless, the ASB had to pay rent to the BC.³⁴⁵

³³⁸ Ibid.

³³⁹ Ibid.

³⁴⁰ Ibid.

³⁴¹ Memorandum B, October 1946, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁴² Annual Report 1946/47, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁴³ Beauclerk to Mair, 26 September 1946, FO 1020/1082, TNA.

³⁴⁴ Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁴⁵ Annual Report 1953/54, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

5.6. The Aims of the Austro-British Society

The ABS aimed to “promote understanding between nations” and emphasised that its work was “outside political and party interests, interdenominational and [that it] includes all classes.”³⁴⁶ The aims of the Austro-British Society, as defined in its constitution, were:³⁴⁷

- a) “the strengthening of democratic thought in Austria, and the furthering of cooperation between British and Austrian democracy
- b) the encouragement of mutual understanding and friendship between the Austrian population and that of the British Empire
- c) the encouragement and development of social, cultural, political and economic relations between Austria and the countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations
- d) the spreading of knowledge of the language, culture, history, social institutions and political and economic conditions of the countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations.”³⁴⁸

The Austro-British Society hoped to achieve these aims through:

1. *“Vorträge, Lichtbild- und Filmvorführungen, Theateraufführungen, Konzerte, Ausstellungen.*
2. *Gesellschaftliche Veranstaltungen aller Art.*
3. *Sportliche Veranstaltungen, besonders gemeinschaftliche Ferienlager und Wanderungen.*
4. *Einrichtung von Büchereien, Leseräumen für Zeitungen und Zeitschriften.*
5. *Förderung von Publikationen aller Art, die den Vereinszielen förderlich erscheinen, allenfalls Einrichtung eines Pressedienstes.*

³⁴⁶ Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁴⁷ The Report of Activities appeared in January 1947, with a circulation of 10,000 copies in German and 3,000 in English. It can be assumed that it was sent to members of the Austro-British Society, and that it was issued at events and lectures. Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁴⁸ Ibid.

6. *Veranstaltung von Studienreisen, Förderung von Privatreisen, Pflege der Gastfreundschaft, Studenten- und Schüleraustausch, Schülerbriefwechsel.*
7. *Zusammenarbeit mit privaten, halboffiziellen und öffentlichen Organisationen und Stellen des In- und Auslands, die einen der Gesellschaftszwecke fördern, so insbesondere mit der Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society in Great Britain.*
8. *Alle anderen, den Zielen der Gesellschaft zweckdienlichen Mittel.*³⁴⁹

5.7. Cultural Activities

A great number of events, mainly lectures, were organised in the first few months following the foundation of the Society. The event with the largest audience was John Boynton Priestley's lecture about "The New Britain" at the Konzerthaus in Vienna. According to the Society's report of activities from the same year, about 2,000 people came to listen to Priestley, who was a famous British novelist and broadcaster.³⁵⁰ In his lecture, Priestley addressed the new "Era of Socialism" in Britain, the problems the country had to overcome after the war, and spoke about British inventions.³⁵¹

Otto Harpner from the AAS approached the British Council just before Priestley's lecture tour of Europe and asked whether they could provide funds for this event.³⁵² The BC refused with the excuse that they had limited funds themselves, and that they would draw up their own programmes for British Council lecture tours. However, the Council assured "to give every assistance possible" for further events.³⁵³ I feel that the Council's reluctance to support an event with Priestley can be traced back to the fact that the BC's conservative opinion leaders did not want to support the left-wing broadcaster.

³⁴⁹ Satzung der Österreichisch-Britischen Gesellschaft, June 1946, FO 924/456 (as well as FO 741/12), TNA.

³⁵⁰ Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁵¹ "Mr. Priestley on the 'New England'," British Morning News, 17 October 1946.

³⁵² Lloyd of Dolobran, Regional Officer, British Council to Harpner, 9 October 1946, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁵³ Ibid.

Further events in 1946 arranged by the Austro-British Society or its students section were, for example, lectures about “Liberty in the Twentieth Century”, “Education in England”, “Art and Modern Pictures” and “Social Service in Post-War Britain”. Furthermore, an emphasis on the British political system is clearly recognisable, as several lectures dealt with this subject. For instance, some lectures discussed “The English Parliamentary System”, “The First Year of the Present British Parliament” and “How Parliament Works.”³⁵⁴

The lectures’ thematic priority on political education was pursued in the following year. In autumn 1947 the ABS – in cooperation with the Vienna *Volkshochschulen* – organised a lecture series on English political and cultural life. These took place in the *Volkshochschulen* in the Viennese districts of Ottakring, Alsergrund and Hietzing. Rosenzweig from the ABS lectured about “Das Verfassungssystem in England”, Marianne Pollak discussed “England und Europa” and Schneider spoke about “Die englischen politischen Parteien.”³⁵⁵ Further lectures addressed “Das englische Pressewesen”, “Das englische Erziehungswesen” and “Dickens und seine Zeitgenossen. Vorkämpfer der Sozialen Bewegung.”³⁵⁶

The educational and political content of these lectures can be understood in the context of general British policy towards Austria in the early phase of the occupation, which was clearly based on re-education and democratisation. The ABS had either continued the “official” British policy from the ACA/BE and the BC, or had recognised its importance and decided to implement it in its own events as well.

The ABS arranged debates, conducted in the British style, on various topics. The debate with the highest number of attendance was about international marriages, starting with the motion “This House proposes that in general

³⁵⁴ The above-mentioned lectures took place between July and September 1946. Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁵⁵ Newsletter Nr. 9, Austro-British Society, September 1947, FO 1020/1180, TNA.

³⁵⁶ Ibid.

marriages between nationals of two countries are undesirable”.³⁵⁷ The reason for the large interest in this topic was probably that, in the course of the occupation period, many international relationships had been formed. Therefore, a vast majority of the audience rejected the motion.

The Austro-British Society also organised social gatherings in the subsequent years. These included, a *Krampus* party, a reading from Charles Dickens’ “A Christmas Carol”, a New Year’s Eve party, several film screenings, as well as quizzes and evening dances. The Society’s students’ section held regular conversation evenings, arranged outings on Sundays, organised correspondence with pen friends in Britain and took part in winter camps in Tyrol. The latter were attended by members of the ABS as well as by members of the British occupation forces.³⁵⁸

The Austro-British Society published a bimonthly newsletter, which announced the upcoming lecture programme and further cultural activities. In September 1947 the ABS proclaimed that the first issue of a monthly magazine, *The Austro-British Review*, would be published by the middle of October. The English language periodical aimed to “give an idea of English institutions and English cultural life.”³⁵⁹ Unfortunately it cannot be verified whether this magazine was actually published or if it did not get past in the planning phase.

In autumn 1947 the ABS founded three sub-groups, namely a conversation group, a music group and an art club. These groups were intended to appeal to a wider audience, and the ABS aimed at satisfying people’s interests in topics beyond the English language and British culture. The conversation groups – 5 in number at the beginning – met several times a week for conversation exercises. The members of the music group gathered once a week to discuss, listen or to

³⁵⁷ About 400 people attended the debate about international marriages. This number of participants is comparatively high, compared to an average number of 180-200 attendees at other events during 1946. Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁵⁸ Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁵⁹ Newsletter Nr. 9, Austro-British Society, September 1947, FO 1020/1180, TNA.

make music and the art club arranged excursions or assembled for sketching lessons.³⁶⁰

5.8. The Austro-British Society in Austria's Provinces

Within the first few months of the Austro-British Society's existence, long-term aims, in particular plans for opening provincial bureaus in Styria and Carinthia were drawn up. By the end of 1949 the ABS had set up branches in Graz, Klagenfurt and Innsbruck.³⁶¹ Further expansion resulted in the establishment of 16 branches by 1952.³⁶² These were located in Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck, Salzburg, Klagenfurt, Leoben, Bruck, Knittelfeld, Leibnitz, Villach, Bad Ischl, Feldkirch, Judenburg, Gmunden and Radenthein.³⁶³ The branches were spread all over Austria, apart from the Soviet zone of occupation. Only four of these branches, namely those in Vienna, Graz, Klagenfurt and Salzburg, maintained their own premises. The Council provided additional subsidies for them, to cover salaries and rent.

The Austro-British Society in Graz worked closely with the Styrian Anglo-Austrian Circle.³⁶⁴ The Circle organised student groups, provided lectures and conducted various cultural activities. Furthermore, it took over the British Council's library and reading room after the Council's premises at Palais Attems became too small to house the library in the long run. Ultimately, the BC subsidised the Circle to secure the library's survival.³⁶⁵

5.9 Criticisms and Interdependence

While the British Council had judged the Austro-British Society favourably in the beginning, it gradually changed its opinion about the ABS becoming more critical in its assessment. The BC maintained that:

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ Annual Report 1948-49, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁶² Annual Report 1951/52, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁶³ Unfortunately, I was not able to identify the location of the sixteenth ABS branch.

³⁶⁴ Report of Activities. June – December 1946. Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁶⁵ Annual Report 1950/51, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

“The high hopes [...] for the future of the Society have been disappointed [...]. The Vienna Branch has fallen into the hands of a narrow clique which has succeeded in virtually destroying the central organisation of the Society. Many members have resigned³⁶⁶, and some of the moving spirits of the Society in its early days have withdrawn their support.”³⁶⁷

On that point, Hiscocks from the British Council noted:

“[...] the federal organisation of the Society has virtually come to an end; the provincial branches have voted themselves almost complete independence and nearly all the influential Right Wing³⁶⁸ members of the Vienna Branch have resigned either office or membership of the Society.”³⁶⁹

The Council heavily criticised the tense situation resulting from the internal power struggle within the different branches of the Austro-British Society. While the British authorities – and in particular the BC – debated and watched the breakaway of the provincial ABS branches closely, interestingly enough, an equivalent discussion amongst the Anglo-Austrian Society did not occur.³⁷⁰

A further point of criticism concerned the Austro-British Society's apparent domination by members with a socialist background. Shortly before the ABS's foundation in Vienna in early 1946, the BC and the British FO interfered regarding a perceived imbalance in the political background of future members. Following discussions about whether to include communist politicians or not, the BC argued in favour of including members of all political parties. Upon the ABS's internal reorganisation and the subsequent change of some members, the British Council spoke out against the Society's domination by members of a

³⁶⁶ Unfortunately, I have so far not been able to trace who these members were.

³⁶⁷ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁶⁸ Right wing is equated with conservative here and refers to members of the Austrian People's Party.

³⁶⁹ Confidential Report, Austria, July/December 1948, attached to: Hiscocks to Controller, 31 December 1948, BW 13/11, TNA.

³⁷⁰ The relevant archive material from the AAS did not even hint at the ABS's internal power-struggle.

single political party. The BC's criticism of the ABS was, in fact, rather similar to the FO's criticism of the AAS in London. The AAS's leading figures Harpner and Hynd were rather tolerated than accepted due to their socialist background, and while the BC had great regard for Pollak, who was highly involved with the ABS, they were not altogether positive about Rosenzweig,

The BC admittedly qualified their statement about the ABS, and argued that the society's conflicts were in fact the result of an internal power struggle based on contradictory personal interests. The BC noticed:

“It has [...] become increasingly clear that the controlling clique in Vienna is actuated less by political motives than by the desire for personal influence and the feeling of fellowship or kinship amongst a body of ex-emigrants.³⁷¹ One or two Left Wing members of the Society at least have looked upon the development of the past [...] months with great distaste.”³⁷²

As a consequence of this tense situation the BC began to dissociate itself from the ABS in Vienna. Yet the Society continued to receive indispensable financial assistance from the ISB. The British Council tolerated this connection, but not without challenging it critically.

“Were it not for the generous subsidies and the moral support given by the Controller of the Information Services Branch, the Branch [note: the Vienna branch of the ABS] would almost certainly have come to an end by now owing to lack of funds. The Council's policy has been one of increasing detachment from the affairs of the Branch without actual severance of its connection [...].”³⁷³

³⁷¹ This refers to Pollak, Schneider and Rosenzweig, who immigrated to the United Kingdom upon the Nazi takeover in Austria. All three of them were involved in the AAS during their residence in London, and were highly involved in establishing the ABS upon their return to Austria.

³⁷² Confidential Report, Austria, July/December 1948, attached to: Hiscocks to Controller, 31 December 1948, BW 13/11, TNA.

³⁷³ Annual Report 1948/49, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

During the early 1950s the relationship between the British Council and the Austro-British Society was characterised by dissociation and dependence. In contrast to the situation in Vienna, the BC kept close contacts with several provincial branches of the ABS throughout Austria. The Council even allocated the entire annual subsidy, which was originally intended for all ABS branches, to the provincial branches while omitting Vienna.³⁷⁴

Due to the British Council's budgetary cuts and the consequent limitations on its scope, the organisation relied on the provincial branches of the Austro-British Society. In 1949 the BC remarked:

“Council activities in a number of places have been carried on entirely through the medium of these branches, and in Linz and Salzburg in particular we are tending to depend more and more on their support.”³⁷⁵

Despite the criticism levelled against the Austro-British Society, the British Council decided against abandoning the ABS altogether. The BC dreaded the idea that most of the provincial branches of the ABS would be dissolved if they did not receive any financial support; this would overall “not conduce to British prestige.”³⁷⁶ The Council's position was:

“However imperfect they [note: the ABS] may be and however weakly administered by voluntary committees composed of busy people, the branches represent a genuine Austrian interest in Britain and provide a channel for Council activities through lectures and functional work.”³⁷⁷

The successful continuance of the British Council's own activities depended on the ABS, and as a result, the existing cooperation could not be dissolved. For example, the BC offices in Graz and Klagenfurt were affected by financial and personal curtailments in 1950. In order not to withdraw completely, the BC passed the baton to the regional ABS branches. Due to additional financial

³⁷⁴ Ibid.

³⁷⁵ Ibid.

³⁷⁶ Annual Report 1949/50, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

subsidies these branches continued to provide library services and facilitated lecture rooms.³⁷⁸

The British Council continued to rely on the AAS, which, after all provided “platforms for Council lectures and centres for the distribution of material.”³⁷⁹ Yet, the BC objected the ABS and criticised:

“The branches of the Austro-British Society unavoidably suffer from the weakness of most voluntary organisations; finance is a permanent problem in those cases where premises are maintained and often the most efficient members have least time for committee work.”³⁸⁰

The Council qualified this statement at the same time and outlined the positive aspects of their amicable cooperation:

“It is [...] idle to complain that they [note: the ABS] are not always as efficient as might be desired, for the connections resulting through them in the schools and government offices are of real value in disseminating knowledge of Britain [...].”³⁸¹

As a result of cutbacks in the Information Services’ general budget in 1950, additional aid for the ABS could no longer be provided from this source. The BC took over providing the necessary funding in order to ensure the continuation of the ABS branches in Graz and Klagenfurt.³⁸² However, these branches were not the only ones that struggled to procure the necessary amount of funds. The Klagenfurt branch had to rely on additional funds from the provincial government and the ABS in Salzburg just about managed to keep afloat through additional income resulting from the annual Salzburg Festival. The Society in Linz was for the most part amalgamated with the local *Volkshochschule*.³⁸³ The ABS’s

³⁷⁸ Ibid.

³⁷⁹ Annual Report 1950/51, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁸⁰ Ibid.

³⁸¹ Ibid.

³⁸² Ibid.

³⁸³ Annual Report 1952/53, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

branches in Graz and Vienna were the “problem children”. Their financial situation in particular remained uncertain from one year to the next.

“The financial position of these [...] two Societies was weakened by the increased cost of salaries and rent, but also by a loss of subscription revenue partly accounted for by individual financial hardship and partly by a certain monotony of the programme.”³⁸⁴

Apart from the financial support, the BC also provided the ABS with rooms for lectures and language courses in both Graz and Vienna. This was connected to the BC’s long-term policy of helping the societies to build up their financial reserves.³⁸⁵ In 1953 the British Council noted that:

“[...] despite their slight instability of structure, these Societies still represent a voluntary Austrian approach to Britain and a most useful point of contact [...]”³⁸⁶

After cooperating for several years the British Council nevertheless remained critical of the ABS. In 1955 the BC still saw itself competing with the Societies. It took the view that “that the Societies and the Council are to some extent competitive in places where both exist.”³⁸⁷

To my mind this critique can be closely linked to the British Council’s own weaknesses. The BC’s financial and personal curtailments – a direct result of the Drogheda Report – had limited its scope in Austria. Denigrating the Austro-British Society was without doubt a way to bolster the Council’s own position.

5.10. Changing Conditions

In the course of 1955 the situation changed not only for the British authorities but also for the Austro-British Society. With the signing of the State Treaty and the

³⁸⁴ Ibid.

³⁸⁵ Ibid.

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

³⁸⁷ Annual Report 1954/55, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

withdrawal of the British troops from Carinthia, Styria and Vienna, members of the occupation forces and their relatives – important target groups of the ABS – disappeared. Personal contacts and exchange between British and Austrian citizens were no longer possible to the same extent as had previously been the case.

As a consequence, the activities of the Austro-British Society's provincial branches were considerably restricted. To give one example, the Klagenfurt branch "required a great deal of help and advice [...] when the British troops departed."³⁸⁸ As a result, the branch was reorganised and new target groups, such as schoolteachers, were approached. In addition, the library stock was updated and the premises reduced from three rooms to one, in order to make better use of the Council's "small subsidy."³⁸⁹

In retrospect, the British Council voiced criticism regarding the actual value and benefit of the Austro-British Societies' activities in post-war Austria.

"The Societies were called into life in the days of the occupation and at one time subsidised both by the Information Services and by the Council. In present-day circumstances, if they did not exist, it would not be necessary to invent them. But because of the history of their development the Council has to be careful not to snob or kill them."³⁹⁰

5.11. Excursus: Personnel Continuities

Some of the exiled Austrians, affiliated with the Anglo-Austrian Society in London during the Second World War, remained in close contact upon their return to Austria. What is more, a few of these people were also involved in the Austro-British Society in post-war Austria. In what follows, I will describe a few examples of personnel continuities.

³⁸⁸ Annual Report 1955/56, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

³⁸⁹ Ibid.

³⁹⁰ Annual Report 1956/57, The British Council Austria, BW 13/13, TNA.

Oscar Pollak, one of the figureheads of the London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists, became the editor-in-chief of the socialist daily newspaper *Arbeiterzeitung* upon his return to Vienna. His wife Marianne Pollak was a founding member of the Anglo-Austrian Society in 1944, while Oscar was a founder member of the Austro-British Society in 1946. During the years that followed, the Pollak's remained very close with their friends in both Societies. Oscar Pollak, for example delivered a lecture for the AAS in London³⁹¹. He and his wife also lectured for the ABS in Vienna.³⁹²

Due to Oscar Pollak's personal involvement with the AAS and ABS, it is quite certain that he was responsible for several on-topic newspaper articles in the *Arbeiterzeitung*. One example is an article that was published in the course of the ratification of the Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom in 1953.

“Österreichische Kultur in England

*In wenig Ländern ist österreichische Kultur so gut vertreten wie in England. Das ist vor allem der Anglo-Österreichischen Gesellschaft zu danken, die während des Krieges gegründet wurde. Die Gesellschaft bereitete alle größeren österreichischen Kulturveranstaltungen der letzten Jahre in England vor, so auch das jüngste Gastspiel der Philharmoniker. Im vergangenen Sommer wurden hunderte österreichische und englische junge Leute ausgetauscht. In den letzten achtzehn Monaten hatten mehr als 200.000 Zuhörer hundertfünfzig Veranstaltungen der Gesellschaft besucht. Der erste Sekretär der Gesellschaft, Dr. Otto Harpner, wird in einem von der Österreichisch-Britischen Gesellschaft veranstalteten Vortrag am 15. d. um 18.15 Uhr im Vortragssaal des Kunsthistorischen Museums, Neue Hofburg, Heldenplatz, über dieses bedeutsame Stück österreichisch-englischen Kulturaustausches berichten.”*³⁹³

³⁹¹ The lecture took place in either 1946 or 1947. Unfortunately, neither the exact date, nor the topic of the lecture could be identified. Annual Report 1946-47, Box 29, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁹² Austro-British Society News Bulletin Number 5, April 1947, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁹³ “Österreichische Kultur in England,” *Arbeiterzeitung*, 13 January 1953.

Examples of further connections between the AAS and the ABS are Walter Wodak, Wilhelm Rosenzweig and Franz Schneider. The socialist Wodak, an early member of the Anglo-Austrian Society, continued his personal contact with the AAS after his brief return to Austria in September 1945, which was followed by his appointment to the Austrian Legation in London.³⁹⁴ To illustrate the continuing contact, I want to refer to a letter from Wodak to Harpner. It reveals that the Wodak had been instructed to pass a cheque on to the AAS, which had been provided by the SPÖ in 1947.³⁹⁵ The lawyer Wilhelm Rosenzweig had been a member of the London Bureau of the Austrian Socialists in Great Britain, before acting as the AAS's honorary treasurer. After his return to Austria in late 1945 he became one of the secretaries of the ABS.³⁹⁶

Franz Schneider, a Christian social who immigrated to Britain during the war, had been a member of the executive committee of the AAS. After Schneider's return to Austria, in order to resume his profession as lawyer, he first became an executive member and later the honorary treasurer of the ABS.³⁹⁷

Even though these selected examples do not include the majority of the members of the Anglo-Austrian Society or the Austro-British Society, they nevertheless illustrate the personal contacts and continuities between the two Societies. Before the end of the Second World War, the AAS provided a framework where exiled Austrians could get together to work towards the liberation of Austria and champion the Austrian cause. It seems reasonable that members of the Society, who had positive encounters with British culture and the British way of life, remained in close contact with their friends in the Great Britain, after returning "home" to Austria. Furthermore, these individuals

³⁹⁴ Bernhard Kuschey, *Die Wodaks – Exil und Rückkehr. Eine Doppelbiografie* (Vienna: Braumüller, 2008); Wagnleitner, "Diplomatie zwischen Parteiproporz und Weltpolitik".

³⁹⁵ The cheque amounted to £200. The letter indicates that the SPÖ had already previously supported the Anglo-Austrian Society with funds. Letter from Wodak to Harpner. 1 June 1947, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁹⁶ Rosenzweig later became a member of the Constitutional Court of Austria. "Ehemalige Mitglieder, Verfassungsgerichtshof Österreich, Wilhelm Rosenzweig," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/richter/exmitglieder.html>; Report of Activities. June – December 1946, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

³⁹⁷ Report of Activities. June – December 1946, Österreichisch-Britische Gesellschaft/Austro-British Society, Box 15, [AAS/AAMS].

continued to support British culture with their membership of or personal involvement with the Austro-British Society.

6. Conclusion

To conclude, the special relationship between the British Council, the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Austro-British Society will be dealt with. In addition, a periodisation of the era discussed in this thesis will be attempted.

The British authorities, and the Foreign Office in particular, repeatedly intervened with both the AAS and ABS. This was mainly the case in matters where political issues were concerned, such as the discussions surrounding the ABS's foundation and the proposed list of members. In this particular case the FO and the BC objected to the involvement of a superior number of politically active members, in particular communists. The AAS's persistent attempts to gain recognition as an official cultural actor under the terms of the Cultural Convention were a further cause of conflict. What is more, the BC relied upon collaborating with the ABS in order to increase its sphere of influence in post-war Austria.

The question of whether the British, and in particular the BC, the FO and the ACA/BE, had an effect upon the activities of the AAS and ABS can, therefore, be answered in the affirmative. This codetermination was based on ulterior motives and heavily affected by politics. Austrian exile organisations in Great Britain during the Second War were not able to exert much influence. The exile communities were fragmented as the political camps, in particular the socialists and communists, refused to cooperate. Communists dominated the largest organisations, like for example the Austrian Centre and the Free Austrian Movement. The exiled communists hoped to play a decisive role in a future post-war Austria. As the FO mistrusted them it had no alternative but to maintain a sceptical attitude towards their organisations. This is one of the reasons why there was no Austrian exile government.

This situation influenced the British authorities' post-war policies. While most of the exile organisations had disintegrated immediately after the war, the AAS remained active and even fostered the establishment of a sister organisation, the ABS, in Vienna. The British authorities, primarily headed by conservatives, were not completely convinced about these socialist-dominated societies. This can

even be ascertained on a personal level. There was tangible opposition between leading AAS and ABS figures with a socialist background, such as Harpner, Hynd and Pollak, and the FO's and BC's conservative-minded officials, such as Cullis. It is indisputable that this conflict was somehow related to the emerging Cold War. Due to the commencing battle between East and West it became necessary for Britain to position itself ideologically, but also as an economical and cultural player. In this specific context, this meant a policy change from re-education and re-orientation to Western-orientation for the British Council. Thus continuities between the FO's and BC's pre- and post-war policies can be observed. British officials brought their distrust of communists and socialists, a partial result of experiences with exile Austrian exile organisations into the post-war period.

In conclusion, I will attempt to divide the activities of the BC, the AAS and the ABS into four different phases:

1. 1943-1944/45
2. 1945-1947
3. 1948-1953
4. 1954-1955

The Moscow Declaration initiated the first phase in 1943, and proved to be the vital spark for the foundation of the Anglo-Austrian (Democratic) Society in 1944. The Society drew attention to the specific Austrian case until the liberation of the country in spring 1945. At the same time, the BC embarked on plans for activities in a future post-war Austria. The second phase can be narrowed down to 1945 to 1947. It was characterised by the BC's brief exploratory period and the subsequent establishment of offices in Vienna, Graz, Klagenfurt, and Innsbruck. The Council's course of action consisted of re-education measures and the display of British culture. The AAS primarily focused on the provision of economic aid in the second phase, while the ABS successfully established itself after several months of debate. The third phase can be assigned to the years 1948 to 1953. The BC's outline gradually began to change, and therefore the organisation arranged far more educational than cultural activities. What is more, its policy shifted from re-education to re-orientation, and, as a result of the Cold War, became more

Western-orientated. The AAS predominantly (co-)organised cultural events, while the ABS increasingly cooperated with the BC. The fourth and ultimate phase was characterised by the BC's considerable budget and staff cuts. Consequently, its cooperation with the ABS increased, in order to maintain British prestige in Austria. For the AAS the fourth phase was marked by a struggle for official recognition within the framework of the Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom. After several months of negotiations, the conflict ended in a categorical rejection on the part of the Austrian and the British governments. The State Treaty indicated the end of the fourth phase. The complete withdrawal of the British troops, and with that the departure of the British bureaucracy signified the disappearance of a necessary target group for both the BC and the ABS.

7. Bibliography

7.1. Primary Sources

Selected Files from The National Archives, Kew, London:

British Council Papers: BW 2/94
 BW 2/95
 BW 2/121
 BW 13/1
 BW 13/9
 BW 13/11
 BW 13/12
 BW 13/13

Foreign Office Papers: FO 371/46656
 FO 371/55309
 FO 741/12
 FO 924/88
 FO 924/196
 FO 924/456
 FO 924/609
 FO 924/1013
 FO 1020/1082
 FO 1020/1180

Cabinet Papers: CAB 66/37/18
 CAB 129/47
 CAB 129/64

Selected Files from the Archives of the Anglo-Austrian Society and Anglo-Austrian Music Society, Institute of Germanic & Romance Studies, London:

Boxes: 9, 10, 15, 18, 23, 29.

“Bundesverfassungsgesetz vom 26. Oktober 1955 über die Neutralität Österreichs,” BGBl. Nr. 211/1955, 4 November 1955.

“Cultural Convention between the Austrian Federal Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,” BGBl. Nr. 60/1953, 18 June 1953.

“Proklamation über die Selbständigkeit Österreichs,” StBGl Nr. 1/1945, 1 May 1945.

Newspaper articles: “An Anglo-Austrian Centre,” *The Times*, 17 January 1948.

“Mr. Priestly on the ‘New England’,” *British Morning News*, 17 October 1946.

“London schlägt eine Brücke nach Wien,” *Wiener Tageszeitung*, 14 December 1952.

“Österreichische Kultur in England,” *Arbeiterzeitung*, 13 January 1953.

7.2. Secondary Sources

Alfred Ableitinger, Siegfried Beer, and Eduard G. Staudinger (eds.), *Österreich unter Allierter Besatzung 1945–1955* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1998).

William B. Bader, *Austria Between East and West. 1945–1955* (Stanford University Press: Stanford, 1966).

Michael Balfour, and John Mair, *Four-Power Control in Germany and Austria. 1945–1946* (London/New York/Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1956).

Marietta Bearman, Charmian Brinson, Richard Dove, Anthony Grenville, and Jennifer Taylor (eds.), *Out of Austria. The Austrian Centre in London in World War II*. (London/New York, Tauris Academic Studies, 2008).

Siegfried Beer (ed.), *Die „britische Steiermark“* (Graz: Selbstverlag der Historischen Landeskommission für Steiermark, 1995).

Siegfried Beer, “Britische Zonenpolitik,” in “*Österreich ist frei!*” *Der Österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955*, eds. Stefan Karner, and Gottfried Stangler (Horn/Vienna: Berger, 2005), 77-81.

Siegfried Beer, “Die britische Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945-1955. Von der Militärdiktatur zur Rehabilitation,” in *Wiederaufbau in Österreich 1945-1955. Rekonstruktion oder Neubeginn?*, ed. Ernst Bruckmüller (Vienna: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik, 2006), 55-89.

Siegfried Beer, “Die Kultur- und Informationspolitik der britischen Besatzungsmacht in Österreich 1945-1955,” in *Besetzte Bilder. Film, Kultur und Propaganda in Österreich 1945-1955*, ed. Karin Moser (Vienna: Verlag Filmarchiv Austria, 2005), 119-132.

Günter Bischof, *Austria in the First Cold War, 1945-55. The Leverage of the Weak* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

Günter Bischof, and Josef Leidenfrost (eds.), *Die bevormundete Nation. Österreich und die Alliierten 1949–1949* (Innsbruck: Haymon-Verlag, 1988).

Leopold Brauneiss, “Friedrich Wildgans: Leben, Wirken und Werk,” *Diplomarbeit*, Universität Wien, 1988.

Charmian Brinson, “‘Between Our Two Peoples’: The Archives of the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Anglo-Austrian Music Society,” in *Refugee Archives. Theory and Practice*. The Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and

Austrian Exile Studies Vol. 9, ed. Andrea Hammel (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2008), 95-108.

Charmian Brinson, “‘A Very Ambitious Plan’ The Early Days of the Austrian Centre,” in *Out of Austria. The Austrian Centre in London In World War II*, eds. Marietta Bearman et al. (London/New York: Tauris Academic Studies, 2008), 6-21.

Angus Calder, *The People's War. Britain 1939 – 1945* (London: Pimlico, 1969, reprinted 2008).

James Jay Carafano, *Waltzing Into the Cold War. The Struggle for Occupied Austria* (College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2002).

Gabriele Clemens, *Britische Kulturpolitik in Deutschland. 1945-1949. Literatur, Film, Musik und Theater* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1997).

Eckart Conze, “States, International Systems, And Intercultural Transfer,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 196-205.

Audrey Kurth Cronin, *Great Power Politics and the Struggle over Austria, 1945–1955* (Ithaca/New York, Cornell University Press, 1986).

Volker Depkat, “Cultural Approaches to International Relations. A Challenge?,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 175-197.

Saki Ruth Dockrill, “Austria in Britain’s Foreign Policy from the Second World War to 1955,” in *Der österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955. Internationale Strategie, rechtliche Relevanz, nationale Identität*, eds. Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005), 249-264.

Frances Donaldson, *The British Council. The First Fifty Years* (London: Cape, 1984).

Diana Jane Eastment, "The policies and position of the British Council from the outbreak of the war to 1950," PhD. diss., University of Leeds, 1982.

Johannes Feichtinger, "Zur Kulturpolitik der Besatzungsmacht Großbritannien in Österreich," in *Österreich unter Allierter Besatzung 1945–1955*, eds. Alfred Ableitinger, Siegfried Beer, and Eduard G. Staudinger (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1998), 495-529.

Johannes Feichtinger, and Eduard G. Staudinger, "Aspekte des kulturellen Wiederaufbaus in der Steiermark zwischen Kooperation und Kontrolle," in *Die „britische“ Steiermark*, ed. Siegfried Beer (Graz: Selbstverlag der Hist. Landeskomm. für Steiermark, 1995), 499-527.

Jessica Gienow-Hecht, "Cultural Transfer," in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, eds. Michael J. Hogan, Thomas G. Paterson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 257-278.

Franz Goldner, *Austrian Emigration 1938 to 1945* (New York: Ungar, 1979).

Cary Travers Grayson, *Austria's International Position. 1938-1953. The Re-establishment of an Independent Austria* (Genève, Droz, 1953).

Anthony Haigh, *Cultural Diplomacy in Europe* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1974).

Harold M. Hawkins, *Allied Commission for Austria. Background, Principles, And Procedures. A Guide*. (Vienna, 1950).

Alice Hills, *Britain and the occupation of Austria: 1943–1945* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000).

Richard Hiscocks, *The Rebirth of Austria* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953).

Akira Iriye, "Culture and International History," in *Explaining the History of American Foreign Relations*, eds. Michael J. Hogan, and Thomas G. Paterson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 214-225.

Stefan Karner, and Gottfried Stangler (eds.), "*Österreich ist frei!*" *Der Österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955* (Horn/Vienna: Berger, 2005)

Armin Klein, *Kulturpolitik. Eine Einführung* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 2003).

Robert Knight, "British policy towards occupied Austria 1945–1950," PhD. diss., University of London, 1986.

Michael Kraus, "'Kultura' Der Einfluss der sowjetischen Besatzung auf die österreichische Kultur 1945 – 1955," *Diplomarbeit*, Universität Wien, 2008.

Bernhard Kusche, *Die Wodaks – Exil und Rückkehr. Eine Doppelbiografie* (Vienna: Braumüller, 2008).

Hans-Jürgen Lüsebrink, *Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Interaktion, Fremdwahrnehmung, Kulturtransfer* (Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler, 2008).

Helene Maimann, *Politik im Wartesaal. Österreichische Exilpolitik in Großbritannien. 1938 bis 1945* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1975).

J. M. Mitchell, *International Cultural Relations. Key Concepts in International Relations: 3* (London/Boston/Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1986).

Reinhard Müller (ed.), *'Fluchtpunkte England' Spuren der österreichischen Emigration in Großbritannien 1938 bis 1945*. Katalog zur Ausstellung an der Universitätsbibliothek Graz (Graz, Universitätsbibliothek Graz, 1996).

Oliver Rathkolb, *Die paradoxe Republik. Österreich 1945 bis 2005* (Vienna: Zsolnay, 2005).

Manfred Rauchensteiner, *Der Sonderfall – Die Besatzungszeit in Österreich, 1945-1955* (Graz/Vienna: Verlag Styria, 1979).

Ilse Reiter, *Gustav Harpner. 1864–1924. Vom Anarchistenverteidiger zum Anwalt der Republik* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar: Böhlau Verlag, 2008).

Victor H. Rothwell, “Großbritannien und die Anfänge des Kalten Krieges,” in *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage. Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945-1952*, ed. Josef Foschepoth (Göttingen/Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 88-110.

Friedrich [Frederick] Scheu, *The Early Days of the Anglo-Austrian Society* (London: Published by The Anglo-Austrian Society, 1969).

Oliver Schmidt, “Small Atlantic World. U.S. Philanthropy and the Expanding International Exchange of Scholars after 1945,” in *Culture and International History*, eds. Jessica Gienow-Hecht, and Frank Schumacher (New York/Oxford: Berghahn, 2003), 115-134.

Eva-Maria Csáky, Franz Matscher, and Gerald Stourzh (eds.), *Josef Schöner, Wiener Tagebuch 1944/1945* (Vienna/Cologne/Weimar, Böhlau Verlag, 1992).

Guy Stanley, “Great Britain and the Austrian question 1938–1945,” PhD. diss., University of London, 1973.

Gabriela Stieber, *Die Briten als Besatzungsmacht in Kärnten 1945–1955* (Klagenfurt: Verlag des Kärntner Landesarchivs, 2005).

Gerald Stourzh, *Um Einheit und Freiheit. Staatsvertrag, Neutralität und das Ende der Ost-West-Besetzung Österreichs 1945-1954* (Vienna/Cologne/Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1988).

Arnold Suppan, Gerald Stourzh, and Wolfgang Mueller (eds.), *Der österreichische Staatsvertrag 1955. Internationale Strategie, rechtliche Relevanz, nationale Identität*. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2005).

Philip M. Taylor, *The Projection of Britain. British overseas publicity and propaganda 1919–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Stephan Verosta, *Die Internationale Stellung Österreichs. Eine Sammlung von Erklärungen und Verträgen aus den Jahren 1938 und 1947* (Vienna: Manzsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1947).

Reinhold Wagnleitner (ed.), *Diplomatie zwischen Parteiproporz und Weltpolitik. Briefe, Dokumente und Memoranden aus dem Nachlaß Walter Wodaks. 1945–1950*. (Salzburg: Wolfgang Neugebauer Verlag, 1980).

Reinhold Wagnleitner, “Großbritannien und die Wiederrichtung der Republik Österreich,” PhD. diss., Universität Salzburg, 1975.

Reinhold Wagnleitner, “Die Britische Österreichplanung,” in *Österreich und die Sieger. 40 Jahre 2. Republik – 30 Jahre Staatsvertrag*, eds. Anton Pelinka, and Rolf Steininger (Vienna: Braumüller, 1986), 67–78.

D. Cameron Watt, “Großbritannien, die Vereinigten Staaten und Deutschland,” in *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945–1949*, eds. Josef Foscith, and Rolf Steininger (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1985), 15–25.

7.3. Journal Articles

Isabella Lehner, Max Chrambach, Konstantin Freytag-Loringhoven, and Paola Varotto, “From entrenching to overcoming the Iron Curtain: The changing goals of Western cultural diplomacy in the first phase of the Cold War (1945 –1975),” *Zeitgeschichte* 6 (2011), forthcoming.

Guy Stanley, "Die britischen Vorbehalte gegenüber der provisorischen Regierung Renner 1945," *Zeitgeschichte* 2 (1975/1976), 38-46.

7.4. Additional Sources

Internet

"Anglo-Austrian Society," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.angloaustrian.org.uk/>.

"Anglo-Austrian Music Society," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.aams.org.uk/index.htm>.

"Austrian Cultural Forum, London," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.acflondon.org/history>.

"Ehemalige Mitglieder, Verfassungsgerichtshof Österreich, Wilhelm Rosenzweig," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.vfgh.gv.at/cms/vfgh-site/richter/exmitglieder.html>.

"List of Cultural Conventions," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.bmeia.gv.at/aussenministerium/aussenpolitik/auslandskultur/kulturabkommen/kulturabkommen.html>.

"Moscow Conference, Joint Four-Nation Declaration, October 1943," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.ibiblio.org/pha/policy/1943/431000a.html>.

Reinhard Müller, "Einige österreichische Exilorganisationen in Großbritannien," last accessed 2 July 2011, <http://www.literaturepochen.at/exil/multimedia/pdf/exilorganisationenreinhard.pdf>.

Film

“Der Dritte Mann”, directed by Carol Reed (1949; Arthaus, Kinowelt Home Entertainment GmbH, 2006), DVD.

Abbreviations

AAS	Anglo-Austrian Society
AADS	Anglo-Austrian Democratic Society
[AAS/AAMS]	Archives of the Anglo-Austrian Society and the Anglo-Austrian Music Society, held at the IGRS
ABS	Austro-British Society
ACA	Allied Commission for Austria
ACA/BE	Allied Commission for Austria, British Element
BC	British Council
BW	British Council Papers, held at The National Archives, Kew
CAB	Cabinet Papers, held at The National Archives, Kew
EAC	European Advisory Commission
FAM	Free Austrian Movement
FAWM	Free Austrian World Movement
FO	British Foreign Office; this also refers to the Foreign Office Papers, held at The National Archives, Kew
IGRS	Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London
ISB	Information Services Branch of the ACA/BE
KPÖ	Communist Party of Austria
MOI	Ministry of Information
MP	Member of Parliament
ÖVP	Austrian People's Party
SPÖ	Social Democratic Party of Austrian
TNA	The National Archives, Kew, London (previously: PRO, Public Record Office)
UK	United Kingdom
U.S.	United States of America

8. Appendix

8.1. The Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom

263	
BUNDESGESETZBLATT	
FÜR DIE REPUBLIK ÖSTERREICH	
Jahrgang 1953	Ausgegeben am 18. Juni 1953
17. Stück	
60. Kulturübereinkommen zwischen der Österreichischen Bundesregierung und der Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland.	
60.	
Der Bundespräsident erklärt das am 12. Dezember 1952 in Wien unterzeichnete Kulturübereinkommen zwischen der Österreichischen Bundesregierung und der Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland, welches also lautet:	
Kulturübereinkommen	Cultural Convention
zwischen der Österreichischen Bundesregierung und der Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland.	between the Austrian Federal Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
Die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland und die Österreichische Bundesregierung,	The Austrian Federal Government and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
von dem Wunsche beseelt, ein Übereinkommen zu schließen, das durch freundschaftlichen Austausch und Zusammenarbeit ein Höchstmaß an Verständnis in ihren beiden Ländern für die geistige, künstlerische und wissenschaftliche Tätigkeit sowie die Lebensweise des anderen Landes anstreben soll,	Desiring to conclude a Convention for the purpose of promoting by friendly interchange and cooperation the fullest possible understanding in each of their respective countries of the intellectual, artistic and scientific activities as well as of the ways of life of the other country;
haben für diesen Zweck bevollmächtigte Vertreter ernannt, die, von ihren Regierungen entsprechend ermächtigt,	Have accordingly appointed Plenipotentiaries for the purpose, who, being duly authorised to this effect by their respective Governments;
wie folgt übereingekommen sind:	Have agreed as follows:
Artikel I.	Article I.
Jede vertragschließende Regierung wird für die Schaffung von Lehrkanzeln, Dozenturen, Lektoraten und Lehrgängen über Sprache, Literatur und Geschichte des Gebietes der anderen Regierung und sonstige sich auf dieses Land beziehende Sachgebiete an Hochschulen und anderen Lehranstalten ihres Staatsgebietes eintreten.	Each Contracting Government shall encourage the creation, at Universities, and other educational institutions in its territory, of Professorial Chairs, Readerships, Lectureships, and courses in the language, literature and history of the country of the other Contracting Government and in other subjects concerning that country.
Artikel II.	Article II.
Jeder vertragschließenden Regierung wird gestattet, kulturelle Institute innerhalb des Staatsgebietes der anderen zu errichten und zu unterstützen, vorausgesetzt, daß die maßgebenden allgemeinen Rechtsvorschriften des betreffenden Landes über die Errichtung und die Tätigkeit solcher Institute eingehalten werden.	Each Contracting Government shall be permitted to establish and assist cultural Institutes in the territory of the other, provided that the requirements of the local law with regard to the establishment and conduct of such Institutes are complied with. The term "Institute" shall include academic and cultural
6	31

Unter dem Wort „Institut“ sind akademische und kulturelle Anstalten, österreichisch-britische Gesellschaften, Bibliotheken, Leihstellen für Filme und Schallplatten und andere Einrichtungen zu verstehen, die dem Zweck des vorliegenden Übereinkommens dienen.

Artikel III.

Die vertragschließenden Regierungen werden den Austausch von Lehrkräften an Hochschulen und anderen Lehranstalten, von Studierenden der Hoch- und Mittelschulen sowie von Vertretern der Wissenschaft und Repräsentanten geistiger und anderer Berufe ihres Staatsgebietes fördern.

Artikel IV.

Jede vertragschließende Regierung wird in ihrem Staatsgebiet im Rahmen der verfügbaren Mittel Stipendien schaffen, die dem Zweck dienen sollen, Staatsangehörigen der anderen vertragschließenden Regierung zu ermöglichen, Studien, eine berufliche Fortbildung oder eine Forschungsarbeit weiterzuverfolgen oder in Angriff zu nehmen.

Artikel V.

Die vertragschließenden Regierungen werden die engste Zusammenarbeit zwischen den wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften sowie den erzieherischen und beruflichen Organisationen ihrer beiderseitigen Staatsgebiete fördern, um dem vorliegenden Übereinkommen Wirksamkeit zu verleihen.

Artikel VI.

Die vertragschließenden Regierungen werden erwägen, ob und unter welchen Bedingungen ein innerhalb des Staatsgebietes der einen erworbener akademischer Grad, ein solches Diplom oder Studienzeugnis für akademische oder in entsprechenden Fällen für berufliche Zwecke dem bezüglichen, innerhalb des Staatsgebietes der anderen erworbenen akademischen Grad, Diplom oder Studienzeugnis gleichgesetzt werden kann.

Artikel VII.

Jede vertragschließende Regierung wird die andere bei der Verbreitung der Kenntnis der Kultur der einen in dem Land der anderen durch folgende Mittel unterstützen:

- a) Bücher, Zeitschriften und sonstige Publikationen;
- b) Vorträge;
- c) Konzerte;
- d) Kunstausstellungen und andere Ausstellungen;
- e) Dramatische und musikalische Darbietungen;
- f) Radio, Filme, Schallplatten und sonstige mechanische Reproduktionsmittel.

centres, Anglo-Austrian associations, libraries, film libraries, gramophone libraries and other organisations dedicated to the purpose of the present Convention.

Article III.

The Contracting Governments shall encourage the interchange between their territories of university and school teachers, students, research workers and representatives of other professions and occupations.

Article IV.

Each Contracting Government shall in its own territory, and within available financial means, provide scholarships in such manner as to enable nationals of the other Contracting Government to pursue or undertake studies, technical training or research.

Article V.

The Contracting Governments shall encourage the closest cooperation between the learned societies and educational and professional organisations of their respective territories for the purpose of giving effect to the present Convention.

Article VI.

The Contracting Governments shall consider whether, and under what conditions, a degree, diploma or certificate issued in the territory of one of them may be accepted as equivalent to a corresponding degree, diploma or certificate issued in the territory of the other for academic purposes and in appropriate cases for professional purposes.

Article VII.

Each Contracting Government shall assist the other in making the culture of the country of the former better known in the country of the latter by means of:

- (a) Books, periodicals and other publications;
- (b) Lectures;
- (c) Concerts;
- (d) Fine Art and other exhibitions;
- (e) Dramatic and musical performances;
- (f) Radio, films, gramophone records and other mechanical means of reproduction.

Artikel VIII.

a) Jede vertragschließende Regierung wird im Rahmen ihrer Gesetzgebung jede Erleichterung bei der Einfuhr der für den Zweck des vorliegenden Übereinkommens notwendigen Ausstattungen, wie Bilder und anderes Ausstellungsmaterial, ferner Bücher, Filme und Schallplatten, aus dem Staatsgebiet der anderen in ihr eigenes gewähren;

b) jede vertragschließende Regierung wird im Rahmen ihrer Gesetzgebung jede Erleichterung bei der Einfuhr von Material, das ausschließlich für den Betrieb der in Artikel II des vorliegenden Übereinkommens genannten kulturellen Institute erforderlich ist, wie Grammophone, Rundfunkapparate, Filmprojektoren und Fahrzeuge, aus dem Staatsgebiet der anderen in ihr eigenes gewähren.

Artikel IX.

Zum Zwecke der Durchführung des vorliegenden Übereinkommens wird eine ständige, aus sechs Mitgliedern bestehende gemischte Kommission aufgestellt werden. Diese Kommission wird aus zwei Sektionen bestehen, und zwar einer aus österreichischen Mitgliedern mit ihrem Sitz in Wien und einer anderen, aus britischen Mitgliedern mit ihrem Sitz in London. Jede Sektion wird drei Mitglieder umfassen. Das britische Auswärtige Amt wird, in Übereinkunft mit den entsprechenden Regierungsämtern des Vereinigten Königreiches, die Mitglieder der britischen Sektion ernennen und das österreichische Bundesministerium für Unterricht wird, in Übereinkunft mit den entsprechenden Regierungsämtern der Österreichischen Bundesregierung, die Mitglieder der österreichischen Sektion ernennen. Jede vertragschließende Regierung wird die Bedingungen für die Bestellung der Mitglieder ihrer eigenen Sektion festsetzen und die Vollmacht haben, Ersatzmitglieder zu ernennen.

Artikel X.

Die vollzählig gemischte Kommission wird innerhalb von zwölf Monaten, angefangen von dem Tage, an dem das vorliegende Übereinkommen in Kraft tritt, und von da an im Falle des Bedarfs, mindestens aber alle zwei Jahre, zusammentreten. Die Zusammenkünfte werden abwechselnd in Österreich und im Vereinigten Königreich stattfinden. Bei diesen Zusammenkünften wird ein siebentes, von der Regierung desjenigen Staates, in dem die Zusammenkunft stattfindet, ernanntes Mitglied den Vorsitz führen.

Artikel XI.

Die gemischte Kommission und jede ihrer Sektionen werden berechtigt sein, zusätzliche, nicht stimmberechtigte Mitglieder als Berater für besondere Fragen zu kooptieren.

Article VIII.

(a) Each Contracting Government shall give every facility within the limits of its legislation for the importation, into its own territory from the territory of the other, of equipment necessary for the purpose of the present Convention, such as pictures and other material for exhibition, books, films and gramophone records.

(b) Each Contracting Government shall give every facility within the limits of its legislation for the importation, into its territory from the territory of the other, of equipment, such as gramophones, radio sets, film projectors, and vehicles, which is required solely for the running of the cultural Institutes mentioned in Article II of the present Convention.

Article IX.

For the purpose of the application of the present Convention a permanent Mixed Commission consisting of six members shall be set up. This Commission shall be divided into two Sections, one composed of Austrian members sitting in Vienna and the other of British members sitting in London. Each Section shall consist of three members. The Austrian Ministry of Education, in agreement with the competent departments of the Austrian Federal Government, shall nominate the members of the Austrian Section and the Foreign Office, in agreement with the competent departments of the Government of the United Kingdom, shall nominate the members of the British Section. Each Contracting Government shall fix the terms on which the members of its own Section are appointed and shall have the power to nominate alternative members.

Article X.

The complete Mixed Commission shall meet within twelve months of the date on which the present Convention shall enter into force, and thereafter when necessary, but not less often than once every other year. Meetings shall be in Austria and the United Kingdom in turn. For the purpose of these meetings the Commission shall be presided over by a seventh member appointed by the Government in whose country the meeting is taking place.

Article XI.

The Mixed Commission and each Section thereof shall be authorised to coopt additional members without voting powers as advisers on special questions.

Artikel XII.

Die gemischte Kommission wird ihre eigene Geschäftsordnung festsetzen.

Article XII.

The Mixed Commission shall make its own rules of procedure.

Artikel XIII.

Es wird eine der ersten Aufgaben der gemischten Kommission sein, in einer Vollversammlung ausführliche Vorschläge für die Durchführung des vorliegenden Übereinkommens zu erstatten, welche dann von den vertragschließenden Regierungen geprüft werden. Bei ihren weiteren Zusammenkünften wird die gemischte Kommission die Lage überprüfen und kann weitere Vorschläge ausarbeiten oder Änderungen ihrer früheren Empfehlungen den vertragschließenden Regierungen zur Prüfung vorschlagen.

Article XIII.

One of the first tasks of the Mixed Commission shall be to draw up at a full meeting detailed proposals for the application of the present Convention which shall then be considered by the Contracting Governments. At its further meetings the Mixed Commission shall review the position and may draw up further proposals or suggest modifications to its previous recommendations for consideration by the Contracting Governments.

Artikel XIV.

Jede vertragschließende Regierung kann fallweise geeignete Organisationen oder Personen namhaft machen, die mit der Durchführung von Aufgaben, welche für die Erfüllung der Bestimmungen des vorliegenden Übereinkommens erforderlich sind, betraut werden sollen.

Article XIV.

Each Contracting Government may designate from time to time appropriate organisations or persons to execute measures designed to ensure the fulfilment of the provisions of the present Convention.

Artikel XV.

In dem vorliegenden Übereinkommen bedeuten

a) die Worte „Staatsgebiet“ und „Land“ in bezug auf die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches das Vereinigte Königreich von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland, in bezug auf die Österreichische Bundesregierung die Republik Österreich;

b) das Wort „Staatsangehöriger“ bedeutet in bezug auf die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches Staatsbürger des Vereinigten Königreiches und Kolonien, die ihren ständigen Wohnsitz im Vereinigten Königreich von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland haben, in bezug auf die Österreichische Bundesregierung Staatsangehörige der Republik Österreich, die ihren ständigen Wohnsitz in Österreich haben.

Article XV.

In the present Convention

(a) The expressions "territory" and "country" shall mean, in relation to the Austrian Federal Government, the Republic of Austria and, in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

(b) the expression "nationals" shall mean, in relation to the Austrian Federal Government, citizens of the Republic of Austria ordinarily resident in Austria, and in relation to the Government of the United Kingdom, citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies, ordinarily resident in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Artikel XVI.

Die Verpflichtung der beiderseitigen Staatsbürger, sich an die gesetzlichen oder sonstigen allgemeingültigen Vorschriften zu halten, welche in den Gebieten der beiden vertragschließenden Regierungen hinsichtlich der Einreise, des Aufenthaltes und der Ausreise von Ausländern in Geltung stehen, wird durch dieses Übereinkommen nicht berührt.

Article XVI.

Nothing in the present Convention shall be deemed to affect the obligation of any person to comply with the laws and regulations in force in the territory of either Contracting Government concerning the entry, residence and departure of foreigners.

Artikel XVII.

Das vorliegende Übereinkommen wird ratifiziert werden. Der Austausch der Ratifikationsurkunden wird in London stattfinden. Das Übereinkommen wird am 15. Tage nach dem Austausch der Ratifikationsurkunden in Kraft treten.

Artikel XVIII.

Das vorliegende Übereinkommen wird für eine Mindestdauer von fünf Jahren in Kraft bleiben. Von da an wird es, wenn es nicht von einer der beiden vertragschließenden Regierungen mindestens sechs Monate vor Ablauf dieser Zeit gekündigt wurde, weiterhin in Kraft bleiben bis zum Ablauf von sechs Monaten nach dem Tage, an dem eine der beiden vertragschließenden Regierungen der anderen die Kündigung notifiziert hat.

Urkund dessen haben die unterzeichneten Bevollmächtigten das vorliegende Übereinkommen gefertigt und mit ihren Siegeln versehen.

Ausgefertigt in doppelter Urschrift in Wien, am 12. Dezember 1952, in englischer und deutscher Sprache mit der Maßgabe, daß beide Texte die gleiche Geltung haben.

Für die Österreichische Bundesregierung:
Leopold Figl Ernst Kolb

Für die Regierung des Vereinigten Königreiches von Großbritannien und Nord-Irland:
Harold Caccia

Article XVII.

The present Convention shall be ratified. The exchange of the instruments of ratification shall take place in London. The Convention shall enter into force on the 15th day after the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

Article XVIII.

The present Convention shall remain in force for a minimum period of five years. Thereafter, if not denounced by either Contracting Government not less than six months before the expiry of that period, it shall remain in force until the expiry of six months from the day on which either Contracting Government has given to the other notice of denunciation.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention and affixed thereto their seals.

Done in duplicate at Vienna the twelfth day of December nineteen hundred and fifty-two, in German and English, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Austrian Federal Government:
Leopold Figl Ernst Kolb

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Harold Caccia

für ratifiziert und verspricht im Namen der Republik Österreich dessen gewissenhafte Erfüllung.

Zu Urkund dessen ist die vorliegende Ratifikationsurkunde vom Bundespräsidenten unterzeichnet, vom Bundeskanzler, vom Bundesminister für Unterricht und vom Bundesminister für die Auswärtigen Angelegenheiten gegengezeichnet und mit dem Staatssiegel der Republik Österreich versehen worden.

Geschehen zu Wien, den 3. Feber 1953.

Der Bundespräsident:
Körner

Der Bundeskanzler:
Figl

Der Bundesminister für Unterricht:
Kolb

Der Bundesminister für die Auswärtigen Angelegenheiten:
Gruber

Da der Austausch der Ratifikationsurkunden am 10. April 1953 in London stattgefunden hat, ist das Übereinkommen gemäß seinem Artikel XVII am 25. April 1953 in Kraft getreten.

Raab



BUNDESGESETZBLATT

FÜR DIE REPUBLIK ÖSTERREICH

Der Bezugspreis des Bundesgesetzblattes für die Republik Österreich, Jahrgang 1953, beträgt vorbehaltlich allfälliger Preiserhöhungen infolge unvorhergesehener Steigerung der Herstellungskosten bis zu einem Jahresumfang von 1600 Seiten S 65.— für Inlands- und S 100.— für Auslandsabonnements. Für den Fall, daß dieser Umfang überschritten wird, bleibt für den Mehrumfang eine entsprechende Neuberechnung vorbehalten. Bezugsanmeldungen werden von der Versandstelle der Österreichischen Staatsdruckerei in Wien III, Rennweg Nr. 16, entgegen-
genommen.

Den bisherigen Beziehern des Bundesgesetzblattes gehen Erlagscheine zu. Neue Bezieher wollen den Bezugspreis auf das Postsparkassenkonto Wien Nr. 178 überweisen. Erlagscheine werden ihnen über Verlangen zugesendet.

Die Zustellung des Bundesgesetzblattes erfolgt erst nach Entrichtung des Bezugspreises. Die Bezieher werden, um keine Verzögerung in der Zustellung eintreten zu lassen, eingeladen, rechtzeitig den Bezug anzumelden und den Bezugspreis zu überweisen. Dieser kann auch in zwei gleichen Teilbeträgen zum 1. Jänner und 1. Juli entrichtet werden.

Einzelne Stücke des Bundesgesetzblattes sind erhältlich gegen Entrichtung des Verschleißpreises von 20 g für das Blatt = 2 Seiten, jedoch mindestens 80 g für das Stück, bei der Manz'schen Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung in Wien I, Kohlmarkt Nr. 16, Telephon R 50 504 Serie, sowie beim Verlag der

ÖSTERREICHISCHEN STAATSDRUCKEREI

Wien I, Wollzeile 27 a, Telephon R 27 2 31.

Druck der Österreichischen Staatsdruckerei.

8.2. German Abstract

Die vorliegende Diplomarbeit gibt einen Einblick in die Aktivitäten des *British Councils*, der *Anglo-Austrian Society* und der *Austro-British Society* zwischen den Jahren 1944 und 1955. Diese Organisationen werden vor dem Hintergrund des österreichischen Exils in Großbritannien während des Zweiten Weltkrieges, der Zeit der alliierten Besatzung in Österreich, und des beginnenden Kalten Krieges diskutiert. Auf Primärquellen aus den *National Archives* (Kew) und dem Archiv der *Anglo-Austrian Society* (London) basiert zum Großteil die Analyse der Methoden und Tätigkeiten dieser drei Organisationen. Die Frage nach deren Interaktion, welche von einem Wechselspiel zwischen Kooperation und Antagonismus geprägt war, bilden den Hauptfokus der Arbeit. Dieses Verhältnis wird anhand von zwei Beispielen näher erläutert.

Erstens werden die ausführlichen Debatten innerhalb des *Foreign Office*, der *Allied Commission for Austria (British Element)* und des *British Councils* bezüglich der Gründung der *Austro-British Society* im Jahr 1946 beschrieben. So drängte die britische Seite besonders auf ein Mitspracherecht bezüglich den Gründungsmitgliedern der *Austro-British Society*.

Zweitens werden die Bestrebungen der *Anglo-Austrian Society* skizziert. Diese erhoffte sich offizielle Anerkennung im Rahmen des im Jahre 1953 ratifizierten Kulturabkommens zwischen Österreich und dem Vereinigten Königreich.

Beide Beispiele zeigen, dass die Aktivitäten dieser offiziell unabhängigen Gesellschaften dennoch massiv von den britischen und auch den österreichischen Behörden gelenkt wurden. Von britischer Seite ist dies unter anderem durch Misstrauen gegen die politischen Motive der jeweiligen Führungspersonen zu erklären. Bei diesen Akteuren handelte es sich in erster Linie um stark politisierte Sozialisten, wie zum Beispiel John Hynd, Otto Harpner, Oscar Pollak und Wilhelm Rosenzweig. Die konservativeren britischen Beamten zeigten kaum Verständnis für Antriebskraft und Motivation dieser Gesellschaften.

8.3. English Abstract

This thesis gives an insight into of the activities of the British Council, the Anglo-Austrian Society, and the Austro-British Society between 1944 and 1955. These

organisations are discussed against the backdrop of the Austrian exile movements in Great Britain during the Second World War, the Allied occupation period in Austria and the nascent Cold War. Based on the findings of archival research, composed of primary sources from The National Archives, Kew, and the Anglo-Austrian Society archive, the respective organisations' policies and structures are discussed. The special focus of attention is on the interaction between these organisations, which was characterised by the interplay of cooperation and antagonism. The relationship is illustrated with two examples. First of all, it is described on the basis of the foundation of the Austro-British Society in 1946. The British authorities, the Foreign Office and the British Element of the Allied Commission for Austria, insisted on exerting an influence on the outlook and membership of the society. The second example is outlined using the Anglo-Austrian Society's ambitions to acquire official recognition under the terms of the 1953 Cultural Convention between Austria and the United Kingdom. In both cases, these ostensibly independent organisations were moulded by the British and the Austrian authorities. This was a result of British suspicion of the political background of the societies' leading figures. These primarily were highly politicised socialists, like for example John Hynd, Otto Harpner, Oscar Pollak, and Wilhelm Rosenzweig. They very often found themselves confronted by British conservatives, who disregarded the societies' devotion to the cause of Anglo-Austrian cultural relations.

Curriculum Vitae

Personal Details

Name	Isabella Lehner
Date of Birth	26 August 1987
E-mail	isabella.lehner @ gmail.com

Education

10/2005 - present	<i>Diplomstudium</i> at the University of Vienna Field of study: History Areas of specialisation: • Austrian contemporary history: Austria between the First and the Second World War, Red Vienna, Austrofascism, National Socialism, post-war Austria, Austria in the Cold War • British contemporary history • German contemporary history • Cultural history • Social history • Women's and gender history
09/2008 - 07/2009	Studies at the University of Swansea in Wales, United Kingdom, European Union Erasmus Programme
2001 - 2005	Secondary school in Krems an der Donau <i>Matura</i> (school leaving examination): 6 June 2005
1993 - 2001	Elementary school in Langenlois

Professional Experience

02/2011 - 03/2011	“The activities of the British Council in Austria between 1945 and 1955.” Paper presented at the Erasmus Intensive Programme “Cold War and Society II. Inventing A Common Past”, ELTE University Budapest, Hungary, 20 February - 4 March 2011.
-------------------	--

- 10/2010 „British Influence in Austria from 1945 to 1955, with a Special Emphasis on Culture and Cultural Relations.“
Paper presented at the 48th National Postgraduate Colloquium in German Studies, Swansea University, United Kingdom, 30 October 2010.
- 07/2009 Student assistant at the international conference “Social and Political Transformations in Germany and Austria pre- and post-1945”, Swansea University, United Kingdom, 3-5 July 2009.
- 10/2006 - 05/2007 Participation in curating the exhibition “*SMS Novara - Hintergründe und Vorbereitungen der ersten Weltumsegelung unter Österreichs Flagge*”, a cooperation of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and the University of Vienna. The exhibition was on display in the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna and at the German Maritime Museum in Bremerhaven.

Grants

- 2010 Research grant from the University of Vienna (KWA scholarship for short-term scientific studies abroad) to carry out research at The National Archives Kew, London and the Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies, University of London.
- 2008 Performance grant from the University of Vienna for outstanding examination results.

Publication

Isabella Lehner, Max Chrambach, Konstantin Freytag-Loringhoven, and Paola Varotto, “From entrenching to overcoming the Iron Curtain: The changing goals of Western cultural diplomacy in the first phase of the Cold War (1945 –1975),” *Zeitgeschichte* 6 (2011), forthcoming.