University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Master's Theses

1965

Soviet Policy and the Austrian State Treaty

Margarete Schattle

University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Schattle, Margarete, "Soviet Policy and the Austrian State Treaty" (1965). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1786.

<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1786>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

DK 63.3
S2

SOVIET POLICY AND THE AUSTRIAN
STATE TREATY

BY

MARGARETE SCHATTLE

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS
IN
POLITICAL SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1965

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am most grateful to Dr. David D. Warren for his patience and assistance, and to Annette B. Swider for the many hours she spent in helping me to finish this thesis.

ABSTRACT

Since the Second World War the world has witnessed a gigantic struggle between East and West, between communism and democracy. After the War the European theater was one of the main areas in which this struggle was waged with each side seeking to extend its influence and block the advance of the other. The result was that virtually no progress could be made in resolving outstanding issues growing out of World War II. Thus for ten years the Soviet Union obstructed the re-establishment of Austria's independence and sovereignty. Why then did the Soviets so suddenly change their policy in 1955 paving the way for Austria's freedom? To answer this question it will be necessary to give an account of the developments in Austria and at the international conference table during this ten-year period. The first part of the thesis will draw mainly on the New York Times, the Reports of the U.S. High Commissioner for Austria, and various books dealing with this period.

Yet it is not enough to merely outline the developments leading to the change in Soviet policy if an adequate explanation is to be provided for the shift which occurred in 1955. Soviet foreign policy, like any other foreign policy, is basically determined by two factors. On the one, hand, it is an integral part of the overall policy of the country and as such closely connected with domestic events. On the other hand, it is to a large extent a reaction to the given international situation. In order to understand the Soviet willingness to negotiate an Austrian peace settlement, internal developments in the Soviet Union as well as the international situation existing at the time must be analyzed. Here,

The Current Digest of the Soviet Press proved to be a very valuable source of information.

The early Soviet policy toward Austria indicates that the Soviet Union was hoping to include, if not the whole of Austria, at least the Soviet zone in the satellite empire. When developments in Austria as well as Western opposition made the realization of this aim very unlikely, the negotiations on the treaty reached a stalemate.

Two changes in Soviet leadership--in 1953 and in 1955--were necessary to break the deadlock in the negotiations on the treaty. After Stalin's death in 1953, several conciliatory moves by the Malenkov government created a more favorable international climate. Yet it was not until Khrushchev won power in the spring of 1955 that there was a clear break with Stalinist principles. The new Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence was an important factor in the shift of the Russian attitude toward Austria. An examination of the international situation at that time reveals that major international problems had been settled. The political and military situation in Europe made an Austrian settlement feasible and even advantageous from the Soviet point of view. Thus it is in the combination of internal developments in the Soviet Union and the political situation on the international scene that the reasons can be found for the Russian withdrawal from Austria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
I. THE FIRST STEPS TOWARD REBUILDING A FREE AND	
INDEPENDENT AUSTRIA	1
International Events	1
Domestic Events	4
II. NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY: PHASE I	10
The Struggle to Get the Austrian Question on the	
Agenda	10
The Moscow Conference: A Great Disappointment	16
The Cherriere Plan	17
III. NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY: PHASE II	22
IV. NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY: PHASE III	29
V. THE ROLE OF THE AUSTRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY	35
VI. SOVIET TECHNIQUES IN AUSTRIA	44
VII. SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY AFTER STALIN	52
Soviet Aims in Austria	53
Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin	54
VIII. WHY THE SOVIET UNION SIGNED THE AUSTRIAN TREATY IN 1955	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY	96
APPENDIX A	102
APPENDIX B. Tables.	104
APPENDIX C. Figures.	107

I

THE FIRST STEPS TOWARD REBUILDING A FREE AND INDEPENDENT AUSTRIA

The first period, which covers the time from the Foreign Ministers Conference in Moscow in the fall of 1943 to the new control agreement for Austria on June 28, 1946, proved to be of major importance to the future of Austria.

On the international stage important meetings and conferences were held which were to determine the course of future negotiations for an Austrian state treaty. The domestic scene was characterized by the efforts of Austrian statesmen to set up a new government in the middle of the ruins and the chaos which marked the end of World War II.

I. INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

The major powers concerned themselves with the question of Austria as early as 1943, when the Foreign Ministers of Great Britain (Sir Anthony Eden), the United States (Cordell Hull), and the Soviet Union (Vyacheslav M. Molotov) met in Moscow to discuss the post-war settlement of war-torn Europe. The Statement on Austria--as part of the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943--contained the basic policy of the Four Powers towards Austria.¹

¹The French Committee of National Liberation published a statement on November 16, 1943, with regard to the Moscow Declaration. It contained an affirmation of their belief in Austrian independence and expressed their conviction that the Austrian patriots would participate in the liberation of their country.

The Anschluss of 1938² was declared null and void and the Four Powers expressed their intention to reestablish Austria as a free and independent country.

The Governments of the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are agreed that Austria, the first 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 15, 1938, as null and void. They consider themselves as in no way bound by any changes affected 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 faced 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.³

It is extremely important here to note the distinction which was made between the case of Austria and the case of Germany. The Allies did not treat Austria as an enemy country, but rather as Hitler's first victim. It was on the basis of this distinction that the Austrian question was not settled by a peace treaty, but by a state treaty.

The next important step on the international scene was the Yalta Conference in February 1945, a meeting of the heads of government of the United States of America (Franklin D. Roosevelt), the Soviet Union (Joseph W. Stalin) and the United Kingdom (Winston Churchill).⁴

²On March 13, 1938, Hitler proclaimed the union of Austria with Germany. Austria became part of Germany.

³William L. Stearman, The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1957), p. 12.

⁴The French Provisional Government acceded to this Declaration later.

In the Declaration on Liberated Europe the Allied Powers stated in general terms their approach to the post-war settlement of the European problem.

The establishment of order in Europe and the re-building of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter--the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live--the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations.

. . . The three governments (United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom) will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state . . . ; (c) to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people; and (d) to facilitate where necessary the holding of such elections.⁵

The last important meeting of the three Big Powers which deserves mentioning in this context is the Berlin Conference of July and August 1945. Three parts of that agreement, which became known as the Potsdam Agreement, are of special importance here. The Agreement for the Establishment of the Council of Foreign Ministers was adopted at Berlin on August 1, 1945. This Agreement created the above mentioned Council, which was to handle a great deal of the negotiations on the Austrian treaty. The same Agreement abolished the European Advisory Commission since the Council was to take over its functions. The Agreement on German Reparations, adopted at Berlin on August 1, 1945, proved to be of much greater importance. It was this particular Agreement with the clause on external German assets which caused so much difficulty in the negotiations on the

⁵Richard F. Fenno (ed.), The Yalta Conference (Problems in American Civilization, Boston: D.C. Heath and Co., 1955), p. 34.

Austrian treaty, and which was used so many times by the Soviet Union to justify seizures of property in Eastern Austria that were at least open to dispute. The important paragraphs read as follows:

IV Reparations from Germany

1. Reparation claims of the USSR shall be met by removal from the zone of Germany occupied by the USSR, and from appropriate external German assets.
9. The governments of the United Kingdom and the United States of America renounce their claims in respect of reparations to shares of . . . German assets . . . in eastern Austria.⁶

Part VII

It was agreed that reparations should not be exacted from Austria.⁷ The problems caused by the different interpretations of the above cited clauses will be discussed at a later stage.

These three conferences provided the guide lines for the future treaty negotiations, and all Four Powers again and again made reference to these conferences in order to justify and support their policies at the different stages of the negotiations.

II. DOMESTIC EVENTS

The first important step on the part of Austria herself was the establishment of a provisional government under Dr. Karl Renner, leader of the Austrian Socialist Party (Sozialistische Partei Oesterreichs, SPOe for

⁶U.S. Element of the Allied Commission for Austria, Austria A Graphic Survey (December 1953), p. XXIII.

⁷Leland M. Goodrich and others (eds.), Documents on American Foreign Relations Vol. VIII 1945-46, (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1947), p. 933.

short), on April 27, 1945. It consisted of ten members of the SPOe, nine members of the Austrian People's Party (Oesterreichische Volkspartei, OeVP for short), seven members of the Austrian Communist Party (Kommunistische Partei Oesterreichs, KPOe for short) and three members without party affiliations (experts). At that time, only the Soviet Union recognized the provisional government. The Western Powers regarded recognition as a matter to be taken up by the Allied Council, which had yet to be established.

After its establishment, the provisional government adopted the Proklamation ueber die Unabhaengigkeit Oesterreichs (Proclamation on the Independence of Austria), declaring among other things that the Anschluss of 1938 was null and void, that Austria was again a democratic republic to be governed by the constitution of 1920, and that a provisional government was to be established with the cooperation of all anti-fascist parties in order to achieve the aims of this proclamation. It also contained a statement with regard to the obligations under the Moscow Declaration, which read as follows:

In pflichtgemaesser Erwaegung des Nachsatzes der Erklaerung der Moskauer Konferenz (ueber die Verantwortung fuer die Teilnahme am Krieg an der Seite Hitler Deutschlands) wird die einzusetzende Staatsregierung ohne Verzug die Massregeln ergreifen, um jeden ihr moeglichen Beitrag zu seiner Befreiung zu leisten, sieht sich jedoch genoetigt, festzustellen, dass dieser Beitrag angesichts der Entkraeftung unseres Volkes und der Entgueterung unseres Landes zu ihrem Bedauern nur bescheiden sein kann.⁸

⁸"With due consideration to the concluding sentence of the Moscow Declaration (on the responsibility for the participation in the war on the side of Germany) the future government will without delay take all steps to make every possible contribution to its liberation. The government, however, deems it necessary in this connection to point out that this contribution, unfortunately, can only be a small one in the light of the

On May 1, 1945, the provisional government passed the Verfassungseuberleitungsgesetz (Constitutional Transition Law) by which act the constitution in force in 1929 as well as all Federal laws as of March 5, 1933, became effective also for the Second Republic.⁹

At the beginning of July 1945, the European Advisory Commission¹⁰ met in London to discuss a control agreement for Austria. The Statement on Austria outlined the control machinery for Austria. The Allied Commission was to consist of the Allied Council and Executive Committee and staffs appointed by the four governments concerned. The tasks of the Commission were as follows: (a) to secure the establishment of a central Austrian administrative machinery; (b) to prepare for a freely elected Austrian government; and (c) to provide for the temporary administration of Austria. The four military commissioners jointly exercised supreme authority in Austria in respect of matters affecting Austria as a whole.¹¹ Each commander had full authority within his own zone. All decisions had to be unanimous. The EAC also discussed the occupation zones in Austria,

plight of the Austrian people and the severe economic situation with which our country has to cope." (Writer's translation). Heinrich Siegler, Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveraenitaet, Neutralitaet, Prosperitaet, 1945-1959 (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1959), p. 9.

⁹The Austrian constitution could be described as a parliamentary-presidential system. It is governed by a Federal Constitution which shows a strong bias toward centralism.

¹⁰At the Moscow Conference in 1943 it was decided to establish a European Advisory Commission (consisting of representatives of the four Allies) to deal with European political problems after the end of the war.

¹¹In 1945 the members of the Allied Commission for Austria were: General Mark W. Clark (United States of America); Lieutenant General Sir Richard McCreery (United Kingdom); Lieutenant General Emile-Marie Bethouart (France); Marshal Ivan S. Koneff (Soviet Union).

and the negotiations resulted in the Agreement on Zones of Occupation in Austria and Administration of the City of Vienna, signed July 9, 1945. The Austrian territory was divided into four occupation zones excluding Vienna. The Russian zone included the Province of Niederoesterreich (Lower Austria) with the exception of Vienna and that part of the Province of Oberoesterreich (Upper Austria) situated north of the river Danube. The American zone included that part of Oberoesterreich south of the Danube and the Province of Salzburg. The British zone included the Provinces Steiermark (Styria) and Kaernten (Carinthia), and Osttirol (Eastern Tyrol). The French zone comprised the Provinces Tirol (Tyrol) and Vorarlberg (see Figure I). Vienna, like Berlin, was divided into four sectors (see Figure II).

On September 11, 1945, the Allied Council for Austria held its first session.¹² Here it was decided that the OeVP, SPOe and KPOe were to be permitted to carry out their party activities in all parts of Austria. It also discussed the extension of the authority of the provisional government to all parts of Austria, yet no decision was reached because of British opposition. Finally on October 20, 1945, the Allied Council stated in a memorandum to Dr. Karl Renner that the four Powers approved of an extension of the authority of the provisional government to the whole of Austria. They also agreed to free elections in the same year.¹³

¹²For the structure of the Allied Commission see Figure III.

¹³Dr. Gerald Stourzh in his book Grundzuege der oesterreichischen Aussenpolitik advances the idea that these elections were only possible because of the overconfidence of the Austrian Communists. They promised the Russians something like 30 per cent of the votes, which was an utter miscalculation.

On November 25, 1945, the first free elections were held on the national level (Nationalratswahlen), on the provincial level (Landtagswahlen) and in the City of Vienna (Wahlen in den Gemeinderat Wien).¹⁴ Record numbers went to the polls, the largest electoral turnout in Austria's history.

After the elections all four Powers of the Allied Council recognized the new government. The government, under the leadership of Federal Chancellor Ing. Leopold Figl (OeVP), was composed of Dr. Adolf Schaerf (SPOe), Vice-Chancellor, and the Cabinet, consisting of eight members of the OeVP, six members of the SPOe, one member of the KPOe and two members without party affiliations. On December 20, 1945, Dr. Karl Renner was elected President of Austria by the Bundesversammlung (Federal Assembly), i.e., Bundesrat (Upper House) and Nationalrat (Lower House).¹⁵

On June 28, 1946, Austria got a new control agreement, which included certain restrictions with regard to the resumption of diplomatic relations with non-members of the United Nations (Allied Council approval was necessary), the extension of the authority of the Austrian government over the entire territory of Austria, and a very significant provision regarding the law making powers of the Austrian government. All laws enacted by the government—with the exception of constitutional provisions and international agreements—were to enter into force 31 days after submission to the Allied Council, unless "unanimously" disapproved

¹⁴See Table I for the returns of the national elections.

¹⁵Parliamentary election of the president goes back to 1931 when Austria eliminated direct popular elections because of the existing state of political tension.

by the Allied Council. A comparison with the old control agreement shows how the powers of the Austrian government were extended. Previously all laws had to be "unanimously" approved by the Council. Now it was no longer possible for one single Power to block important domestic legislation.¹⁶

After the extension of the government's authority and the coming into force of the new control agreement, no major changes took place within the Austrian government. With the exception of two Communist attempts to overthrow the government,¹⁷ no serious threats were posed to the stability of the Austrian government. The struggle for Austria's independence centered thereafter on the international level.

It was a period of prolonged discussions and negotiations on various levels, of hope awakened by more conciliatory attitudes of the Russians, and of frustrations after it became obvious that it was only another strategic move in the political chess game. Naturally, some of these events (such as the question of German assets), had significant domestic repercussions. Where it is necessary for the purpose of this thesis, due reference will be made to national events; in general, however, the emphasis will be on international events in the following chapters.

¹⁶The following enumeration should give some indication of the activities of the Allied Commission in Austria. It had to deal with: international agreements between Austria and other countries; transport of corpses in the Austro-Swiss frontier traffic; denazification; replacement of German legislation by Austrian laws; demilitarization; censorship; or installation of a telephone which had to be connected to a switchboard which happened to be in a different zone.

¹⁷For further details see Chapter V, pp. 41-44.

II

NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY:

PHASE I

The first period of the negotiations is an excellent illustration of the political "tug-of-war" between East and West. After the end of the war Austrian statesmen naturally were interested in settling the Austrian question as soon as possible and in restoring Austria's sovereignty and independence. Yet it took almost two years before the Austrian question was even put on the agenda of the Council of Foreign Ministers. While the United States was making every possible effort to open negotiations on Austria, the Russians were outright opposed to this, arguing that it was too early and that other questions, such as the Italian treaty or the treaties for the Balkan states, had to be settled first. Even among the Western Powers there was no unanimity as to how and when the Austrian question should be handled.

I. THE STRUGGLE TO GET THE AUSTRIAN QUESTION ON THE AGENDA

At the beginning of May 1946, United States Secretary of State James Byrnes submitted a draft treaty for the settlement of the Austrian question to the Council of Foreign Ministers in Paris. The main provisions of the draft were: (a) Austria should regain her independence; (b) Austria had to protect democratic liberties such as freedom of speech, religion, etc.; (c) the Big Four would recognize and commit themselves to defend the independence of Austria; (d) the German assets question would be handled in accordance with the Potsdam Agreement; (e) freedom of

commerce would be guaranteed on the Danube; (f) armaments would be limited to those necessary for internal order; and (g) the frontiers with Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Hungary and Germany would remain as of January 1, 1938. The frontier with Italy would remain too, but some guarantees for civil liberties would be provided.

Yet the Soviet Union was not willing to discuss the Austrian question. No progress was to be expected on that point. For this reason Secretary Byrnes proposed to call a 21-nation peace conference in Paris around the middle of July with the hope of finding a more responsive forum there and of getting the Austrian question on the agenda. This proposal was supported by Bevin (United Kingdom) and Bidault (France), but was opposed by Molotov.

Finally the futile meeting was recessed until June 15, without any agreement on the major issues. Byrnes in his report on the Paris Conference said among other things: ". . . it is particularly important that we press forward with the Austrian treaty. The Moscow Declaration contemplated that Austria should be regarded more as a liberated than as a satellite country.¹ The making of peace with Austria is essential to the restoration of anything like conditions of peace in Europe."²

The Council resumed its session on June 15, 1946, without reaching any further agreement on the Austrian treaty. An excerpt of the

¹On more than one occasion it was made clear by the Western Powers that Austria was not regarded as an enemy country. On October 28, 1946, President Truman issued a statement to the effect that Austria was a "liberated" country. The United Kingdom adopted the same view.

²New York Times, March 21, 1946, p. 4.

report by the Secretary of State (Byrnes) on this meeting gives a good illustration of the positions of the four Powers.

Finally, we came to a discussion of the Austrian problem. On June 1, I had circulated a proposed draft treaty recognizing the independence of Austria and providing for the withdrawal of the occupying troops. The British also had submitted a draft for consideration. I asked that the Deputies be directed to prepare the treaty.

The Soviets submitted a counterproposal calling first for further action to insure the de-Nazification of Austria and the removal of a large number of displaced persons from Austria whom they regarded as unfriendly to them.

The British and French were willing to join us in submitting to the Deputies the consideration of the treaty and in requesting the Control Council to investigate and report on the progress of de-Nazification and the problem of the displaced persons. But the Soviets were unwilling to agree to the Deputies' taking up the Austrian treaty until more tangible action was taken on these other two problems.³

This meeting, however, was significant insofar as the Council rejected Austria's claims to part of Southern Tyrol on the grounds that this would constitute a major border rectification.

Although Austria was not on the agenda of the 21-nation peace conference in Paris,⁴ that conference was of considerable importance since it helped to settle the problem of Southern Tyrol. The Austrian government sent a note to the Paris peace conference asking for self-determination of Southern Tyrol. The conference voted for a hearing on the problem of Southern Tyrol. After long bilateral negotiations between the Austrian Foreign Minister, Dr. Karl Gruber, and the Italian Prime

³Leland M. Goodrich and others (eds.), Documents on American Foreign Relations Vol. VIII 1945-46, (Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1947), p. 284.

⁴Austrian delegates were seated at the Paris peace conference, but they had no voice.

Minister, Alcide de Gasperi, a compromise was achieved, which was to be submitted to the Paris peace conference and the Council of Foreign Ministers.⁵ The Gruber-de Gasperi Agreement was signed on September 5, 1946, and was incorporated in the Appendix of the Italian Peace Treaty on the basis of a decision of the Council of Foreign Ministers during their meeting in New York in November and December 1946.

When the next meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers⁶ took place in New York (November-December 1946), Austria once more was not on the agenda. The Soviet Union was still unwilling to discuss the Austrian state treaty. Yet this meeting was of great significance to Austria. First, two proposals for a settlement of the German and Austrian questions were submitted by the United States and the Soviet Union. Second, and most important of all, the Big Four agreed to put Austria on the agenda of their next meeting, which was to be held in Moscow in March 1947. True, Austria was at the bottom of the list, but at least she was on the agenda. In addition, the Council agreed to appoint special deputies to study the Austrian and German treaties at a meeting scheduled for January 14, 1947. This was the first positive step toward a settlement of the Austrian question; Austria finally was a conference issue.

On January 15, 1947, the Foreign Ministers Deputies began their

⁵The compromise was as follows: The entire area of Southern Tyrol would remain within the Italian territorial sovereignty, but the Austrian population in this area was to get regional autonomy and minority privileges.

⁶Representatives on the Council were: Ernest Bevin (United Kingdom); James Byrnes (United States); V. M. Molotov (Soviet Union); and Maurice Couve de Murville (France).

talks in London. Their task was to draw up two treaties, one for Germany and one for Austria. From the very beginning tension arose between the West and the Soviet Union. The latter wanted to complete the German treaty first and then discuss the Austrian one, while the West wanted to discuss them simultaneously. It was the Western approach which finally prevailed.

The Austrian government was invited to state its point of view on the treaty, and Federal Chancellor Leopold Figl appeared before the conference. Foreign Minister Karl Gruber outlined at a later stage the Austrian aims with regard to the treaty. The treaty should: (a) re-establish Austria's borders as of January 1, 1938; (b) recognize Austria's status as a member of the community of nations and prompt withdrawal of the occupation forces; and (c) completely and clearly separate Austria from Germany (economically, financially and politically).

Soon it became obvious that the delegates were faced with major difficulties as to the treaty. The disagreement centered on: (1) the question of German assets in Austria;⁷ (2) the guarantee of Austria's borders. The United States was particularly interested in the protection of the eastern border, the actual frontiers of Austria and the wording of

⁷This question will be dealt with rather extensively in Chapters V and VI of this thesis. For our purposes here it suffices to point out that the disagreement was caused by different definitions of German assets by the Western Powers on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other. The clause of the Potsdam Agreement which deals with this question is rather vague (see Chapter I, p. 4). While the Western Powers used the definition given by the United Nations in January 1943, known as the London Declaration, the Russians used their own definition which was much more advantageous for their particular aims.

the preamble.⁸

Yet as compared to the draft for the German treaty, a certain progress was achieved in the negotiations for the Austrian treaty. Several clauses were approved, among others a clause providing for a democratic system with secret ballot and universal suffrage; a clause making it mandatory for Austria to protect human rights; and a clause providing for a restoration of documents from Austria to Germany and vice versa.

Toward the middle of February another problem threatened to deadlock the negotiations. Yugoslavia claimed parts of Carinthia,⁹ and her claims were supported by the Soviet Union. The Western Powers rejected the Yugoslav claim, and urged a restoration of the borders of January 1, 1938. While the conference had reached a stalemate on this question, progress was made in some other areas. The conference finished work with some of the military clauses, dealing with the withdrawal of

⁸In the preamble to the treaty the Russians wanted to pin as much war guilt on Austria as possible, while the United Kingdom and the United States wanted to make Austria look like the unhappy victim. No agreement was reached on this point.

⁹In 1910, 304,287 Germans and 82,212 Slovenes lived in Carinthia (figures taken from the Encyclopaedia Britannica). After the World War I the Yugoslav claimed the south eastern part of Carinthia with the capital Klagenfurt. Under the Treaty of St. Germain an area of 128 sqmi. was given to Yugoslavia. The other disputed area, however, was subjected to a plebiscite under the supervision of the Inter-Allied Plebiscite Commission. The territory was divided into two zones. Zone A was rural with a population of about 78,000. Zone B included the City of Klagenfurt with a German majority. The results in Zone A showed a heavy majority in favor of staying with Austria. On the basis of these results, the plebiscite in the other Zone was cancelled.

the occupation forces, the Austrian air force, etc.¹⁰

When the London conference ended on February 25, 1947, the prospects for an Austrian treaty were rather good. The conference had worked out a rough draft of the treaty with a preamble of nine paragraphs (five of which were fully approved), and 53 potential clauses. 13 of these clauses were never discussed by the Deputies. Of the 40 clauses discussed, 27 were either fully agreed to or the differences were only of a minor nature.

The major areas of disagreement at the end of the conference were the question of German assets, the Yugoslav territorial claims, and the dispute between East and West as to whether the preamble should state that Austria was a liberated country or not. The Western Powers, however, were confident that the Council of Foreign Ministers meeting in Moscow could settle the remaining problems.

II. THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE: A GREAT DISAPPOINTMENT

On March 10, the meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers opened in Moscow. The atmosphere was friendly, and progress was made on several clauses. However, it soon became obvious that the question of German assets in Austria would pose considerable problems. The Russians wanted the Western Powers to recognize the Soviet seizures in the

¹⁰The Deputies agreed that 90 days after the signing of the State Treaty all occupying forces were to be withdrawn. As far as the air force was concerned, it was agreed that Austria was to have 90 planes, not more than 70 could be of combat type, and none of these were supposed to be bombers. The maximum personnel of the air force was to be 5,000 men.

eastern zone of Austria.¹¹ The West, which adhered to a different definition of German assets, was unwilling to do this, and the conference reached a dead end on this issue. But there was still hope for agreement. Toward the end of March the Council invited Austrian representatives to attend the conference, and to present their government's view. The negotiations went fairly well with the exception of the clause on German assets and the territorial claims which were brought up again by Yugoslavia; these were firmly rejected by Foreign Minister Karl Gruber. In addition to the territorial claims, Yugoslavia also made reparation claims against Austria which were supported by the Soviet Union, and were firmly rejected by the Western Powers and Austria.

It was on these three issues that the conference finally reached complete stalemate. The conference ended on April 25, 1947, with no agreement on these major points; in fact, the two Blocs were further apart on these issues than at the beginning of the conference. In order to continue the discussions, the conference appointed a Four Power Commission to study further the issue.

III. THE CHERRIÈRE PLAN

On May 12, 1947, the Four Power Commission, established at the Moscow Conference, held its first session in Vienna. The negotiations

¹¹At the beginning of July 1946, the Russians seized a number of enterprises and factories in the eastern zone of Austria, claiming that these enterprises fell under the heading of German assets. The Western Powers, relying on the Declaration on Forced Transfer of Property in Enemy Controlled Country (London Declaration) rejected the Russian claims, and refused to recognize the legality of the Soviet seizures.

proceeded very slowly. The Commission held 85 sessions between May 12, and October 11, 1947. On October 8, the French delegate General Paul Cherrière submitted a plan for the settlement of the German assets question. This plan became known as the Cherriere Plan.¹² However, there was no agreement on the Plan, and it was submitted to the Council of Foreign Ministers at their next meeting in London (November 25-December 15).¹³ Yet here too, no agreement was achieved on this Plan. The Russians were prepared to accept it in principle, but reserved the right to make certain counterproposals with regard to individual items.

On January 24, 1948, the Russians made their reply to the Cherriere Plan. They were willing to accept it, but they demanded two-thirds of the current oil production; two-thirds of the oil exploration areas; oil refineries with a capacity of 450,000 tons per year for fifty years; all possessions of the Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft in Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria and 25 per cent of its assets in Austria; and a sum of \$200 million payable in two years.¹⁴

¹²According to this Plan, the German assets demanded by the USSR should be divided into two categories: (a) all demands regarding the Austrian oil production and the Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaft (Danube Steam Ship Company); (b) all other demands. Concessions regarding Austrian oil: the Soviet Union was to get 50 per cent of the current oil production; one-third of the oil exploration areas around Zistersdorf (main Austrian oil fields); and refineries with an annual capacity between 250,000 and 300,000 tons. As for the DDSG claims, the USSR was to get all its assets in Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania. All other claims should be met by a payment of \$100 million.

¹³Ernest Bevin (United Kingdom); V. M. Molotov (Soviet Union); Georges Bidault (France); George Marshall (United States).

¹⁴Heinrich Siegler, Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveraenitaet, Neutralitaet, Prosperitaet, 1945-1959 (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1959), p. 25.

Despite these demands and the difficulties they posed, the West and Austria were still optimistic and were hoping to arrive at a compromise.

The Foreign Ministers Deputies held their next meeting from February 13 to March 31, 1948, in London.¹⁵ They dealt with two problems: the Cherrière Plan and the Yugoslav claims. Despite some concessions on part of the Soviet Union (she was willing to reduce the payment to \$150 million payable in six years instead of two, as well as some other minor changes), no agreement was reached on the Plan. Yugoslavia again made her territorial claims to Carinthia. Russia's support of the Yugoslav claims made further discussion futile, and the meeting ended in a deadlock. Dr. Karl Gruber, Austrian Foreign Minister, used excerpts from the meeting to describe the general Russian attitude.

Mr. Koktomov: The position of the Soviet Delegation is quite clear in that it supports the Yugoslav claims.

Mr. Marjoribanks: Do the compromise proposals envisaged by the Soviet Delegation still involve the cession of Austrian territory to Yugoslavia?

Mr. Koktomov: Yes.

Mr. Reber: Now further discussion seems to be futile. I will not bargain over Austria's frontiers.¹⁶

This statement was later on denied by the Russians. In the meantime,

¹⁵ United Kingdom: James Marjoribanks (Austrian expert in the British Foreign Office); United States: Samuel Reber (career diplomat); France: General Paul Cherrière; Soviet Union: Commercial Counsellor Nicolai Koktomov.

¹⁶ Karl Gruber, Between Liberation and Liberty (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1955), pp. 154-155.

relations between Yugoslavia and Russia were deteriorating. The Foreign Ministers Deputies met again from February 8 to May 10, 1949. By then a violent press war was going on between Belgrad and Moscow. The issues were still the same: the German assets and the Yugoslav claims. No agreement was arrived at on either point.

It was not until the Foreign Ministers Conference in Paris from May 24 to June 20, 1949,¹⁷ that some progress was finally achieved. At this meeting the Soviet delegation suddenly ceased to support the Yugoslav claims. Andrej Vishinsky stated that the Soviet Union still regarded the Yugoslav claims as justified, but that it was no longer willing to support them. The Soviet Union was primarily interested in settling the German assets question and was not that much concerned about the Yugoslav claims.

In general this conference gave new hopes to the Western Powers and Austria for an early settlement of the problem. The representatives reached agreement on the main principles of an Austrian treaty. The communique of June 21, 1949, adequately described the progress which had been made. The Austrian frontiers were the same as those of January 1, 1938; Austria was not obliged to pay reparations; and the question of German assets was settled in principle. The Deputies were instructed to draw up a draft treaty on the basis of these agreed principles.

The Deputies met from July 4 to September 1, 1949, in London and

¹⁷Dean Acheson (United States); Ernest Bevin (United Kingdom); Robert Schuman (France); Andrej Vishinsky (Soviet Union).

on September 22 and 23, in New York, without reaching agreement.¹⁸ The Deputies resumed discussions from October 10, 1949, to April 26, 1950, yet no further progress was made, and another futile session came to an end. At the request of the Soviet delegate Georgij Zarubin, a new meeting was called on May 4, 1950. Here the Russians brought up a new issue. Zarubin accused the West of violating the Italian Peace Treaty by still maintaining troops in Trieste. He demanded a settlement of this question before any further talks on an Austrian treaty could take place.¹⁹ At this time it was obvious that the Russians were not willing to discuss seriously the Austrian treaty. No constructive talks took place for about two years.

¹⁸There were basically five major areas yet to be settled: (a) the relief to displaced persons; (b) the Soviet Union wanted to prevent Austria from employing foreign military advisors and experts. The West regarded this an unnecessary restriction; (c) the question of the compensation for the transfer of United Nations property in Austria. The Western Powers wanted some compensation for transfers of property after the Anschluss in those cases where no compensation had been offered. The Soviet Union was against this since it seemed to benefit primarily the Western Powers; (d) disputes over the Austrian obligations with regard to debts incurred during the war; (e) post-war debts. The Soviet Union wanted Austria to pay for all Allied supplies, services, etc., while the United States was willing to waive these claims. William L. Stearman, The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1957), p. 142.

¹⁹Siegler, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

III

NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY:

PHASE II

As already indicated, the next period was one of almost complete standstill in the negotiations between the four Powers with regard to an Austrian state treaty. It was primarily the Soviet Union which frustrated all further negotiations. It brought up new issues such as the question of Trieste, accused Austria of not having sufficiently complied with denazification and demilitarization requirements, and finally refused to send representatives to the scheduled meetings.

Yet despite all these obstacles, efforts were being made by the Western Powers and Austria to continue the negotiations and to arrive at a settlement of the Austrian question.

On January 19, 1952, an invitation was extended to the Soviet Union to resume negotiations. The Soviet answer to the Secretary-General of the Conference of Foreign Ministers Deputies was as follows:

Dear Mr. Dowing,

In connection with your letter of 19 January, the Soviet delegation considers it necessary to state that, as formerly, it considers that the question of the Austrian Treaty cannot be examined independently of the fulfillment by the Austrian Government of the decision of the Four Powers on the demilitarization and denazification of Austria and the question of the fulfillment by the Governments of Great Britain, the United States of America and France of their obligations according to the peace treaty with Italy in that part which concerns the Free Territory of Trieste. Your answer to the letter of the Soviet delegation, which was received on the 19 January, requires study.

In view of this, the Soviet representative will not be able to attend the meeting of the Deputies on the 21 January.

Yours sincerely,

V. Jerofejev¹

This clearly indicated that the Russians were not interested in continuing constructive talks at that point.

In an attempt to get the discussions started again the Western Powers, with the consent of the Austrian government, submitted an "abbreviated treaty" comprising only eight articles, as compared to the 53 articles of the original draft. The main provisions of this treaty were to end the occupation and to reestablish Austria's independence. The West also wanted a clause renouncing claims to German assets in Austria, a demand which was utterly unacceptable to the Soviet Union.

From here on the contacts between the Western Powers, Austria and the Soviet Union were maintained through the conventional diplomatic channels. The Austrian state treaty became the subject of a rather intensive exchange of notes.

On August 14, 1952, the Russians demanded in a note to the Western Powers the withdrawal of the "abbreviated treaty." The Western Powers proposed in reply to the Soviet Union (September 5, 1952) another meeting of the Foreign Ministers Deputies; the Russians, however, were not willing to participate in the meeting.

In the face of these obstacles Austria turned to the United

¹Karl Gruber, Between Liberation and Liberty (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1955), pp. 202-203.

Nations. The Soviet Union was opposed to any discussion of the Austrian question by the United Nations, but despite this every government in the world received a memorandum on July 31, 1952, describing the problems and the stage of the negotiations of the Austrian treaty.

The Austrian Foreign Minister, Karl Gruber, visited Brazil in July 1952, and got its support for the Austrian cause. Brazil was willing to take the initiative on the Austrian question in the United Nations.² Brazil sent a note to the Secretary-General of the United Nations (September 18, 1952) requesting that Austria be put on the agenda of the General Assembly. The note was co-sponsored by Holland, Lebanon and Mexico.³

Thus the agenda included an item called "Question of an Appeal to the Powers, Signatories to the Moscow Declaration of 1 November 1943, for an Early Fulfillment of their Pledges towards Austria." The Soviet Union filed an unsuccessful protest. Mexico presented a motion to invite Austria to present its case to the world forum, and Foreign Minister Karl Gruber addressed the General Assembly on behalf of Austria. The appeal was approved by a great majority giving Austria the support of the Latin American, African and Asian countries.⁴

Although the Russians did not immediately return to the

²Austria needed somebody to present her case to the United Nations, since she was not a member of this organization at that time.

³Gruber, op. cit., pp. 276-297.

⁴48 countries voted in favor of the appeal. Not a single country was opposed. Afghanistan and Pakistan abstained. The countries of the Soviet Bloc did not participate in the voting.

conference table, the atmosphere improved somewhat after the interlude at the United Nations. Austrian Foreign Minister Karl Gruber met Jacob Malik, Soviet Ambassador to London, for an exchange of opinions.

On January 12, 1953, the three Western Powers submitted a note to the USSR proposing new negotiations on Austria. The Soviet Union answered with a note on January 27, denouncing the United Nations appeal yet indicating their willingness to participate in discussions if the "abbreviated treaty" was withdrawn. On February 9, the Foreign Ministers Deputies met, yet no progress was made. The West insisted on the "abbreviated treaty" while the Soviet Union bluntly refused to discuss it. The Western Powers suggested another meeting. The Soviet Union refused to come, because it considered such a meeting a waste of time.

On June 25, 1953, Dr. Karl Gruber asked the Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru for his good offices for the restoration of Austria's independence. Krishna Menon, who visited Moscow somewhat later, did discuss the Austrian question with Molotov; however, no immediate change of the Soviet attitude occurred.⁵

Austria transmitted a note to the Soviet Union on June 30, 1953, indicating her willingness to enter into diplomatic negotiations concerning the Austrian state treaty. In answer to Austria and the three Western Powers, Russia indicated its willingness to enter diplomatic negotiations if the "abbreviated treaty" was withdrawn.

⁵Heinrich Siegler, Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveraenitaet, Neutralitaet, Prosperitaet, 1945-1959 (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchie, 1959), pp. 32-33.

On August 16, 1953, the Western Powers transmitted a note to the Soviet Union indicating their withdrawal of the "abbreviated treaty." On August 19, 1953, Austria approved the withdrawal of the "abbreviated treaty."

While there was little progress on the international scene, the Russians suddenly showed a much more conciliatory attitude toward Austria. They exchanged ambassadors, replaced the military High Commissioner with a civilian High Commissioner, and on July 30, they announced their decision to renounce the occupation costs Austria had to pay so far.⁶ The Federal Chancellor Julius Raab gave expression to the new hope by saying that these steps clearly indicated that Austria had entered a new phase in relations with the Eastern Bloc.

Yet at the same time a new issue was introduced into the discussions on the international level. On August 4, 1953, the Soviet Union indicated in a note to the Western Powers that the Austrian question could be solved much easier in the light of a solution of the German question. On November 25, 1953, the Western Powers transmitted three identical notes to the USSR expressing their willingness to discuss any proposal for a solution of the Austrian question provided it was not connected with any other question. This exchange of notes finally led to a new important meeting between the Big Four--the Berlin Conference from January 25 to February 18, 1954.⁷ The differences as to the

⁶The United States of America renounced the occupation costs as early as June 1947. On August 18, 1953, the British decided to renounce the occupation costs as of January 1, 1954. A similar decision was announced by the French on September 19, 1953.

⁷John Foster Dulles (United States of America), Georges Bidault (France); Anthony Eden (United Kingdom); V. M. Molotov (Soviet Union).

agenda were finally settled, and the Conference could begin. During the discussion of the Austrian treaty, the Austrian Foreign Minister Ing. Leopold Figl⁸ and State Secretary Bruno Kreisky were allowed to participate.

On February 12, 1954, Foreign Minister Figl appealed to the four Powers to settle the Austrian question as soon as possible. The same day V. M. Molotov presented the Russian proposal for the state treaty. The Deputies should draw up a final draft of the treaty within three months. Several new points were to be taken into consideration: (1) Austria had to refrain from entering into any military alliance, and was not allowed to have any foreign military bases on her territory; (2) the Soviet Union was willing to accept the \$150 million payment in kind instead of cash; (3) withdrawal of occupation troops could take place only after the conclusion of a treaty with Germany; (4) the question of Trieste had to be solved.⁹

Foreign Minister Figl stated his disappointment with regard to the Russian proposal. A treaty without withdrawal of the occupation troops would be a farce. The Western Powers, too, voiced their strong opposition to the proposal, in particular to linking the Austrian problem with the German peace treaty and to neutralizing Austria. If Austria were voluntarily to choose neutrality, the West would be glad to recognize it, but it could not be forced upon a country. Yet despite all the con-

8

On November 26, 1953, Dr. Karl Gruber resigned his post, Ing. Leopold Figl became the new Austrian Foreign Minister.

⁹Siegler, op. cit., p. 36.

cessions that the Western Powers were willing to make if the Soviet Union were to drop the demand for neutralization and to withdraw its occupation troops, the Soviet Union was not willing to give in on these points.

On February 16, 1954, the Austrian Foreign Minister Figl declared Austria's willingness to adopt the status of a neutral country, however, the clause on the occupation troops was utterly unacceptable. Molotov was delighted over Austria's attitude toward neutrality, yet was not willing to compromise on the issue of the occupation troops.¹⁰

When the Conference ended on February 18, 1954, the withdrawal of troops was the only unresolved question. Yet in view of the Russian refusal to compromise on that issue, the Western Powers withdrew their approval of the five disputed articles. Thus a conference which had aroused so many hopes in Austria and in the Western countries proved to be another disappointment.

Yet the struggle went on. In May 1954, the Austrian Parliament passed a resolution, expressing Austria's determination not to surrender Austria's sovereignty and to insist upon the fulfillment of the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943. Again attempts were made to resume negotiations, but they were fruitless. It seemed once more that the negotiations had reached a deadlock.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 37.

IV

NEGOTIATIONS FOR AN AUSTRIAN STATE TREATY:

PHASE III

The Berlin Conference marked the end of another unsuccessful attempt to draw up a state treaty for Austria. Again all hope had vanished for an early fulfillment of the promise of the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943. No important meeting took place for the rest of 1954. Both sides were unwilling to compromise.

Then came the historic speech of V. M. Molotov at a session of the Supreme Soviet on February 8, 1955. The Soviets, all of a sudden, showed willingness to compromise on the issues which led to the deadlock of the Berlin Conference in 1954.

The Soviet Union attaches great significance to the settlement of the Austrian question, the question of a full restoration of the independence of a democratic Austria. At the same time one cannot fail to take into consideration those dangers which the plans of militarization of Western Germany, such as the Paris agreements, bring for Austria.

The settlement of the Austrian question cannot be examined independently of the German question, especially in view of the existing plans of remilitarization of Western Germany, which increases the threat of absorption, the Anschluss of Austria.

The withdrawal of the armed forces of the four powers from Austria can be achieved without awaiting the conclusion of the peace treaty with Germany.

Austria must take upon herself not to enter any kind of coalition or military alliance directed against any power which took part with its armed forces in the war against Hitlerite Germany and in the liberation of Austria and not to allow also the creation on her territory of foreign military bases.

In the interest of speedy settlement of the Austrian question an immediate convening of the four power conference is necessary at which the German question on the conclusion of the state treaty with Austria will be examined.¹

¹New York Times, February 9, 1955, p. 6.

This showed that the Russians were willing to compromise on the most important point, making the withdrawal of troops from Austria no longer dependent on a German peace treaty and representing a complete reversal of their position at the Berlin Conference. It seemed that this time there was real hope for the conclusion of a state treaty.

The Austrian government instructed the Austrian Ambassador to Moscow, Norbert Bischoff, to establish contacts with the Soviets. The Austrian Ambassador, in fact, had three meetings with Molotov. At the first meeting on February 25, 1955, Molotov affirmed the Soviet stand that the German peace treaty was no longer regarded as a prerequisite for the withdrawal of troops from Austria. The second meeting (March 2, 1955) served as a further clarification of the issues. The Austrian Ambassador assured Molotov that Austria herself wants to prevent a second Anschluss by any means. Molotov wanted an official answer from Austria with regard to his speech on February 8. This official statement was transmitted to Molotov at the third meeting with the Austrian Ambassador, March 14, 1955.

This official statement, the Dreipunkteerklärung, declared that:

(a) Austria welcomed the guarantee of her independence and freedom and the protection against a second Anschluss; (b) Austria was willing to give a declaration to the effect that she would refrain from entering into any military alliances and would not permit any foreign bases on her territory; and (c) that a solution of the Austrian question could be worked out only at a new conference and with the participation of Austria.²

²Heinrich Siegler, Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveränität, Neutralität, Prosperität, 1945-1959 (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1959). p. 39.

On March 24, 1955, Molotov received the Austrian Ambassador in Moscow and gave him the answer to the Austrian Dreipunkteerklärung. The Soviet Union recognized the necessity to discuss the withdrawal of troops and the guarantee of Austria's freedom; she was prepared to negotiate on a declaration of neutrality and she was willing to discuss the Austrian state treaty at a special four Power conference.³

In addition, Molotov extended an invitation to the Austrian Federal Chancellor Ing. Julius Raab and other Austrian representatives to come to Moscow. On March 29, 1955, the Austrian Council of Ministers accepted the invitation. The delegation to Moscow consisted of Federal Chancellor Raab, Vice-Chancellor Dr. Adolf Schaerf, Foreign Minister Ing. Leopold Figl, and State Secretary Dr. Bruno Kreisky.

On April 4, 1955, the Western Powers transmitted a note to Austria, expressing their confidence in the Austrian steps. They indicated, however, that the state treaty and all its provisions had to be approved by all the Allies. On April 9, Moscow notified the Western Powers of the visit of the Austrian delegation to Moscow.⁴

The meeting in Moscow lasted only three days, from April 12 to April 15, 1955, but these days determined the fate of the Austrian future. The results of this conference were summarized in the official communique.⁵ The main points of the communique were: (a) Austria would

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 41.

⁵For text of the communique see Appendix A.

become neutral. She was willing to follow a policy similar to that of Switzerland. The Soviet Union on the other hand expressed her willingness to recognize a declaration to that effect; (b) the Soviet Union was willing to sign the treaty immediately, and would withdraw her troops by the end of 1955; (c) the USSR was willing to accept the \$150,000,000 in goods; (d) Russia would sell all oil interests to Austria for 10,000,000 tons of crude oil; (e) the USSR would hand over all assets of the Danube Steamship Company (DDSG) in Austria for \$2,000,000; and (f) Russia promised to release all Austrian prisoners of war in Russia.⁶ The Austrian delegation was overjoyed. Federal Chancellor Raab telephoned to Vienna: "Austria will be free, and we will receive back our native soil in its entirety. Our war prisoners will be free again."⁷ These concessions were extraordinary. These terms were much better than the ones the Western Powers were willing to accept at Berlin in 1954.

On April 19, 1955, Moscow sent a note to the Western Powers and Austria suggesting a conference of the Foreign Ministers in Vienna. In their answer of April 21, 1955, the Western Powers suggested in return a conference of Ambassadors to examine the Moscow proposals. The USSR agreed, and the Ambassadors met in Vienna from May 2 to May 12, 1955. The discussions centered mainly on three major points. The first point which was discussed extensively and which was finally approved by all Powers was the question of the restitution of German property. The

⁶ New York Times, April 16, 1955, p. 2.

⁷ Ibid., April 15, 1955, p. 1.

period within which the German property should be returned was to be laid down by the treaty. The agreement was that two months after the entering into force of the treaty, all German property was to be returned to Austria. In this connection the Russians insisted on adding another clause which forbade Austria to return German property beyond a certain value to German physical or juridical persons. Oil fields had to remain under Austrian ownership. The second major conference issue was the withdrawal of the occupation troops. It was agreed upon to withdraw all occupation troops within 90 days after the entering into force of the treaty. In addition, another issue was brought up: the claims of French, British and American oil companies. These claims, however, were not settled by the state treaty, but were dealt with in separate agreements.⁸

All other issues were settled at the Ambassadors Conference, and the only thing which remained to be done, was to sign the treaty. This was done on May 15, 1955, in the Marmorsaal of the Schloss Belvedere, Prince Eugene's beautiful castle. The Austrian State Treaty was signed by Vyacheslav M. Molotov for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Harold Macmillan for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, John F. Dulles for the United States of America, Antoine Pinay for France, and Ing. Leopold Figl for the Republic of Austria. Austria was free again.

On June 5, 1955, the Austrian Nationalrat adopted a decision to proclaim Austria's neutrality. This proclamation was presented to the

⁸Siegler, op. cit., p. 43.

Nationalrat on October 26, 1955, as a constitutional law, and was passed and entered into force on November 5, 1955.

On September 19, 1955, the last Allied soldier left Austria. After ten years of hard struggle, of hope and frustration, Austria was again a free, independent and sovereign country.

THE ROLE OF THE AUSTRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

Though essential, the chronological account of the events between 1945 and 1955 provides only the very basic structure, the skeleton, of the work undertaken by the writer. At this point a more detailed examination of Soviet policy toward Austria is indicated, in order to point out the changes helping to create a situation in which Soviet withdrawal from Austria became possible.

The Soviet policy in Austria had two distinct features. One approach was direct Soviet actions in the area concerned, an approach which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter VI. The other method was the use of the existing Austrian Communist Party. Through the Party the Russians were able to exercise indirect influence on the population and, what was even more important, they could get control over important government positions.

One of the first actions of the Russians in Austria was the establishment of local administrations. These bodies were staffed with people who were willing to carry out all Russian wishes. Members of the Austrian Communist Party (Kommunistische Partei Oesterreichs, KPOe for short) were naturally preferred, since they served the dual intention of the Russians. First, the Russians were assured that trustworthy individuals were in these positions, and second, it was a means of strengthening the KPOe.¹ Russian efficiency is seen in the fact that

¹The following two chapters are mainly based on Adolf Schaerf, Oesterreichs Erneuerung, 1945-1955 (Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volks-

within a few weeks after the Soviets had entered Vienna, 16 out of the 21 districts in the city had Communist police chiefs.² When the provisional Renner government was established, the Soviets succeeded in securing the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Education, Public Information and Religious Affairs for leading Austrian Communists. Franz Honner became the Minister of Interior, giving him control of the Austrian police forces, an extremely important position for a future Communist take-over. Ernst Fischer, another high ranking member of the KPÖ, was put in charge of the other Ministry which provided him and the KPÖ with all the important tools of propaganda such as radio and press.³ Thus the ground was well prepared for future action.⁴

In the struggle for a new constitution, which finally led to the adoption of the 1929 version, Koplenig, a KPÖ representative in Parliament said: "Die Schaffung einer wahren Volkedemokratie ist eine weitere Voraussetzung dafuer, dass sich die Geschichte der letzten Jahre

buchhandlung, 1956); and William L. Stearman, The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1957).

²Stearman, op. cit., p. 57.

³The preparations for the successful coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia included among other things the infiltration of the police forces with Communist elements; the attainment of important Cabinet positions such as the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Information; the control of the administrations on the local, district and regional levels; and the control of mass organizations such as trade unions or youth groups. Dana A. Schmidt, "The Communist Coup d'Etat," Problems in International Relations, Andrew Gyorgy and H. S. Gibbs, editors (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962), pp. 19-31.

⁴Dr. Schaerf maintains that under the protection of the Russians an Austrian exile government was being set up in Yugoslavia. Schaerf, op. cit., p. 29.

nicht noch einmal wiederholen kann."⁵ This statement left no doubt about the future plans for Austria.

Government posts, although extremely important, were not the sole means for achieving the Communist aims. The KPOe attempted to create popular support through the formation of mass organizations. In other countries under Russian occupation the Communist parties relied heavily on the trade unions. In Austria, however, their efforts were frustrated in this respect. There was very close cooperation between the trade unions and the Austrian Socialist Party. The KPOe attempted to organize the workers in the factories. This move was counteracted by the formation of socialist fractions of the Oesterreichische Gewerkschaftsbund (Austrian Trade Union Association) in the enterprises concerned, and this tactic prevented the KPOe from getting control over the trade unions and the workers.⁶

Yet the KPOe was by no means troubled by these developments. Its optimism was enormous. In a Communist meeting at the Kosmoskino in Vienna on October 26, 1945, Ernst Fischer expressed the opinion that by May 1, 1946, the two workers' parties would be united.⁷ But this was not the only grave miscalculation. The KPOe expected to win 25 to 30 per cent of the votes in the upcoming elections, a point already indicated at an earlier part of this thesis.

⁵The creation of a true people's democracy is another safeguard against a repetition of the events of the last years. (Writer's translation). Schaerf, op. cit., p. 53.

⁶Ibid., p. 75.

⁷Ibid., p. 76.

The large-scale defeat of the KPOe in the first elections was in the writer's opinion one of the most decisive events in Austria's struggle for freedom. This was a severe and perhaps fatal blow to Soviet plans for Austria. Five per cent of the votes were not enough to retain the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Education, Public Information and Religious Affairs. The KPOe had lost control over the most important agencies of government. It now had to change its tactics and look for new methods to achieve its aims. The KPOe still retained four seats in Parliament and even got one Cabinet post, the Ministry of Power and Electrification; but the important channels of influence had been cut off.⁸

The Austrian Socialist Party and the Austrian People's Party made most of their chance to diminish Communist influence wherever possible. The expected union between the Socialist Party and the Communist Party naturally did not materialize. Oskar Helmer, a Socialist, became the new Minister of Interior. He faced the monumental task of purging the police forces, in particular the Vienna police, of Communist elements. In order to fully understand the difficulty and importance of this task, a brief review of earlier events will be necessary.

When the Soviets entered Austria, Austria was without an effective police force. The Russians immediately established a new police force by very carefully filling important positions with loyal Communists. A Communist publication of 1945 gives evidence of this fact: ". . . and in the police forces it was again the Communists who were in charge of the difficult and unrewarding task of the reconstruction in

⁸Ibid., p. 80.

the first few months."⁹ The head of the Austrian police forces at that time was Dr. Duermayer, a high ranking member of the KPOe. This was the situation Minister Helmer had to face after he took office. The first important step was to transfer Dr. Duermayer to Salzburg where he could do little harm. Dr. Duermayer, however, preferred to resign. Joseph Holaubek, a Socialist, became the new head of the police forces. The Communists protested in vain against that move. The further elimination of Communists from the ranks of the police was a long and difficult task, and many obstacles had to be overcome.¹⁰ Yet the Austrian government succeeded in accomplishing this important task and in creating a new and loyal Austrian police (see Table II).

Thus the KPOe suffered one defeat after the other, while across the border the other Communist parties in Czechoslovakia and Hungary were very successful. These developments apparently convinced the KPOe that they had to resort to more drastic means in order to retain the favor of the Soviets. This was possibly one of the major motivations for their two attempts to overthrow the government by force. The first of these attempts took place in the spring of 1947.¹¹

⁹Schaerf, op. cit., p. 146.

¹⁰Stearman points out that the Soviets still exercised a great deal of control over the police forces in their zone. They opposed an increase in the police forces, had several training schools closed, and prohibited adequate arming of the forces. Stearman, op. cit., p. 60.

¹¹This attempt took place at the same time as the Hungarian Communists successfully completed the government take-over in Hungary. On May 30, 1947, Premier Ference Nagy had to resign, and the Communist were in complete control.

On May 15, 1947, the KPOe organized a strike in Vienna. A large number of workers marched to the Ballhausplatz, the seat of the Federal Chancellory, where the Communist representatives in Parliament addressed the crowd. Franz Honner said among other things: "If the government in its present composition is not able to realize the seriousness of the situation, then it simply will have to be dissolved."¹²

This speech left very little doubt about the intentions of the KPOe. However, the Communists did not have enough popular support. Only minor incidents took place and the putsch had to be written off as a failure. Dr. Schaerf points out several times that after this failure the relations between the Russians and the Austrian Communist Party did cool off markedly. The fact that the KPOe was not invited to participate in the newly formed Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) seems to substantiate this view.¹³

Yet the KPOe was not willing to admit its defeat. At a dinner party given by Kristovic Binder, Austrian People's Party, at the beginning of July 1947, Ernst Fischer promised generous Russian support for a new Communist-controlled government. He was also quick to point out that otherwise the Soviet Union would not be willing to sign an Austrian treaty. In addition, he demanded the removal of unpleasant government members such as Foreign Minister Gruber or Minister of Interior Helmer.¹⁴

¹²Schaerf, op. cit., p. 162.

¹³The Communist parties of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Russia, Poland, France, Czechoslovakia and Italy were all represented.

¹⁴New York Times, June 8, 1947.

This offer caused considerable concern in view of the developments in Hungary and other satellite countries. Although the KPOe succeeded in causing much unrest in government circles and among the people, the firm rejection of any such offer by the two coalition parties, the Austrian Socialist Party and the Austrian People's Party, soon restored internal stability.¹⁵

Then Austria decided to participate in the Marshall Plan. The KPOe could not prevent Austria from signing this agreement (which was openly rejected by the Soviet Union), and its member resigned from the government in protest. In 1950 the KPOe made a last desperate attempt to bring about a change in the government by force. It very skillfully exploited the existing unrest among the workers about the new Lohn-und Preisabkommen (Wage and Price Agreement) by demanding a much greater increase in wages than was provided for by the new agreement.

The strike started on September 26, 1950. Strikers blocked the traffic in Vienna. Some non-Communist workers joined the strike. The pro-Nazi Independents League openly aided the KPOe.¹⁶ On September 29, the KPOe suddenly called off the strike. On September 30, a Communist-sponsored meeting of the All-Austrian Shop Stewards Conference took place, and an ultimatum was submitted to the Austrian government. The Austrian government rejected the ultimatum, and on October 3, 1950, a

¹⁵Schaerf, op. cit., pp. 163-170.

¹⁶In connection with this strike the US High Commissioner Lieut. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes raised a number of charges against the Soviet Union for aiding the strikers. Among those charges were: Soviet army trucks had brought workers into the city; Soviet interference with the actions of the Austrian police, e.g. in Sankt Poelten where employees of the Soviet controlled enterprises had occupied the railroad plants. New York Times, September 30, 1950.

general strike was proclaimed. In the beginning a fairly large number of workers in Upper Austria, Styria, Lower Austria and Vienna participated. There was, however, hardly any violent action in the Western provinces. The Austrian Trade Union Association and the Austrian government continually appealed to the strikers not to follow the Communist strike appeal. In the Western provinces the political nature of the strike was soon realized and the workers started to go back to work. On October 4, 1950, it had become clear that the strike was a complete failure in the Western zones. It was only in the Russian zone that the strike had a temporary success, due to some local Russian support. Anne O'Hare McCormick of the New York Times gave an account of the actions in Lower Austria and Vienna.

In a few centers in the Russian zone of Lower Austria the post and telegraph offices were occupied and workers were driven out of factories by Communist terrorists with the tacit connivance of the Russian authorities In the tenth district of Vienna 400 Communists seated themselves on rails. The Russians prevented police forces from interfering. Suddenly four truck loads of building workers arrived and chased them away.¹⁷

Stearman also points out the important role of the flying squads of the Austrian Trade Union Association which were of great help in fighting the Communist workers.¹⁸

Because of a serious incident in Wiener Neustadt, where the Soviets did not allow Austrian police forces to intervene and reoccupy a post office held by the Communist strikers, the Austrian government appealed to the Allied Council to stop Russian interference. American and British troops

¹⁷New York Times, October 5, 1950.

¹⁸Stearman, op. cit., p. 123.

were on alert and were equipped with huge rolls of barbed wire in order to assist the Austrian police if necessary.¹⁹ It was not necessary. On October 5, 1950, the Presidium of the All-Austrian Shop Stewards Conference called off the strike. The KPOe had suffered another big setback. William Stearman in commenting on the strike wrote: "The excesses which took place during these strikes, senseless sabotage acts . . . , severely damaged the Communist chances beyond repair."²⁰

From that time on until 1955 the KPOe no longer presented any real danger to the Austrian government. All these failures had discredited the KPOe not only in the eyes of the Austrian population, but also in the eyes of the Russian occupation forces. This latter assumption might very well explain why the Russians ceased to render any important assistance to the KPOe during the last abortive putsch in 1950.

¹⁹New York Times, October 5, 1950.

²⁰Stearman, op. cit., p. 124.

VI

SOVIET TECHNIQUES IN AUSTRIA

The Austrian Communist Party was without doubt one of the main tools for the implementation of Soviet policy in Austria. Yet, as has already been pointed out, the Russians tried to pursue their aims not only through the Communist Party but also by other means. In many cases they took the necessary steps themselves. Direct Soviet interference, or often the mere threat of interference, posed a serious danger with which the Austrian government had to reckon at all times.

When comparing the situation in Austria with the situation in the satellite countries, one has to remember a significant difference. Russia was not the only occupation power in Austria. She had to share her power in the Allied Council with the other Western Allies, a fact which proved to be of great importance after the second Control Agreement.¹ Yet despite that, her policy was very successful, particularly in the Eastern zone.

The Soviets, undoubtedly, were most successful in their handling of the question of German assets in Austria. The rather vague clause in the Potsdam Agreement concerning German assets² proved to be a perfect tool for the Russians.

When they entered Austria they immediately occupied the oil fields in the north of Vienna (the second largest in Europe). A large portion of the machinery was "exported" to the East.³ In August 1945, the Soviet

¹See Chapter I, p. 9. ²Ibid., p. 4.

³In 1947 in a study undertaken by the Oesterreichische Industriellenverband (Association of Austrian Industrialists) the replacement value of

government claimed all rights of production and exploration in Eastern Austria under the German assets clause of the Potsdam Agreement. This resulted in strong protests from the Austrian government and the Western Allies. The Western Allies maintained that this action constituted a violation of the 1943 Declaration Regarding Forced Transfer of Property in Enemy Controlled Territory.⁴

The Soviets then approached the issue from a slightly different angle. They proposed the formation of an Austro-Soviet oil company for the joint management of the oil industry.⁵ This plan was modelled after the Rumanian-Soviet economic agreement of May 8, 1945. The Soviet contribution to this joint undertaking was to consist in the German assets located in the area under discussion, while Austria was supposed to grant the Russians the exploration rights in the whole of Austria for a period of sixty years. The capital value of the Russian contribution was estimated at 12 billion dollars; the Austrian contribution only at 500,000 dollars. The rest of about 13 billion dollars was to be paid by the Austrian government within a period of five years. The whole company was to be placed under a Russian Director-General. No Austrian official was to hold a

the machinery removed by the Russians from Austria was estimated at about 1 billion dollars. William L. Stearman, The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1957), p. 48.

⁴This Declaration regarded as non-valid any transfer of property rights which had been effected by open blunder or by transactions under duress even when these were apparently legal in form. Since most of the properties now claimed by the Russians did not constitute German assets under the meaning of the above Declaration, the Soviets actually took Austrian property. Department of State, The Austrian State Treaty (An Account of Postwar Negotiations Together with the Text of the Treaty and related Documents. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957), p. 6.

⁵Adolf Schaerf, Oesterreichs Erneuerung, 1945-1955 (Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1956), pp. 64-65.

comparable position.⁶

These conditions were ridiculous. Dr. Schaerf describes this plan very adequately: "Der Vertrag erschien mir als Musterbeispiel einer 'societas leonina', einer Gesellschaft, in welcher der eine nur Rechte und der andere nur Pflichten hat."⁷ Naturally, the Austrian Communists supported the plan wholeheartedly.

Looking back now on that time, one can easily see the dangers which lurked below the surface. The realization of the plan would have meant almost complete economic dependence on Russia. On the basis of this agreement the Russians would have been able to penetrate the entire Austrian economy, thus extending their influence also to the Western zones. In addition, Austria would have never been able to raise the required 13 billion dollars. The Western powers certainly would not have provided Austria with the necessary capital to establish this Austro-Soviet company. The only other possibility would have been to get the money from the Russians which would have made Austria even more dependent on the good will of the Soviet Union.

The Austrian government, however, rejected the proposed agreement, and probably prevented thereby a future split of the country into East and West Austria. Yet this was only the beginning of the economic exploitation by the Russians. On July 6, 1947, General Kurassov issued an order to the effect that all German property in the Russian zone would be

⁶Ibid., p. 65.

⁷"This agreement was in my opinion an excellent example of a 'societas leonina', an agreement where one party has only rights while the other one has only duties." Ibid.

transferred into Russian ownership.⁸ In the execution of this order the Red Army occupied the enterprises concerned and placed them under Soviet control. The capital was handed over to the recently established Russian State Bank.⁹

On July 10, 1946, the Austrian Parliament firmly rejected the Soviet claims. The issue was brought up several times at the meetings of the Allied Council. The Russians presented an official definition of the German assets. The Western Powers refused to accept it and insisted on the definition laid down by the London Declaration of 1943. It was impossible to reach an agreement on this point.¹⁰

In the meantime the Austrian government had passed the Nationalization Act of July 26, 1946. This Act met with vigorous opposition from the Soviet Union, since it extended to a number of enterprises seized by the Russian occupation forces. The Soviet attempts to have the Act vetoed by the Allied Council were frustrated by Western opposition. The Russians resorted to a different technique. At the Allied Council meeting on August 20, 1946, the Soviets maintained that the Nationalization Act was a constitutional law and as such required the unanimous approval of the Allied Council before entering into force. This proposition was also rejected by the Western Powers.¹¹ When all these moves

⁸Stearman, op. cit., p. 46.

⁹Schaerf, op. cit., p. 118.

¹⁰In order to realize fully how disastrous this move was to the Austrian economy see Table III on the percentage of German ownership of Austrian corporations.

¹¹The US member of the Allied Council said in this connection: ". . . what did the Soviet government think they were signing when they

failed the Russians fell back on an earlier statement of their representative to the Allied Council:

The Soviet command on the basis of Article 2(d) of the Control Agreement of June 28, 1946, reserves the right in the Zone of Austria controlled by it to take such action to safeguard the interest of the Soviet Union as it may consider necessary.¹²

This meant, in other words, that the Soviets refused to apply the provisions of the Nationalization Act in their zone of occupation.

The Soviets now proceeded to set up their own administration of the seized enterprises. They established the Upravlenye Sovetskovo Imushchestva v Avstrii (Administration for Soviet Property in Austria), USIA for short.¹³ They had their own bank, the Soviet State Bank, which granted loans with very high interest rates to these enterprises, making them even more dependent on the Russians. They also set up the Soviet Mineral Oil Administration.¹⁴

Aside from depriving Austria of the benefits of her entire oil resources and from taking a large part of the industry out of her economy, the USIA enterprises had some other very harmful effects upon the Austrian economic life. Protected by their Russian administrators, they refused to pay taxes and social insurance contributions. This meant, on the one hand,

signed this new Control Agreement, that is in connection with the constitutional law? Just what did you think a constitutional law was when you signed it for your Government? I knew exactly what I was doing when I signed it for my Government." United States Forces in Austria, Report of the United States High Commissioner (Washington: United States Forces, August 1946), p. 12.

¹² Ibid., p. 8.

¹³In 1954 there were about 324 USIA enterprises in Austria employing 46,780 workers. Schaerf, op. cit., p. 121.

¹⁴Stearman, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

that the Austrian government lost part of the desperately needed income. On the other hand, it enabled the USIA retail stores, which were established between 1950 and 1952, to sell far below the established price (10 to 50 per cent).¹⁵ This was undoubtedly an attempt to undermine the Austrian economy. At that time it was difficult even for a very good patriot to buy the more expensive goods of Austrian stores.

These enterprises, however, represented not only an economic but also a political danger. All these enterprises had a small private army, the Werkschutz, a paramilitary organization consisting of about 2,000 members in the Russian zone. These members were mostly Austrian Communists, but some of them came from other countries.¹⁶ It is important to point out here that these paramilitary organizations were of decisive importance during the Communist take-over in Czechoslovakia. Despite continuous efforts to solve the question of the German assets in Austria herself, as well as at the international conference table, Austria had to live with the USIA enterprises until the signing of the State Treaty in 1955.

To give a more complete picture of the Russian methods in Austria it will be helpful to briefly discuss some other Russian tactics. From the very beginning of the occupation the Russians were in control of the Austrian communications system. They had occupied the Telephone and Telegraph Exchange at the Schillerplatz in the first district of Vienna. Although the Western Allies were entitled to equal access, the Russians

¹⁵Ibid., p. 54.

¹⁶Schaerf, op. cit., p. 121.

managed to keep the control largely in their own hands. It was not until the latter half of 1953 that some of the censorship exercised by the Russians during all these years was abolished.

With similar efficiency the Russians controlled the press. Their interpretation of the Press Decree issued by the Allied Council on October 11, 1945,¹⁷ enabled them to suppress any anti-Soviet propaganda. In the Allied Council meeting on July 11, 1952, it was pointed out that since the beginning of that year 103 papers had been banned; 111 book titles permanently banned; and 3012 books seized in the mails by the Soviet censors.¹⁸

Abductions and midnight arrests represented another integral part of the Soviet tactics. The Russians not only arrested people in their zone, but they also arrested them in Western zones or the Western sectors in Vienna. In many cases they went so far as to arrest high ranking government officials such as Oberinspektor Anton Marek, a leading Austrian police officer.¹⁹ These actions led to numerous protests by the Allies and the Austrian government with very little effect. The Russians either denied the charges or refused to answer at all. This part of the Soviet technique served at least two purposes. First, abductions were a useful means to remove certain unpleasant persons from places where they might cause trouble or frustrate Soviet aims. Second, these abductions could not fail to have the desired psychological effect upon the population. Fear and uncertainty on part of the population led to a

¹⁷Stearman, op. cit., p. 73.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 74. ¹⁹Ibid., p. 65.

greater willingness of the people to submit to Soviet rule.

All these techniques, as well as others, were used with varying success by the Soviet forces to intimidate the population and to get control over the Austrian government. It was not until 1953 that some of these practices were discontinued, and the situation improved to any noticeable degree.

VII

SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY AFTER STALIN

The foreign policy of a country is an integral part of the overall policy of the government. Internal events often shape the course of international developments. A country's foreign policy, furthermore, is not conducted in a vacuum. The international situation to which the country concerned has to respond is just as important in determining the foreign policy as are the developments in the domestic field. Important changes within the country will have their effects on its international relations, in the same way as significant changes in the international field might necessitate a re-evaluation of the country's foreign policy. It is, therefore, important to consider the Austrian question not as an isolated issue, but to see it in relation to other international events. At the same time it is necessary to examine how the changes in the Soviet leadership affected Soviet foreign policy.

A brief discussion of the Soviet aims in Austria prior to Stalin's death will provide the background for an understanding of the events after 1953. The main emphasis, however, will be put on the international situation at the time of Stalin's death and developments thereafter. It is important to understand the close connection between the Austrian question and some of the other international problems which were awaiting solution at that time. Only against the background of developments in the European theater and in Russia herself can one understand Soviet policy toward Austria.

I. SOVIET AIMS IN AUSTRIA

In 1945 all the evidence indicates that the Russians envisaged Austria as another Soviet satellite. The actions of the Soviet occupation forces after their entry into Austria--getting control of the Austrian police forces or putting Austrian Communists in leading government positions such as the Ministry of Education, Public Information and Religious Affairs and the Ministry of Interior--all point in this direction. Similar actions were taken in other Russian-occupied countries, as in Czechoslovakia, where they finally led to a successful overthrow of the government (see Chapter V, p. 36).

The election defeat of 1945 shattered these hopes. Stalin could no longer expect to bring the whole of Austria behind the Iron Curtain. The Russian policy after 1945, however, points to the fact that the Soviet Union had no intention of withdrawing from Austria. The measures in the economic field, the harassments, abductions and arrests, the interference with actions of the local police, are all testimony to the fact that the Soviet Union's tight grip over the Eastern zone of Austria was by no means loosened. These measures justify the assumption that the Soviet Union was trying to make at least the Eastern part of Austria part of her satellite empire. This policy, as is well known, was very successful in Germany. German unification is still one of the big unsolved problems in Europe.

The main reason why a similar policy did not succeed in Austria can again be found in the developments after the 1945 elections. Contrary to the situation in Germany where two separate governments were established,

one for the Western zones and one for the Eastern zone, the whole of Austria was governed from Vienna. On the basis of the 1945 elections Austria was unified at least on the government level. All laws were applicable in all the zones. True, the Soviet Union frustrated the law enforcement in many cases in their zone, for instance the Nationalization Act, but the main instrument of Soviet policy--the Communist puppet regime--was absent. Thus Soviet activities were severely limited and bound to fail in the long run. The two abortive attempts by the Austrian Communist Party to overthrow the government by violence and force and to establish a true people's democracy were other setbacks which made it even more difficult to realize the Russian aims. Yet Stalin was not willing to admit defeat, and he resorted to delaying tactics in the negotiations for an Austrian treaty.

In order to better understand the Soviet policy toward Austria in the last few years before the signing of the Austrian State Treaty, it is necessary to look at the international situation in the early 50's, and to give an account of the developments which helped to shape Russian foreign policy in these years.

II. SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY AFTER STALIN

Though the Soviets had succeeded in establishing a protective belt of satellites by 1950, characterized by large-scale economic, political and social integration with the Soviet Union, Russian foreign policy had suffered major setbacks in other areas. The Berlin blockade proved to be a failure due to immediate and firm intervention by the Western Allies; the support of the Greek guerilla fighters through the Balkan

allies¹ resulted in American aid under the Truman Doctrine; and the Russian attempt to make Yugoslavia into a satellite after the pattern of the other satellite countries failed due to Marshall Tito's resistance. It led, on the contrary, to a severe rift within the Communist bloc.² At the time of the 19th Party Congress in Moscow the situation of the other Communist parties in Europe had by no means improved. Only in Italy was an increase in membership recorded. In Great Britain membership had dropped from 45,000 to 33,000; in France from 907,000 to 506,000; in Denmark from 45,000 to 16,000; in Norway from 40,000 to 7,000; and in Switzerland, Sweden and Holland the membership decreased by 50 per cent.³

The existing international situation called for a reappraisal of Soviet foreign policy. Direct military actions had failed to bring the desired results. Now the Soviet Union had to resort to new tactics, slow pressure upon non-Communist countries or delaying tactics. It is in this change in tactics that an explanation can be found for the stalemate in the negotiations on the German and Austrian treaties. The Korean War might be another explanation for the lack of initiative in the West. Russia was probably more concerned with problems in the Far East than

¹J. M. Mackintosh, Strategy and Tactics of Soviet Foreign Policy (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 27.

²The rift between Moscow and Belgrad in 1948 was mainly based on the rivalry between the two countries. Tito's plan of a Balkan Federation was a direct challenge to the predominant position of the Soviet Union in this area. The independent course of Yugoslavia led to the expulsion of the Yugoslav Communist Party from the Cominform. It was not until after Stalin's death that relations improved again.

³Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 70.

with a speedy settlement of the German and Austrian questions.

Stalin's death on March 5, 1953, was decisive in as much as it opened new possibilities for Soviet foreign policy. After Stalin's death a group of new leaders appeared. Individual leadership was replaced by collective leadership.⁴ The transition was not effected without a struggle for power. Beria was charged with attempting to overthrow the government, was tried and later on executed. On March 25, 1953, Khrushchev succeeded Malenkov to the position of the first secretary of the Communist party.⁵

As already indicated Soviet foreign policy was stagnant at Stalin's death. The negotiations on Germany and Austria were deadlocked. Russia's participation in the United Nations technical organizations was minimal. The contacts with Greece and Yugoslavia had almost ceased to exist. As Mr. Mackintosh observes, Russia was so "isolated that it was practically

⁴The new leadership consisted of G. M. Malenkov who was premier and first secretary of the Communist party, and L. P. Beria, V.M. Molotov, N. A. Bulganin and L.M. Kaganovich all deputy premiers. Ibid., p. 72.

"One of the fundamental principles of party leadership is collectivity in deciding all important problems of party work. No matter how experienced leaders may be, no matter what their knowledge and ability, they do not possess and they cannot replace the initiative and experience of a whole collective." Pravda as cited in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 13, p. 3.

⁵"A plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held March 14, 1953, adopted the following resolution: 1. to grant the request of Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Comrade G. M. Malenkov to be released from the duties of Secretary of the Party Central Committee; 2. to elect the following Secretariat of the Party Central Committee: Comrades N. S. Khrushchev, M. A. Suslov, P. N. Pospelov, N. N. Shatalin and S. D. Ignatyev." Pravda and Izvestia in the Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 8, p. 12.

impossible to have a positive policy in international affairs."⁶

The new leaders were interested in restoring some of the contacts in order to decrease international tensions during the period of internal consolidation.⁷ Several moves point in this direction. After a collision between British and Soviet aircrafts over the Soviet zone of Germany, the Russians suggested a conference on air safety over Germany. For another thing, having opposed Dag Hammarskjold's appointment as Secretary-General of the United Nations for a long time, the Soviet Union now gave her consent. Diplomatic relations were resumed with Israel. The attacks on Yugoslavia decreased, and in June the Soviet government proposed the re-establishment of full diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia. The relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union too witnessed a marked improvement. Pravda reported on July 19, 1953:

In the name of preserving good neighborly relations and strengthening peace and security, the Governments of Georgia and Armenia have found it possible to renounce their territorial claims on Turkey.⁸

This political thaw also extended to the Far East. For the first time the Soviet Union agreed to voluntary repatriation of prisoners of war in Korea, a proposal which she had rejected until that time. The

⁶ Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 74.

⁷ During all these months important changes took place in the governments of the Ukraine Republic, Belorussian Republic, Armenian Republic, Georgian Republic or Azerbaidzhan Republic, to mention only a few. These reforms consisted mainly in bringing in new men or in amalgamating ministries.

⁸ Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 29. pp. 21-22.

exchange of wounded and sick prisoners of war started on April 20, 1953.⁹
On July 27, 1953, the Korean Armistice was signed.

The improvement in the international climate was paralleled by similar conciliatory measures of the Russians within Austria. On June 7, Pravda and Izvestia reported:

The USSR Council of Ministers has pronounced it no longer expedient to combine in one person the functions of USSR High Commissioner in Austria and Commander in Chief of the Soviet forces. Therefore the Commander in Chief has been relieved of his duties as High Commissioner and his activity restricted to command of Soviet forces in Austria.

Ambassador I. I. Ilyichev has been appointed USSR High Commissioner in Austria.¹⁰

This was followed by an announcement that the Soviet Union and the Austrian government had agreed to give their diplomatic representations embassy status. Certain other alleviations were granted. Austria was allowed to have air mail communications with the German Democratic Republic, the West German Republic and Japan.¹¹

On July 30, 1953, the USSR High Commissioner in Austria I. I. Ilyichev sent a note to the Austrian government indicating that from then on the Soviet Union would pay her own costs for the occupation forces:

In connection with the desire expressed by the Austrian government, the USSR government deems it possible, starting August 1, 1953, to take over all expenses connected with maintaining Soviet occupation forces in Austria, and thus to free the Austrian state budget of these expenses.¹²

⁹David J. Dallin, Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1961), 126.

¹⁰Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 23, p. 20.

¹¹Ibid., No. 24, p. 12.

¹²Ibid., No. 31, p. 17.

In the meeting of the Allied Council in Austria on August 14, it was decided to end quadripartite censorship in Austria. In another Allied Council meeting on August 28, 1953, all control over communication was abolished as of September 1, 1953. This meant that postal, telegraph and telephone, as well as radio communications were again under Austrian control.

Yet despite these alleviations within Austria, the Soviet Union did not make any concessions on the basic issue of the Austrian treaty. In fact, she fell back on the old argument that she was not going to discuss the "abbreviated treaty."¹³ The demand for withdrawal of this version of the treaty was repeated until the Western Allies did comply with the Russian demand. The Soviet Union also continued to accuse Austria in the Allied Council of engaging in militarist activities and of not carrying out the demanded denazification. Statements on Austria were very vague and non-committal, but at least they were not wholly negative. An observation of Foreign Minister Molotov may serve as an illustration.

As regards the Austrian treaty, the Soviet Union considered and considers that here also there are no questions which cannot be solved on the basis of previously achieved understanding, given the effective observance of the democratic rights of the Austrian people.¹⁴

¹³The "abbreviated treaty" does not provide for any decision which could facilitate restoration of a truly independent democratic Austrian state. At the same time it leaves the door open for restoration of a fascist regime and the transformation of Austria into a satellite of the American aggressors. The "abbreviated treaty" also completely ignores the Potsdam decision on the transfer to the Soviet Union of German assets in East Austria, an omission which is clearly directed against the Soviet Union. Pravda and Izvestia. Ibid., No. 3, p. 18.

¹⁴Ibid., No. 20, p. 7.

One might ask at this point why the Soviets despite all these conciliatory moves, continued to procrastinate on the German and Austrian treaties? Three possible explanations of the seeming dichotomy in Russian foreign policy suggest themselves at that time. First, there is ample evidence that the Russians were preoccupied with internal affairs such as the reorganization of the governments in the various republics. The outward unity of the Soviet bloc showed very serious cracks. The Soviet control over the satellite countries was challenged by the June revolt in East Berlin, which spread all over East Germany and was crushed by the Soviet troops with brutal force. Yugoslavia's independent course defied all Soviet attempts to bring that country under their power. In order to be able to cope with these internal problems, a temporary truce on the international scene was more than desirable. This truce was obtained by some of the above mentioned steps to reduce international tension. Since internal developments required the full attention of Russia, maintenance of the status quo in the negotiations on the Austrian and German peace treaties would only be advantageous. The second reason for the maintenance of the status quo in Europe might be a very simple one. No one doubts that settlement of Austrian and German questions was probably one of the most difficult international problems. The stalemate in the negotiations on the treaties during the last few years of Stalin's rule support this fact. These two questions involved the vital interests of the East and the West. It is, therefore, a credible assumption that the new regime simply did not have a new and definite policy toward Austria or Germany, and, therefore, took refuge in vague and non-committal statements about both questions, yet still leaving the door

open for future negotiations. Vyacheslav M. Molotov, the Russian expert in foreign policy at that time, might provide the third explanation. Molotov was a staunch believer in Stalinist principles, and one could hardly expect him to introduce major changes in Soviet foreign policy. According to Professor Dallin, Molotov was the only man in the new government who knew anything about foreign policy, which certainly gave him great influence.

One is justified then in drawing the conclusion that the seemingly conciliatory trends in the Soviet foreign policy were only superficial and designed to create a favorable international climate, while the uncompromising attitude and the delaying tactics of the Stalin era still lingered on. Professor Fainsod arrives at a similar conclusion: "On the international front, they (the Russians) have sought to preserve the gains which Stalin achieved, while pressing for a 'detente' in their relations with the free world." ¹⁵

The Western Powers, encouraged particularly by the events in the Far East, tried to reopen the negotiations on the German and Austrian treaties. The Soviets countered with a new move. In a note on August 4, 1953, they linked the Austrian question with the question of Germany. "It stands to reason that possible progress in solving the German problem could also facilitate solution of the Austrian treaty."¹⁶ In addition,

¹⁵Merle Fainsod, "The Soviet Union Since Stalin," Problems of Communism (Washington: United States Information Agency, Vol. 3, No. 2, 1954), p. 10.

¹⁶Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 35, p. 19.

they still demanded the withdrawal of the "abbreviated treaty." The Western Powers finally agreed to withdraw the disputed treaty. The Austrian question continued to be one of the main subjects of the diplomatic correspondence between the Soviet Union and the Western Allies.

It is worth noting in this context the contradiction in the Soviet foreign policy. Russian politicians had indicated at several points that a solution of the Austrian question was not impossible. Yet they proceeded to link the Austrian question with the German settlement. The Russian attitude toward Germany, however, did not justify any optimistic assessment of the chances of an early settlement of the problem.

Malenkov was very outspoken about his attitude toward Germany in a speech given at a dinner party in the Kremlin on August 22, 1953: "No disguise can hide the true aspirations of the Adenauer group which is the headquarter of militarism and revanchism in West Germany, and which is leading Germany into a new war."¹⁷ It was not until the separation of the Austrian and German questions in the spring of 1955 that the Austrian treaty became reality.

On the basis of the above mentioned exchange of notes, the Soviet Union finally agreed to a four Power conference in order to decrease international tensions and to discuss the German and Austrian treaties:

Being guided by the desire to cooperate in the speedy settlement of urgent international problems, the Soviet government expresses its readiness to take part in a meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs of the United States, the USSR, England and France.¹⁸

¹⁷Pravda cited in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 34, pp. 1-2.

¹⁸New World Review, December 1953, p. 13.

The Berlin Conference of the Foreign Ministers proved to be a great disappointment for the Western Powers.¹⁹ The Western Powers and Austria were definitely overoptimistic with regard to this Conference. The Russians had not given any indication whatsoever that they would be willing to make concessions on the Austrian or German questions. On the contrary, the events before the Berlin Conference, such as linking Austria with Germany, justified exactly the opposite assumption. Clearly, the Soviet Union came to the Berlin Conference with aims quite different from those of the Western Allies. To the Russians the Austrian and German treaties were only of secondary importance. The main reason why the Russians came to the Conference was to get disarmament talks under way and to obtain the Chinese People's Republic's representation at the forthcoming Geneva Conference, which was to deal with the problems of Indochina and Korea. The Soviet Union achieved both aims, and the Conference was recorded by the Soviet press as a success for the Soviet Union. Pravda pointed out on February 20, 1954, that the Berlin Conference made it possible to have a valuable exchange of opinion which helped to clarify the differences. The article hailed the fact that agreement was reached between the United States, France, Great Britain and the Soviet Union to take positive steps in the field of disarmament. Pravda, furthermore, devoted considerable attention to the fact that the Allies had agreed to call the Geneva Conference which would witness the

¹⁹For further details see Chapter III, p. 28.

participation of the Chinese People's Republic.²⁰ This article was followed by another on February 22, 1954, discussing the importance of the Chinese People's Republic, and emphasizing the fact that China's participation in negotiations dealing with difficult international problems had become a necessity.²¹ Izvestia followed the same line in an article on February 28, 1954.

The decision to hold the Geneva conference is convincing proof that the role and importance of the Chinese People's Republic in international life can no longer be ignored. This decision implies virtual recognition of the Chinese People's Republic as a great power.²²

Very little attention was devoted in both papers to the Austrian and German questions. Pravda stated: "The Ministers were unable to reach an agreement on these questions, but it goes without saying that they were not taken off the agenda."²³ A second reference was made to Austria, stressing again the connection between the Austrian and German settlements.

The aforementioned Western plans for Germany, which intensify the danger of a German militarist revival, prevented settlement of the Austrian question. Nonetheless the Soviet government reaffirmed its faith that the possibility remains of settling the question in the very near future.²⁴

On the basis of these articles the conclusion seems to be justified that the Soviets had absolutely no intention of solving the German and Austrian questions at the Berlin Conference.

²⁰Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VI, No. 4, p. 3.

²¹Ibid., No. 8, p. 29.

²²Ibid., No. 9, p. 25.

²³Ibid., No. 4, p. 3.

²⁴Ibid., p. 4.

The Soviet press now turned its attention to the forthcoming Geneva Conference. The United States was frequently attacked for helping to continue the struggle in Indochina, and for planning aggression in other parts of Asia.²⁵ Russian fears that the United States might get directly involved in Indochina were not completely unfounded. Secretary of State Dulles had asked representatives in Congress to support a resolution to permit the President to use air and naval power in Indochina. His theory was that if Indochina fell the United States might have to retreat to Hawaii. Western intervention was only prevented by the refusal of other Allies, in particular Great Britain, to support that action. The conference table was considered the more appropriate means for settling that dispute.²⁶

On April 25, 1954, the Geneva Conference opened. Two issues were on the agenda: the problem of Korea and the problem of Indochina. While the Korean question could not be settled satisfactorily, an accord was finally reached on Indochina. The war was ended and three states were created--Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. Vietnam was divided, the northern part to remain under Communist dominance and the southern part to remain under Western influence until elections were held. The Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic undoubtedly played an important role in these negotiations. The Geneva accord was hailed at least as a partial success in the Soviet press. Pravda pointed out that the Geneva accord

²⁵Ibid., No. 11, p. 20.

²⁶Chalmers M. Roberts, "The Day We Didn't Go to War," World in Crisis, Frederick H. Hartmann, editor, second edition (New York: Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 241.

had created favorable conditions for the settlement of other important unresolved international questions such as ending the arms race or guaranteeing collective security for all European states.²⁷

Already before the Geneva Conference the Soviet Union had to turn her attention to Europe and in particular to Germany. A whole score of articles can be found in the Soviet press denouncing German remilitarization and pointing to the necessity of collective European security. The Soviet Union naturally was strongly opposed to the European Defense Community (EDC), which would have provided for rearmament of West Germany. Various techniques were used. German rearmament was depicted as a threat to Italy. The old German-French antagonism was exploited to prevent ratification of the treaty establishing the EDC.

The Soviet Union, however, not only engaged in strong protests but also offered a counterproposal to the EDC. On February 10, 1954, Molotov submitted a draft for an all-European security treaty.²⁸ The United States and the Chinese People's Republic were to be admitted as observers. This was clearly an attempt to defeat the EDC, which would have permitted German rearmament. Molotov more than once expressed the Russian opposition to German remilitarization. In a note on March 31, 1954, the Soviet Union proposed the abandonment of the EDC, and urged the United States to join the all-European security system. Russia in return was willing to consider joining the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. ". . . the USSR is prepared to consider jointly with the

²⁷Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VI, No. 24, p. 1.

²⁸New York Times, February 11, 1954, p. 4.

governments concerned the participation of the USSR in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."²⁹ This proposal, however, was rejected by the West as an attempt to block the EDC. The Russians continued their warnings against German rearmament. In a speech before the Supreme Soviet, Premier Malenkov pointed out that ". . . the West German militarists are beginning to feel themselves in the saddle once more and increasingly, act not as a potentially aggressive force, but as a real threat to European security."³⁰

On July 24, 1954, the Soviet Union sent another note to the Western Allies proposing a conference of all European countries, together with the United States and the Chinese People's Republic as observers, to discuss European collective security. On August 30, 1954, the French National Assembly rejected the EDC by a vote of 319 to 264.³¹ The Soviet press and Soviet officials hailed the rejection of the EDC. Yet their joy was shortlived. The Western powers immediately started looking for a substitute for the EDC. The extension of the Brussels Pact was regarded as the best solution. The nine powers at the London conference³² agreed on October 3, 1954, to revise the Brussels Pact and to include Germany and Italy.³³ This conference was followed by a nine-power

²⁹New World Review, April 1954, p. 11.

³⁰Ibid., May 1954, p. 17.

³¹New York Times, August 31, 1954.

³²United States, Canada, Great Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Italy and Germany.

³³New York Times, October 4, 1954.

conference in Paris, which approved a protocol creating the Western European Union.

The Soviet Union scored the London and Paris agreements and charged the West with engaging in aggression. In a note of November 13, 1954, the Soviet Union extended an invitation to all European countries with whom she had diplomatic relations and to the United States to attend a conference on European security in Moscow on November 29. Pravda wrote with regard to the European security conference: "Apparently, American leaders think that the Soviet Union and other peace-loving European countries will passively watch the formation of a military bloc which includes West German militarists."³⁴ The next developments proved that the Soviet Union was not passively watching. The meeting scheduled for November 29, took place despite the refusal of the Western countries to attend the conference. On December 2, 1954, a statement of the participants was issued to the effect that they were willing to participate in a European defense organization if the Paris agreements were abandoned.³⁵ Should the Western Powers insist on these agreements, the Communist countries would form their own defense organization.³⁶ This was not an empty threat. On May 14, 1955, the Warsaw Treaty, the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Aid between the Albanian People's Republic, Bulgarian People's Republic, Hungarian People's Republic, German Democratic

³⁴Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VI, No. 46, p. 45

³⁵Only the eight Communist countries of Eastern Europe and the Chinese People's Republic as an observer participated in the conference.

³⁶Mackintosh, op. cit., p. 86.

Republic, Polish People's Republic, Rumanian People's Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Czechoslovak Republic, was concluded, the Communist counterpart to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.³⁷

A brief glance at developments with regard to the Austrian treaty shows that no progress was achieved in this field. On August 12, 1954, the Soviet government sent a note to the Austrian government stating:

The Soviet government considers, as before, that it is fully possible to conclude a state treaty aimed at restoring a free and independent Austrian state In accordance with this, the Soviet government consents to holding a conference of Ambassadors of the USSR, France, Great Britain and the United States in Vienna, with the participation of an Austrian representative, which would concern itself with examining the remaining unresolved questions concerning the draft treaty with Austria . . .³⁸

This note, however, did not lead to any meeting, and the Austrian question was put on the shelf until the spring of 1955.

Once more it is necessary to turn attention to internal Soviet affairs. Toward the end of 1954 and particularly at the beginning of 1955 Malenkov's position appeared to be less and less secure. The differences arose over economic policy, although there were several reasons for Malenkov's fall. Malenkov had repeatedly stressed the importance of the consumer good industry:

The urgent task lies in raising sharply in two or three years the population's supply of foodstuffs and manufactured goods, meat and meat products, butter, sugar, confectionery, textiles, garments, footwear, . . . ; in raising considerably the supply to the population of all articles of general consumption.³⁹

³⁷New York Times, May 15, 1955.

³⁸Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VI, No. 46, p. 45.

³⁹Pravda cited in New World Review, September 1953, p. 6.

Khrushchev, on the other hand, believed in the overriding importance of heavy industry. Professor Dallin's comment about the fall of Malenkov is: "The rock on which the Malenkov ship went down was heavy industry versus food and consumer goods."⁴⁰

On February 8, 1955, Malenkov resigned, and was succeeded by Marshal N. A. Bulganin who together with Khrushchev formed the new top leadership in Russia. It was only after Khrushchev had removed Malenkov that progress was achieved in the negotiations for the Austrian treaty. Although the Soviet Union was not willing to make any concessions on Germany, for rather obvious reasons, Molotov indicated in his speech on February 8, 1955, that the Austrian question might be solved in the near future.⁴¹ The opportunity was not bypassed by the Austrian government. Contacts were established immediately through traditional diplomatic channels. The initial discussions were followed by an invitation to the Austrian government to send a delegation to Moscow for further discussion of the issue. The invitation was gladly accepted and an Austrian government delegation went to Moscow. In the negotiations between April 12 and April 15, it was agreed that Austria would be a neutral country after the pattern of Switzerland.⁴² The final points were settled at an Ambassadors' conference in Vienna; and on May 15, 1955, the

⁴⁰Dallin, op. cit., p. 221.

⁴¹For further details on the negotiations until May 15, 1955, see Chapter IV, pp. 29-34.

⁴²Dallin points out that Molotov first wanted a mutual assistance pact between Austria and the Soviet Union. Upon Austria's refusal Molotov agreed to Austria's neutrality following the Swiss example.

four foreign ministers signed the Austrian State Treaty.

An analysis of the events between 1945 and 1955 brings out the aims and the failures of the Soviet policy in Austria, and furnishes some of the reasons for these failures. The original aims of adding the Austrian state to the satellite empire⁴³ had to give way to more modest plans. Yet even these more modest aspirations failed to become reality. The rising Western opposition to further Communist expansion, the lack of popular support in Austria and the blunders and miscalculations of the Austrian Communist Party necessitated a change in the original plans for Austria. Due to the inability of the Austrian Communists to get control of mass organizations and to retain their positions in the Austrian government, the Russians had to fall back on their own resources. The essential instrument of Russian, or better, Communist tactics--the Communist-controlled puppet regime--was lacking. Thus the Soviets could not pursue their policies behind the facade of legitimacy. Not only did the Russians fail to establish a Communist puppet regime, but the government established after the 1945 elections had authority in the whole of Austria, and not just in the Eastern zone or Western zones as was the case in Germany. It was a government which was by no means willing to retreat because of Soviet threats.

⁴³In an interview Professor Ulam agreed with this conclusion. He asserted that "Austria too was on the time table." He pointed out that Stalin was a very cautious and skillful politician in the field of foreign policy, and was careful not to push the West too far. This undoubtedly is one of the reasons for the change in Soviet policy toward Austria. Dr. Adam B. Ulam, of Harvard University, in an interview, April, 1965. Permission to quote secured.

In the last few years before Stalin's death the Soviet policy toward Austria had reached a point where positive action was no longer possible without admitting defeat. As pointed out at the beginning of Chapter VII, Austria was not the only failure in Soviet foreign policy. Thus Stalin resorted to a policy which could be pursued without a loss of face--maintenance of the status quo.

The question has often been asked why there was no marked change after Stalin's death. Why did the new leadership not discard the old policy and take a more positive approach to the question of Austria? Chapter III has attempted to find some answers to these questions. The answer is not a simple one; various elements have to be taken into consideration.

First, one of the most important factors in this respect is the element of continuity. The spectacular changes in leadership, which are usually surrounded by a great deal of mystery in the case of the Soviet Union, tend to camouflage the fact that despite these changes there is continuity. While the policy makers in the Soviet Union come and go, sometimes very unexpectedly, general Russian policy whether within the domestic or foreign spheres, follows the same broad course. Change certainly does take place in the policy pursued, but it is a slow, gradual modification. The changes in foreign policy after Stalin's death and again in 1955 after Malenkov's resignation bear out the above statement. The conciliatory moves discussed in greater detail in Chapter VII were indications of a more "liberal" Soviet foreign policy, but they do not justify the assumption that a radical reorientation took

place after Stalin's death. The Russian position on Austria and Germany and the attitude toward the West in general, in fact, show that the principles governing foreign policy under Stalin were taken over into the Malenkov era; they were modified, one might say "liberalized," but basically they were still Stalin's principles; continuity was maintained.

Second, a closer look at the developments after Stalin's death shows very clearly the interdependence of the various problems confronting the Soviet Union in international politics. It would be a great mistake to see the solution of a question as an isolated event which has no connection with other problems. The Austrian and German treaties, more than any other issue, bear out this fact. How could anyone understand the difficulties of the German settlement without seeing it in the proper context of the East--West struggle, without realizing the potential dangers inherent in the German rearmament, or without taking account of the Soviet fears of a rearmed Germany?

As long as Russia's main interest was focused on a settlement of the Korean and Indochinese questions, positive steps in Europe could hardly be expected. A Russia which was preoccupied with avoiding German rearmament through the European Defense Community or through other means could hardly be expected to seriously seek a solution of the Austrian question. Vital interests of a nation naturally have priority.

A last important point, is the close connection between domestic and foreign policy. Instability within the country, manifest after Stalin's death and continuing to exist due to the power struggle between Khrushchev and Malenkov, was not conducive to making major concessions in

foreign policy, especially if these concession involved retreat from a certain controversial position. No one will doubt that a free and independent Austria would have entailed concessions which Malenkov was unable and unwilling to make at that time.

Why then, was it possible for Khrushchev to make these concessions and to restore a free and independent Austria? This question will be explored in the final chapter.

VIII

WHY THE SOVIET UNION SIGNED THE AUSTRIAN TREATY IN 1955

Up to this point the study has dealt with the historical facts of the negotiations and the cumbersome and exhausting discussions over the various clauses of the treaty. The readers attention has been drawn to Molotov's speech on February 8, 1955, in which he indicated that a solution of the Austrian question was possible, and to the developments between the speech and the news dispatches announcing that Austria was free again. The discussion of Soviet foreign policy after Stalin revealed certain important changes which were responsible for the new positive policy toward Austria.

While the first step of finding the modifications is fairly easy, the second step of analysing and interpreting these facts is much more difficult. Involved is an evaluation of certain actions, and an evaluation is always in some measure subjective. No doubt developments before and after a certain action can be and in fact have been used here to verify and substantiate the hypotheses presented. But one has to bear in mind that, particularly with regard to policy decisions of the Soviet Union, the material available is limited; in many cases sources are only disclosed a long time after the event took place, if they are disclosed at all. This does not preclude a meaningful and valuable analysis of certain policy decisions; it only points out the limits within which such an analysis has to remain.

A discussion of the motives or reasons for Russian withdrawal from Austria encounters precisely the above mentioned limitations. Molotov or Khrushchev did not indicate the real reason for the Russian move, and even if their statements are examined in this context, great difficulty lies in deciding what is propaganda and what indicates the real motives behind a certain policy. For these reasons other sources must be explored to find an explanation for the Russian willingness to sign the State Treaty.

The foreign policy of a country is basically determined by two factors. First, the foreign policy of any country depends on the international situation at a given time. Although the foreign policy of a superpower such as Russia helps to shape a given international situation to a large extent, it is also a reaction to international events. Thus it is obvious that part of the answer to the question why the Russians signed the Treaty has to be found in the international situation prevailing at that time. Secondly, every foreign policy is closely connected with domestic events.¹ It would be utterly wrong to assume that foreign policy does exist by itself and is not subject to domestic events. The change in foreign policy after Stalin's death is an excellent example of this interdependence. "You cannot have a Stalinist foreign policy without Stalin," commented Professor Ulam.²

¹"The principles of the Communist Party on questions of foreign policy are an integral part of the program, strategy and tactics of the Party." Kommunist, No. 7 cited in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. V, No. 20. p. 3.

²Dr. Adam Bruno Ulam, of Harvard University, in an interview, April, 1965. Permission to quote secured.

Thus domestic events might provide the cause for a certain action in the field of international politics, which otherwise would be hard to explain if one looked only into the international situation. There is ample evidence that changes in the Soviet leadership had and still have their repercussions in international politics, yet it is difficult to measure the real impact they have on Russian foreign policy. The answer to the above question, therefore, must be found primarily in the international field, leaving the detailed evaluation of the relationship between domestic and foreign policy to an expert on Soviet government.

Before proceeding to the analysis proper one other premise has to be established. Hardly any policy decision in international politics can be attributed to one single factor. National interest, the aims of the policy makers and existing international conditions all contribute to the final decision. The process of making a decision consists in the careful balancing of the advantages and disadvantages of a given step. If a certain action would be contrary to the national interest of a nation, and if the nation is able to make its own decision without outside pressure, then the nation will decide against the action. If the advantages prevail over the disadvantages, then the nation will take the step. This was precisely the situation in which Russia found herself in the spring of 1955.

Russia's biggest headache in Europe, Western Germany, was beyond her reach. Despite a year-long war (propaganda war to be sure), Russia lost the battle against Western determination to rearm Germany. The London and Paris Agreements establishing the Western European Union provided for German rearmament. This inclusion of West Germany into the

Western defense system called for similar steps by the satellite countries, and these steps were taken on May 14, 1955, when the Warsaw Treaty Organization was formed in Warsaw. Thus Europe was more or less divided into two military camps with a few exceptions; Austria was one of them. The Eastern part of Austria was surrounded by Communist satellite countries, namely Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia, while NATO powers were situated at the southern and northern boundaries. Switzerland, a neutral country, completed the picture in the west.

But the European theater was not the only area in which the Soviet Union was interested. There were many other developments which required Soviet attention. For instance the pending summit conference or the disarmament talks which had been carried on for quite a while, and in which the Soviet Union seemed to be very interested.³ In the light of the new Soviet policy toward the underdeveloped countries, the Bandung conference in April 1955 was certainly of great importance for the Russians. As a matter of fact, this conference has been regarded as a great success for the Soviet Union, since it was a symbol of Communist and neutralist cooperation, and brought the Soviet Union, under whose protection the conference took place, a little closer to the Asian and African world.⁴ The desirability of these closer contacts is obvious in

³On May 10, 1955, the USSR representative Y. A. Malik submitted a Proposal of the Soviet Government on International Control of Armaments, Reduction and Prohibition of Atomic Weapons to the Subcommittee of the UN Disarmament Commission.

⁴David J. Dallin, Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin (New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1961), p. 302.

view of a new trend in the Soviet foreign policy. Professor Dallin describes it as follows: "Khrushchev was planning a 'grand offensive' in the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa."⁵ Neutralism, once regarded as another form of capitalism, was suddenly accepted. India, at one time heavily attacked by the Soviet press, now became Russia's friend. The Soviet Union promised her aid in building steel mills; in July 1955, a three year Soviet-Burmese trade agreement was concluded. The Soviets provided Afghanistan with arms. In November and December 1955, Bulganin and Khrushchev visited India, Burma and Afghanistan. All these steps can only be interpreted as a shift of Soviet interest to a new and so far little explored area.

On the domestic scene Khrushchev's power position was still newly acquired and needed consolidation. In order to carry out this very delicate and dangerous task, a reduction in international tensions was very desirable. Yet consolidation of his position in Russia was not Khrushchev's only concern. The Soviet Bloc showed a number of independent trends which, if not carefully checked, might possibly lead to revolt and disintegration of the Bloc. Events such as the Polish strike or the uprising in the Eastern zone of Germany could not be disregarded. Austria was just another one of these major or minor problems to disturb Khrushchev's mind.

What were the reasons for Khrushchev's decision to withdraw from Austria? In order to find an answer, the Austrian question must be

⁵Ibid., p. 279.

projected against the above mentioned domestic and international developments. In the course of this study eight major reasons for this Soviet decision have suggested themselves.

1. Austria Was no Loss for the Russians

All things considered, the Russians really did not lose very much in leaving Austria. True enough, the Russian withdrawal represented a real concession in so far as it is the only case where the Soviet Union retreated from an established position in Europe. But in Austria the advantages of a withdrawal by far outweighed the advantages of staying there. Looked at from the point of view of prestige, Russia's move was carefully planned. The differences with regard to the state treaty were settled in bilateral talks between Austria and the Soviet Union. It was there that the major difficulties were removed without the active participation of the Western Powers. Thus Russia was able to point to the Soviet initiative and to claim the lion's share in the successful conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty. Since Russia's step was not a reaction to a Western action, but was initiated by the Soviet Union herself, she did not suffer any loss of prestige at all. On the contrary, it was a gain in prestige, since Russia could claim credit for getting the negotiations under way.

Secondly, Austria was no loss militarily. With regard to the occupation pattern of Austria, by far the largest area was occupied by French, American and British troops. By agreeing to withdraw Russian troops from Austria, the Soviet Union forced the Western Powers to evacuate a much larger area than her own. The Russians had to retreat

only into Hungary which left them virtually at the gates of Vienna, while the Western troops had to retreat much further. Khrushchev pointed to this very fact in his speech before the Central Committee in July 1955, when he stated that although Russia had to give up some bases, the West had to do it too, and by making Austria a neutral country the military potential of the enemy was not enhanced.⁶

Thirdly, Austria was no real economic loss. Throughout the ten-year occupation the Russians had exploited Austria as much as possible.⁷ In 1955 Austria virtually had to buy her State Treaty from the Russians, as the clauses in the Austrian State Treaty reveal. Russia made a very good bargain by granting Austria her independence. Fourthly, the Soviet Union did not lose anything in the ideological field. The Austrian Communist Party and the Russian occupation forces had failed completely to attract Austrians to their ideology. The numerous failures and defeats of the Austrian Communists are a vivid testimony to the rejection of Communism by the Austrian population. Again Khrushchev used this fact in his defense of the Austrian solution at the above mentioned session of the Central Committee by pointing out that not even the Eastern zone of Austria was socialist; thus the socialist camp did not suffer a loss by neutralizing the country.

⁶Dallin, op. cit., p. 228.

⁷See Chapter VI for further details.

2. Austria Was a Propaganda Victory for the Soviet Union

As already indicated under the previous heading, the Soviet Union took the initiative in opening the final stage of the negotiations. She not only took the initiative, but she excluded the Western Powers from the negotiations and put the United States, Great Britain and France in the rather awkward position of having to ratify (more or less) the Moscow Memorandum. Problems which had held up the conclusion of the negotiations for years were suddenly solved within a matter of months without the participation of the Western Powers. Thus the Soviet Union, on the one hand, could proudly point to her peaceful intentions and show that she really believed in peaceful coexistence, and that international problems could be solved at the conference table. On the other hand, she could allege that the Soviet Union was always interested in a solution of the Austrian question--a slogan which appeared many times in the Soviet press--and that it was only the Western Powers which had prevented the conclusion of a state treaty. As the New World Review in its June 1953 issue pointed out, it had been generally conceded in the press that it was the "notable concessions of the USSR that had made agreement possible."⁸ There is no doubt about the fact that only the Soviet Union was in the position to grant Austria her independence. The explanation naturally lies in the fact that it was primarily Soviet opposition which had frustrated efforts to conclude a treaty. Yet this aspect of the picture was very skillfully omitted; Soviet politicians could allude to their peaceful intentions, and they could stress the fact that the real efforts and concessions of

⁸New World Review, June 1953, p. 3.

the Soviet Union led to Austria's independence and freedom. No doubt, the Austrian settlement is probably the best example of peaceful coexistence.

3. A Settlement of the Austrian Question Would Decrease International Tension

It has been pointed out before that the Soviet Union was interested in a decrease of international tensions. Khrushchev's new policy of peaceful coexistence could be pursued only in an atmosphere where not everybody was determined to cut everybody else's throat. Going back to the change in leadership in 1953, a gradual improvement of the relations between East and West occurred from that time on. Khrushchev, as the new leader, was determined to decrease tensions further. The events after the signing of the Austrian State Treaty would seem to show that Khrushchev initiated a new course in Soviet foreign policy. The opposition to Molotov at the session of the Central Committee in July 1955, indicated that Khrushchev was not willing to base his foreign policy on the principles of the Stalin era. His policy was that of peaceful coexistence. President Eisenhower had stated in a speech on April 16, 1953, that it was deeds and not mere words that counted. The Soviet press had devoted much attention to that speech. Eisenhower's remarks were reported in Pravda and Izvestia, and the two papers more than once linked conciliatory moves of the Soviet Union to the demand for deeds. New World Review joined the general trend. "This continuing series of deeds designed to relieve international tensions, demonstrates the sincerity of the Soviet Union in their efforts for peace, and point up the necessity of an early top level

meeting."⁹ The Austrian treaty question offered Khrushchev a unique opportunity to prove Russia's good intentions by a deed, as demanded by President Eisenhower. Izvestia wrote on March 27, 1955: "After all, American officials themselves have frequently called the Austrian question the 'touchstone' for solving urgent international problems."¹⁰ The timing of this action was good; it occurred shortly before the summit conference, which had been planned for quite a long time. The good relations between Eisenhower and Marshal Georgi Zhukov were stressed. Zhukov said in an interview: "We spoke as soldiers and saw no grounds for war between our countries."¹¹ Shortly before the summit conference took place, New World Review reported that the conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty provided a hopeful background for the forthcoming conference.¹² It is obvious, therefore, that the Russians were interested in decreasing international tensions.

To the above stated reasons might be added another one: their newly initiated campaign in the underdeveloped countries. This marked change in the Russian attitude toward the countries in Asia and Africa went hand in hand with the doctrine of peaceful coexistence. The success of the new policy depended to a large extent on the belief of these countries that the Soviet Union was honestly striving for peace. The conclusion of an

⁹New World Review, July 1953, p. 24.

¹⁰Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VII, No. 13, p. 26.

¹¹New World Review, March 1955, p. 9.

¹²Ibid., June 1955, p. 8.

Austrian treaty was a dramatic enough proof of these peaceful intentions. Russia's emphasis on peaceful coexistence and her actual efforts to decrease international tensions, together with anti-imperialistic slogans, seemed to be a very good approach to winning the support of some of the Afro-Asian countries.

4. The New Soviet Attitude Toward Neutrality Made a Neutral Austria Possible

As Professor Dallin observes: "There was no place in Stalinism for neutral nations or parties. For Stalin, the world was divided into two camps--the capitalist and the socialist--and there was no room for anyone between the fronts."¹³ After Stalin's death the policy underwent gradual modification and took a decisive turn into a pro-neutralist attitude after Khrushchev won power. Evidence of this trend appears in the Bandung Conference of April 1955, which took place under Soviet sponsorship, and in the new attitude toward the non-aligned countries such as India, Burma or Afghanistan (see p. 81).

Thus neutrality was no longer equated with capitalism: the Soviet Union realized that there was a third group of countries which belonged neither to the socialist camp nor the capitalist camp, but which occupied a central position. The Soviet Union now looked at the situation realistically. It was true, a neutral or non-aligned country was no gain for the socialist camp, but, more important, it was not a gain for the capitalist camp. Neutral countries were at least an indirect asset. A

¹³Dallin, op. cit., p. 290.

realistic appraisal of the Austrian situation made neutrality possible and perhaps desirable (see below). It was better to have a unified, neutral Austria than to hand over the western part to the capitalist camp. A neutral Austria was actually an advantage for Khrushchev. Seen in relation to the other neutral Asian and African countries, this step could only enhance Russia's prestige in these areas.

5. A Neutral Austria Was a Loss to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

According to a press comment, an advantage of an independent, neutral Austria was that "The agreement reached in Moscow precludes Austria's entry into aggressive military alliances and coalitions like the North Atlantic Bloc and the Western European Union."¹⁴ In view of its location and looked at in the light of international developments in 1954 and 1955, little Austria suddenly achieved a rather important strategic position. The Paris and London Agreements created the Western European Union (WEU) which was to include two new members, West Germany and Italy. WEU, linked to NATO, covered almost all of central Europe with the exception of Switzerland and Austria. Western Austria, together with Switzerland, separated West Germany from Italy, two NATO powers. The inclusion of Western Austria in NATO would have been very desirable from the Western point of view. Articles in Western newspapers had in fact often discussed this possibility. In the light of new developments, with Germany becoming a member of NATO, the inclusion of Western Austria into this organization was by no means a utopian idea, especially if the stalemate in the

¹⁴Pravda cited in Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VII, No. 16, p. 24.

negotiations on an Austrian treaty continued for much longer. The leaders in the Kremlin appeared to be very much aware of this fact. Izvestia stated in March 1955:

"... the answer to this question¹⁵ is found in the alarm expressed by the British newspaper Daily Express over the fact that the opportunity to settle the Austrian problem threatens to end the Western powers occupation of Austria. This is what these powers fear, this is what they don't want."

"... the press reports that the Western powers assign Austria the role of 'Alpine stronghold' of the Atlantic bloc."¹⁶

There was only one way of preventing Austria's participation in the NATO alliance: to make Austria a free and neutral country. It is true that the Russians had to sacrifice some bases, but as already pointed out before, this was not a real sacrifice; on the contrary, this was a great advantage. It was far more important that Austria, together with Switzerland, cut the NATO bloc in half, interrupting land and air communications between the NATO forces in Germany and Italy. Khrushchev's justification of his policy toward Austria brings out that very point. By making Austria neutral, the military potential of the enemy was not increased. The seeming concession of the Russians turned out to be an important gain for the Soviet Union.

6. The Warsaw Treaty Made Withdrawal from Austria Possible

It has been brought out more than once that one of the main justifications for the stationing of Soviet troops in Hungary and Rumania was the necessity of maintaining supply and communication lines

¹⁵The article dealt with the rather mixed reaction of the West to the new Soviet move.

¹⁶Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VII, No. 11, p. 27.

for the Russian occupation forces in Austria. In fact, the peace treaties with Hungary and Rumania explicitly granted that right to the Soviet Union. The developments in the satellite bloc before and after the signing of the Austrian State Treaty clearly indicated that without the presence of Soviet troops in these countries, Russia would not have been able to build and maintain her satellite empire. As long as there was no substitute for the guarantees in the Hungarian and Rumanian peace treaties, Russia could hardly be expected to sign an Austrian treaty and withdraw her troops from Austria, since such a move would have necessitated the withdrawal of troops also from Hungary and Rumania.¹⁷ The events in 1956 in Hungary proved that a withdrawal of Soviet troops might have had disastrous effects from the point of view of the Russians.

The new defense pact, the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the counterpart to NATO, eliminated this problem. Under the terms of the Warsaw Treaty, the Soviet Union could station troops in the countries concerned. Since one of the main objectives of the Soviet Union was thus achieved, it was possible to sign the Austrian State Treaty. Now the Soviet Union could withdraw her forces into Hungary, and could thus still exercise the function of a police power in the satellite countries.

7. An Independent Neutral Austria would be a Safeguard Against a New Anschluss

From statements by Soviet officials as well as press releases in

¹⁷ These implications of a withdrawal of Soviet troops from Austria might give some explanation for the Soviet proposal at the Berlin Conference in 1954, which provided for a signing of the treaty, but insisted on the continued stationing of troops in Austria.

Pravda and Izvestia, the possibility of a future Anschluss was of greater concern to the Russians than generally believed. The fear of a new Anschluss was not a theme brought up just around 1955, but was mentioned throughout the ten years of occupation. Whenever there was a sign of more friendly relations between Austria and Germany, Russia raised protests in the Allied Council for Austria, and Pravda and Izvestia started to attack Austria, accusing her of planning a new union with Germany. Numerous articles and editorials warned Austria against siding with Germany on any issue, since it might lead to a new Anschluss. Any step toward closer economic ties with Germany brought down on Austria a flood of warnings and accusations. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to look into the reasons and origins of these fears. It is enough to be aware of these fears and to take them into consideration when discussing the Austrian solution.

Pravda commented that a treaty with Austria was possible "if an agreement is concluded on measures to make impossible a new Austrian Anschluss with Germany."¹⁸ At another point Pravda stated: "Even if one agreed that the danger of an Anschluss is not urgent today, is there any real basis for saying that it might not become urgent tomorrow?"¹⁹ The inclusion of Western Austria in the Western European Union, which seemed to be at least a distant possibility at that time, might have resulted sooner or later in a closer alliance between Austria and Germany, the very thing the Russians had opposed for so many years. Thus an Austrian

¹⁸Dallin, op. cit., p. 255.

¹⁹Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vol. VII, No. 11, p. 27.

treaty re-establishing a free and neutral country could only further Russian aims in this respect, particularly since the treaty was to include an express prohibition against any future Anschluss.

It is impossible to determine how much of this opposition to a new Anschluss was genuine concern and how much was plain propaganda. It seems, however, reasonable to assume that it was one of the major factors in the Soviet decision to sign the treaty.

8. Pressing Domestic Problems Made Improved Relations with the West More Desirable

Last but not least there were problems within the Communist camp which certainly had their bearing upon the decisions with regard to the Austrian State Treaty. Figuring prominently here were, on the one hand, the power struggle within the Soviet Union, and on the other hand, the problems created by events in the satellite countries. Any change in leadership in Russia involves a great deal of behind-the-scenes struggle, about which there is usually scant information. When Khrushchev and Bulganin became the new leaders of the Soviet Union several problems had to be settled, and the influence of certain personalities had to be reduced or eliminated. The growing differences between Molotov and the new leadership reveal this process at work. At the meeting of the Central Committee in July 1955, Molotov's views met with unanimous disapproval. Khrushchev's throne, however, was by no means secure; at times, in fact, it was very shaky. This became clear especially in the years 1956 and 1957 with the formation of the anti-Khrushchev party, which almost brought about his downfall. Khrushchev, obviously, was very much

interested in maintaining his newly acquired position as leader of the Soviet Union. This certainly called for a very skillful foreign policy, avoiding major risks and not exposing any weaknesses of the new leadership. It was much more desirable to come to some kind of agreement with the West in order to avoid being tied down with external issues. A relaxation in the international field enabled Khrushchev to face the domestic problems with undivided attention.

Internal Russian affairs, however, were not the only Communist problems Khrushchev had to cope with. The policy of relaxation had led to some undesirable repercussions in the satellite bloc. Aside from the already well known independent course of Yugoslavia, other satellites began to show signs of unrest. The strikes of 1953 in Poland and Eastern Germany were early indications. This trend finally led to the Hungarian uprising in fall 1956, which had to be crushed by brutal force.

All these events, both in Russia herself and in the satellites made a reduction in international tensions desirable. Since Austria offered the best opportunity to demonstrate the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union, the Russians were willing to sign the Treaty. Thus conciliatory action in the international field gave Russia the latitude to deal with the internal problems of the Communist bloc more efficiently.

It seems appropriate to discuss in this context one other motivation which is sometimes attributed to the Russians. It has often been maintained that one of the reasons why the Soviet Union signed the Austrian State Treaty was to show Germany the way to achieve unification. Taking into consideration the size and geographical position as well as the history of Germany, it seems highly unlikely that the Soviet Union

was seriously trying to find the solution in a neutral Germany. The problems raised by a neutral Germany would have been very great. Who would guarantee Germany's neutrality? Who would be able to stop a free and independent Germany from deciding to rearm again? The nature of Germany's economy requires a large amount of exports and imports, bound to lead to strong ties with some of the trading partners. If one of the trading partners happened to be the United States, and this would most likely be the case, would close economic ties with this capitalist nation constitute a violation of the status of neutrality? These problems exist even with regard to Austria today, which is a fairly small country compared to Germany. In the case of Germany such problems would be magnified many times and would cause continuous friction between the East and the West.

Aside from these implications of neutrality, West Germany had just become a member of the Western European Union, and a realistic Soviet leader could have hardly expected Germany to give up that long-fought for position. Molotov, in fact, clearly indicated that a neutral Germany could not be the solution. "It would be a great blunder, if the German issue were to be solved on a similar basis (he was referring to the Austrian solution)."²⁰ These were not the only reasons which militate against a neutral Germany, but they suffice to make it clear that a neutral Germany would have been unacceptable both to the East and the West.

²⁰Dallin, op. cit., p. 230.

CONCLUSION

If any major conclusion emerges from the preceding pages it is that a policy decision in the international field cannot be attributed to one single factor. Any policy decision seems to depend, on the one hand, on an interaction between international and domestic developments, and on the other hand, on the power constellation within the international realm. Domestic events may make for a more conciliatory policy in the international field, as was the case after Stalin's death in 1953 and also after Malenkov's resignation in 1955. Domestic events, however, may also increase international instability or lead to stalemate and deadlock, a situation prevailing in the last few years of Stalin's reign. The other characteristic of foreign policy is its relation to other international developments taking place at a certain time. As previously indicated, any decision in international politics will be action and reaction at the same time. Action stands for the motives, for the ethos of the leaders; reaction is the response to the international environment. To put it in more concrete terms, if a ruling elite wishes to take a certain action, it is necessary to look first at the international situation and determine whether a certain action is feasible and if it is, whether the implications or results of this action will be advantageous or disadvantageous for the country concerned. This evaluation process is vital, and in many cases the factors involved are so numerous that any clear decision is difficult. This leads to the further conclusion that the aims of the leadership and the possibilities of action in the international theater do not fully coincide at all times. Thus, although the foreign policy of a country

will show a high degree of continuity, there are many decisions which create the impression that they do not quite fit into the general line of policy of a given country. But a closer analysis of the specific policy decision will almost always reveal that there is no real contradiction between the decision and the general line of policy. The contradiction might only be superficial.

Austria is an excellent example. Khrushchev, in commenting on the Austrian solution, said himself that one of the basic principles of Lenin's strategy was to "take temporary losses entailed in a struggle for higher gains."²¹ This proves that, although the Russian withdrawal from Austria seemed to be a contradiction to the general line of policy,²² it can best be regarded as a temporary loss for higher gains. The attempt has been made in the preceding pages to point out some of these higher aims. Some aims were of a short-term nature, such as more freedom in dealing with problems within Russia and the Communist bloc, or the decrease in international tensions which was desirable at that time. Other aims had long-term implications, such as preventing Austria's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or the demonstration of a new attitude toward neutral countries, which had a great impact on the relations between the Soviet Union and the underdeveloped countries in Asia and Africa.

²¹Dallin, op. cit., p. 225.

²²"The treaty was significant because it marked the first voluntary post-war withdrawal by the Soviet leaders from an established position in the center of Europe." Alvin Z. Rubinstein (ed.), The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union (New York: Random House, 1960), p. 283.

It seems that in the case of Austria the Russian policy makers carefully balanced the pros and cons of withdrawal from Austria and finally arrived at the conclusion that it was more advantageous for the Soviet Union to withdraw from Austria. There are some indications that Russia would have preferred a solution which did not entail her withdrawal from Austria. If the Soviet Union, however, was really interested in some of the above stated higher aims, as she seemed to be, the withdrawal from Austria could only be advantageous. It is, furthermore, important to recall that for the first time since the end of the Second World War the Soviet Union was able to withdraw her troops from Austria, due to the Warsaw Treaty. As to the economic concessions, it has already been pointed out that Austria had to pay a very high price for her freedom.

One can, therefore, arrive at the conclusion that the Austrian independence was, from the Russian point of view, the most advantageous or most profitable one. The correlation between the aims of the leaders on the one hand, and the domestic and international developments on the other hand, tipped the scales in favor of a free, independent and neutral Austria, and the Iron Curtain went down not at the Enns, but at the Austro-Hungarian border.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. COLLECTED DOCUMENTS

- Commager, Henry Steele (ed.). Documents of American History. Sixth edition. 2 vols. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1962.
- Goodrich, Leland M., et al. (eds.). Documents on American Foreign Relations. Vol. VIII, 1945-46. Boston: World Peace Foundation, 1947.
- Frankland, Noble (ed.). Documents on International Affairs, 1955. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

B. BOOKS

- Dallin, David D. Soviet Foreign Policy After Stalin. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1961.
- Deutsch, Julius. Ein weiter Weg. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1960.
- Fenno, Richard F. (ed.). The Yalta Conference. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1955.
- Garthoff, Raymond L. Soviet Strategy in the Nuclear Age. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1958.
- Gorbach, Alfons. Gedanken zur Politik. Wien: Wilhelm Frick Verlag, 1961.
- Gruber, Karl. Between Liberation and Liberty. Trans. Lionel Kochan. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1955.
- Gyorgy, Andrew, and H. S. Gibbs (eds.). Problems in International Relations. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1962.
- Hartmann, Frederick H. (ed.). World in Crisis. Second edition. New York: Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Palmer, Oskar. Fuenfzig Jahre erlebte Zeitgeschichte. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1957.
- Helmer, Oskar. Oesterreichs Kampf um die Freiheit. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1949.
- Hiscocks, Richard. Rebirth of Austria. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

- Jambor, Walter. Die oesterreichische Zeitgeschichte 1918-1960 in ihren Grundzuegen. Wien: Verlag fuer Geschichte und Politik, 1961.
- Klenner, Fritz. Putschversuch oder nicht? Wien: Pressereferat des Oesterreichischen Gewerkschaftsbundes, 1950.
- Kulski, Wladyslaw W. Peaceful Coexistence. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959.
- Mackintosh, J. M. Strategy and Tactics of Soviet Foreign Policy. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Misch, Alfred. Anschlag auf Oesterreich: Ein Tatsachenbericht ueber den kommunistischen Putschversuch im September und Oktober 1950. Wien: Zentralsekretariat der Sozialistischen Partei Oesterreichs, 1950.
- Raab, Julius. Verantwortung fuer Oesterreich. Wien: Oesterreichischer Wirtschaftsverlag, 1961.
- Renner, Karl. Fuer Recht und Frieden: Reden. Wien: Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1951.
- Renner, Karl. Oesterreich von der Ersten zur Zweiten Republik. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1953.
- Rubinstein, Alvin Z. The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union. New York: Random House, Inc., 1960.
- Schaerf, Adolf. Oesterreichs Erneuerung, 1945-1955. Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1956.
- Seltenreich, Susanne. Leopold Figl--Ein Oesterreicher. Wien: Verlag Erwin Metten Betriebsgesellschaft, 1962.
- Shepherd, Gordon. The Austrian Odyssey. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1957.
- Siegler, Heinrich. Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveraenitaet, Neutralitaet, Prosperitaet, 1945-1959. Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1959.
- Stearman, William L. The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria. Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1957.
- Stourzh, Gerald. Grundzuege der oesterreichischen Aussenpolitik, 1945-1955. Wien: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1961.
- Zoellner, Erich. Geschichte Oesterreichs. Zweite Auflage. Wien: Verlag fuer Geschichte und Politik, 1962.

C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Austria: A Graphic Survey. Vienna: U.S. Element of the Allied Commission for Austria, December, 1948.

Austria: A Graphic Survey. Vienna: U.S. Element of the Allied Commission for Austria, December, 1953.

Bundesministerium fuer Unterricht. Freiheit fuer Oesterreich. Dokumente. Wien: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1955.

Bundesministerium fuer Unterricht. Oesterreich frei! Wien: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1956.

Bundesministerium fuer Unterricht. Oesterreich freies Land, freies Volk. Wien: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1957.

Bundesministerium fuer Unterricht. Die Verhandlungen ueber den oesterreichischen Staatsvertrag. Wien: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1955.

Department of State. The Austrian State Treaty. An Account of the Postwar Negotiations Together with the Text of the Treaty and Related Documents. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.

Oesterreichischer Bundespressdienst. Oesterreichisches Jahrbuch, 1945-1946. Wien: Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1947.

Oesterreichischer Nationalrat. Stenographisches Protokoll. 33. Sitzung des Nationalrates der Republic Oesterreich, VII. Gesetzgebungsperiode, 24. Februar 1954. Wien: Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1954.

Staatsvertrag betreffend die Wiederherstellung eines unabhangigen und demokratischen Oesterreichs. Bundesgesetzblatt fuer die Republik Oesterreich. Wien: Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, 30. Juli 1955.

D. PERIODICALS

Current Digest of the Soviet Press, Vols. IV-VII (January 1952-December 1955).

Gruber, Karl. "Austria Holds On," Foreign Affairs, No. 2 (April, 1948), pp. 478 ff.

Gruber, Karl. "Austria Infelix," Foreign Affairs, No. 2 (January, 1947), pp. 229 ff.

Renner, Karl. "Austria: Key for War and Peace," Foreign Affairs, No. 4 (July, 1948), pp. 589 ff.

Gazette of the Allied Commission for Austria, 1945-1955.

New World Review, January, 1953-December, 1955.

Dewar, Hugo. "Behind the Beria Affair," Problems of Communism, Vol. III, No. 2 (March-April, 1954), pp. 17 ff.

Fainsod, Merle. "The Soviet Union Since Stalin," Problems of Communism, Vol. III, No. 2 (March-April, 1954), pp. 1 ff.

Aron, Raymond. "Permanence and Flexibility in Soviet Foreign Policy," Problems of Communism, Vol. IV, No. 3 (May-June, 1955), pp. 8 ff.

Lowenthal, Richard. "Crisis in Moscow," Problems of Communism, Vol. IV, No. 3 (May-June, 1955), pp. 1 ff.

Haven, Andrew. "The Time Factor in Soviet Foreign Policy," Problems of Communism, Vol. V, No. 1 (January-February, 1956), pp. 1 ff.

Reports of the U.S. High Commissioner, Nos. 1-53 (November, 1945-March, 1951).

E. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

"Carinthia," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1964 ed.), IV, 915-916.

F. NEWSPAPERS

New York Times, January, 1945-May, 1955.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SOVIET-AUSTRIAN COMMUNIQUE¹

MOSCOW, APRIL 15, 1955

From April 12, 1955, until April 15, 1955, discussions were held in Moscow between an Austrian Government Delegation headed by Chancellor Julius Raab and Vice-Chancellor Dr. Adolf Schaerf and a Soviet Delegation headed by the Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers for Foreign Affairs, V. M. Molotov, and the Deputy Chairman of the Council of Minister, A. I. Mikoyan, which were carried out in a friendly spirit.

As a result of discussions by both sides the State Government of the Soviet Union as well as the Government of the Republic of Austria consider as desirable the earliest conclusion of a State Treaty on the establishment of an independent and democratic Austria which should serve the national interests of peace in Europe.

The Austrian Delegation gave assurances that the Austrian Republic, in the spirit of the declaration made at the Berlin Conference in 1954, intends not to join any military alliances or permit military bases on her territory and will pursue a policy of independence in regard to all states which should insure the observance of this declaration.

Exodus This Year Agreed

The Soviet side expressed its agreement that the occupation forces of the four powers be withdrawn from Austria upon the entering into force of the State Treaty and in any case not later than December 31, 1955.

Taking into consideration the declaration of the United States, Britain and France made public on April 5, of this year to the effect that they are striving to achieve the earliest conclusion of an Austrian State Treaty, the Soviet Union and Austria express the hope that at the present time there are favorable opportunities for conclusion of a treaty by means of appropriate agreement among the Four Powers in Austria.

The Soviet Government agreed in the third of its statements at the conference at Berlin in 1954 to accept the equivalent of \$150,000,000 provided for by Article 35 of the Austrian Treaty fully in the delivery of Austrian goods.

The Soviet Government declared its readiness in addition, for the early forseen transfer of former German property in the Soviet zone of occupied Austria, to transfer to Austria immediately after conclusion of the State Treaty, for proper recompense, the property of the Danube Steamshipping Company (DDSG), including the ship yards and Korneuburg dock and all vessels and port installations.

¹New York Times, April 16, 1955, p. 2.

Oil Fields to be Yielded

The Soviet Government agreed further to cede to Austria the oil fields and refineries, including the company for trade in oil products, OROP, defined as belonging to Austria in Article 35 of the State Treaty, in exchange for the delivery of crude oil in amounts agreed to by the parties.

Moreover, agreement was reached to enter into negotiations in the near future aimed at normalization of trade relations between Austria and the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Delegation informed the Austrian Delegation that the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR had expressed its consent to consider favorably the request of the Austrian Federal President, Dr. Koerner, about the return of the Austrians to their motherland who are serving terms at the decision of the Soviet Court organ.

After the withdrawal of the Soviet occupation troops from Austria, not a single military prisoner or detained civilian person of Austrian citizenship will remain on the territory of the Soviet Union.

APPENDIX B

TABLE I

NATIONALRATSWAHLEN 1945-1955¹
 (Elections to the National Assembly 1945-1955)

1. ELECTIONS: NOVEMBER 1945

3,449,605 eligible voters
 3,217,354 valid votes

OeVP	1,602,277 votes . .	85 seats in the Nationalrat
SPOe	1,434,898 votes . .	76 seats in the Nationalrat
KPOe	174,257 votes . .	4 seats in the Nationalrat
Democratic Party	5,972 votes . .	0 seats in the Nationalrat

2. ELECTIONS: OCTOBER 1949

4,391,850 eligible voters²
 4,246,239 voted
 4,189,366 valid votes

OeVP	1,846,381 votes . .	77 seats in the Nationalrat
SPOe	1,624,024 votes . .	67 seats in the Nationalrat
KPOe	213,066 votes . .	5 seats in the Nationalrat
Independents . . .	489,273 votes . .	16 seats in the Nationalrat

3. ELECTIONS: FEBRUARY 1953

4,586,879 eligible voters
 4,395,176 voted
 4,319,274 valid votes

OeVP	1,781,969 votes . .	74 seats in the Nationalrat
SPOe	1,818,811 votes . .	73 seats in the Nationalrat
KPOe	228,228 votes . .	4 seats in the Nationalrat
Independents . . .	473,022 votes . .	14 seats in the Nationalrat

¹Heinrich Siegler, Oesterreichs Weg zur Souveranitaet, Neutralitaet, Prosperitaet, 1945-1959 (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchieve, 1959), pp. 16, 26, 32.

²At the first elections former members of the Heimwehr and of the Sturmscharen (both paramilitary organizations) were disqualified from voting due to their connections with Hitlerism.

TABLE II

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE AUSTRIAN POLICE FORCES¹A. KRIMINALBEAMTE (Criminal Investigators)

1945	1,235 men in the service
1953	1,425 men had entered the service
	1,655 men had left the service

B. VERWALTUNGSDIENST DER POLIZEI (Administrative Branch of the Police)

1946	3,418 men in the service
1953	1,081 men had entered the service
	2,235 men had left the service

C. SICHERHEITSWACHE (Security Police)

1945	6,152 men in the service
1953	13,128 men had entered the service
	13,093 men had left the service

TABLE III

GERMAN OWNERSHIP OF AUSTRIAN CORPORATIONS IN 1944²

Banks	83 per cent
Insurance	61 per cent
Smelting and Mining	72 per cent
Machine and Metal	64 per cent
Chemical	71 per cent
Electric	82 per cent
Construction	56 per cent
Wood	49 per cent
Textile	57 per cent
Transportation	58 per cent
Oil	50 per cent

¹Adolf Schaerf, Oesterreichs Erneuerung, 1945-1955 (Wien: Verlag der Wiener Volksbuchhandlung, 1956), p. 150.

²William L. Stearman, The Soviet Union and the Occupation of Austria (Wien: Verlag fuer Zeitarchie, 1957), p. 25.

APPENDIX C

FIGURE I

OESTERREICH - AUSTRIA
(Occupation Zones 1945-1955)¹

- Russian Zone
- American Zone
- British Zone
- French Zone

¹From Julius Raab, Verantwortung fuer Oesterreich (Wien: Oesterreichischer Wirtschafts-
verlag, 1961), p. 27.

FIGURE II
DIVISION OF VIENNA INTO SECTORS²

Russian Sector comprising districts 2,4,10,20,21,22.

British Sector comprising districts 3,5,11,12,13.

American Sector comprising districts 7,8,9,18,19.

French Sector comprising districts 6,14,15,16,17.

District I was under joint control of the four Allies which took turns every months.

²Julius Raab, Verantwortung fuer Oesterreich (Wien: oesterreichischer Wirtschaftsverlag, 1961), p. 31.

FIGURE III

Adapted from US Element of the
Allied Commission for Austria,
Austria: A Graphic Survey,
December 1948, p. 1.

ORGANIZATION CHART
ALLIED COMMISSION FOR AUSTRIA