
Writing a Revolution: On the Production and Early Reception of the Vienna Circle's Manifesto

Thomas Uebel

University of Manchester

*Considerable unclarity exists in the literature concerning the origin and authorship of *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis*, the Vienna Circle's manifesto of 1929 and on the extent of and the reasons for the mixed reception it received in the Circle itself. This paper reconsiders these matters on the light of so far insufficiently consulted documents.*

The year 1929 is of particular significance in the history of the Vienna Circle. It saw what for five years had been an informal academic discussion group “step out” and assume a notable public profile as a revolutionary philosophical movement with a distinctive socio-historical and cultural grounding.¹ As matters are commonly remembered nowadays, this profile was attained by the publication of a short programmatic brochure, *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis* (“The Scientific Conception of the World. The Vienna Circle”), which first bestowed upon this group its now common name. But the publication of this brochure was but one of several moves initiated from within this group and designed to procure an audience for its new philosophy. Another of these moves was the organization of the First Conference for the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences, where this brochure was first presented and distributed. It also was no coincidence that 1929 was the year in which the group succeeded in retaining its nominal leader, Moritz Schlick, despite his having received an attractive call to a chair in Bonn: the brochure was dedicated to him personally “as token of gratitude and joy at his remaining in Vienna” (Anon. 1929; trans. 1973, 299).

It is unsurprising, given this context of origin, that the brochure

1. The by now common distinction between the “private” and the “public phase” of the Vienna Circle was first drawn explicitly by Mulder (1968, 386).

Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung is many things. It declares dead the philosophy that wishes to lord it over science and instead encourages science to develop its own philosophy. In doing so it is a philosophical manifesto that serves as much the purpose of self-definition for the group it represents as it serves the purpose of announcing a distinctive program to philosophers outside. But the brochure is also a socio-historical and cultural manifesto that at a time of perceived political danger declares renewed the Enlightenment claim to public reason. In raising responsiveness to evidence to the very criterion of cognitive significance, it offers a common platform of discourse free of metaphysical and theological obfuscation to all interested individuals and parties. Moreover, apart from the multiple aims it pursued, the brochure was also the product of many hands. As is not uncommon in collective productions, a number of tensions find expression not only in its text but also in its reception amongst members of the Vienna Circle and those close to it.

The purpose of this paper is to consider some of these tensions and to review the issues of the origin and the production history of the brochure in the light of sources so far insufficiently considered. Besides settling questions about the inception and the authorship of the manifesto, the point will be made that its reception shows that already in 1929 some of the divisions are detectable that so visibly divided the Vienna Circle in the mid-1930s.

1. The Role of the Verein Ernst Mach

Let's begin with the association under the aegis of which the brochure was published.² It was largely through the efforts of Otto Neurath that the yet-to-be-so-called Vienna Circle secured an extra-mural institutional framework for popular lecture series and study groups in Vienna through its involvement in the founding of the Verein Ernst Mach in November 1928.³ In fact, most prominently involved in the founding of the Verein Ernst Mach was the Freidenkerbund (Free Thinker Association), whose leader, Carl Kindermann, alongside socialist representatives of the Viennese adult education movement, had initiated the plan for an association dedicated to the dissemination of scientific thought. Once founded, however, members of the Circle were prominent among its elected officers: Schlick was president, Hans Hahn one of his deputies, and Rudolf Carnap and Neurath minute keepers. A handbill calling for new members an-

2. On the history of the Verein Ernst Mach, see Stadler, 1997; trans. 2001, 328–349.

3. Karl Menger also recalled: "During 1928, Neurath advocated ever more emphatically the need for a public forum, where the insights gained in the privacy of the Circle could be disseminated" (1982, 90).

nounced forthcoming lectures by Schlick, Hahn, Carnap, Neurath, Philipp Frank, Herbert Feigl, Friedrich Waismann and Karl Menger, amongst others.⁴

As Frank put it in his often overlooked history of the Vienna Circle, the Verein Ernst Mach became “the legal organization of the Vienna Circle”, presumably because it also served as the base from which still further ventures were organized (Frank 1949, 40).

In 1929, we had the feeling that from the cooperation that was centered in Vienna a definite new type of philosophy had emerged. . . . We decided to publish a monograph about our movement, next, to arrange a meeting, and eventually to get control of a philosophical journal so that we would have a way of getting the contributions of our group printed (Frank 1949, 38).⁵

Just as the brochure was published under the aegis of the Verein Ernst Mach, so the “meeting” and the later editorship of a journal was sponsored by it, jointly with Hans Reichenbach’s Berlin-based Society for Empirical Philosophy.⁶ While the lecture series in Vienna was to have popular appeal—“Broader circles of people with a conception of the world that is free of metaphysics demonstrated the need to establish lasting connections to scientific representatives of this tendency”⁷—the planned conference was clearly addressed to the academic community.

The arrangement of the meeting was not so easy. We wanted to reach a large audience. The regular philosophy meetings followed the traditional lines and would hardly have given us enough scope. By a happy coincidence I was just in 1929 arranging a meeting of the physicists and mathematicians from the German-speaking regions in Central Europe. . . . The German Physical Society, which was the official sponsor of this meeting, did not particularly like the the idea of combining this serious scientific meeting with such a foolish thing as philosophy. However, I was the chairman of the local committee in Prague and they could not refuse my serious

4. See the reproduction in Stadler 1997, 332–3.

5. Actually, the plan for “a new periodical as a forum for our kind of philosophy” went back to Reichenbach at the Erlangen conference of 1923; see Carnap 1963, 32.

6. The only other publication in the series “Veröffentlichungen des Vereins Ernst Mach” was Hahn 1930.

7. “Weitere Kreise mit metaphysikfreier Weltauffassung zeigten das Bedürfnis, dauernde Beziehungen zu den wissenschaftlichen Vertretern dieser Richtung herzustellen” (Neurath 1930, 74). Note that, given the founding history of the Verein, this was no self-aggrandising claim.

wish to attach a meeting with the topic ‘Epistemology of the Exact Sciences’” (Frank 1949, 39–40).

In some respects, the plan succeeded very well. Frank, the successor to Einstein in Prague since 1912,⁸ gave the first plenary address of the Fifth Congress of German Physicists and Mathematicians on September 16 to a full auditorium, celebrating the anti-metaphysical scientific world conception and rejecting other philosophies as “fossilizations of earlier physical theories” (Frank 1929; trans. Frank 1949, 115). Frank was followed by the applied physicist Richard von Mises (also the co-editor with Frank of the renowned Riemann-Weber compendium of mathematics for physicists) with an address broadly sympathetic to Frank’s cause. The texts of their lectures were soon published in the widely circulating journal *Die Naturwissenschaften* (Mises 1930). The smaller First Conference on the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences, meanwhile, had begun a day earlier on September 15 with introductory remarks by Frank and Hahn’s opening address, followed over the next three days by lectures from Carnap, Reichenbach, Neurath, Waismann, Feigl and Adolf Fraenkel. Their texts were published in the following year in the first volume of *Erkenntnis*.⁹ (This was the philosophical journal which, as planned, the Vienna Circle by then had succeeded in taking over, with the Berlin society, and renamed from *Annalen der Philosophie*, with Carnap and Reichenbach as editors; see Hegselmann and Sigwart 1991.) Last but not least, the first copies of the brochure were distributed at the Conference to interested colleagues.

On the other hand, the Vienna Circle’s message was received coldly by the Congress at large. Of her husband’s plenary lecture, Hania Frank reported that it seemed as if his “words fell into the audience like drops into a well so deep that one cannot hear the drops striking the bottom. Everything seemed to vanish without a trace” (quoted in Frank 1949, 40). Perhaps not surprisingly, the assembled scientists did not readily take to the suggestion, made by Frank, that they tended to adhere to a philosophy that had been rendered redundant by their own science. Frank had to face criticism in the third plenary address by the theoretical physicist Arnold Sommerfeld (the teacher of Heisenberg and Pauli). Sommerfeld, deaf to the differences between the old and the new positivism, reheated aspects of the Mach-Planck controversy in his lecture which, in turn, was published in the prominent *Physikalische Zeitschrift* (Sommerfeld 1929). Hav-

8. Frank took over Einstein’s former position first as associate professor, but was appointed full professor in 1917.

9. For the proceedings of the Conference for the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences see *Erkenntnis* 1 (1930): 93–310 (where Frank’s and v. Mises’ papers were also published).

ing drawn the battlelines rather sharply, the Vienna Circle found few converts, at least initially. The effect of the brochure was no different in this respect. But thanks to the double patronage of the Verein in organizing the Conference and publishing the brochure, the Vienna Circle at least had been able to introduce itself forcefully on the central European academic scene.

2. The Role of Schlick's Offer from Bonn

According to the brochure, it was on the occasion of Schlick's receiving the call to Bonn that it first became clear to those involved that "there is such a thing as the 'Vienna Circle' of the scientific conception of the world" (Anon. 1929, 299). Actually, that is not quite correct. Already in his 1928 review of Carnap's *Aufbau*, Neurath spoke about the "exact conception of the world" as professed by the "'Vienna School' around Moritz Schlick."¹⁰ Carnap promptly commented: "So you wish to gain the historical merit to name and proclaim the 'Vienna School' for the first time. You are right, incidentally, that a slogan, a summary name, is important for the reception even if it does not say anything on its own accord."¹¹ In Neurath's mind at least the spirit of the group around Schlick had attained self-consciousness long before the offer from Bonn was received.¹²

That noted, the threat of Schlick leaving Vienna did play a considerable role in the production history of the brochure. Having learnt of the threat, the board of the Verein Ernst Mach wrote to Schlick in April, congratulating him on the honor of the call but impressing upon him "the profound and grievous damage" that his departure would inflict on the work he had undertaken for the scientific conception of the world in Vienna: "no one else could possibly fill the void left in the cultural life of Vienna."¹³ Schlick

10. Neurath used the expressions "exakte Weltbetrachtung" and "die 'Wiener Schule' um Moritz Schlick" in Neurath 1928, repr. 1981, 296. Note also that already in his lecture to the founding meeting of the Verein Ernst Mach on 23 November 1929 Neurath spoke of the transformation of the "naturwissenschaftliche Weltanschauung" to the "exaktwissenschaftliche Weltauffassung." See Neurath 1928, 10, quoted in Stadler 1997, 369.

11. "Sie wollen sich also das historische Verdienst erwerben, die 'Wiener Schule' als erster zu benamen und zu proklamieren. Sie haben übrigens recht, dass ein Schlagwort, eine zusammenfassende Bezeichnung, auch wenn sie nichts für sich besagt, von Wichtigkeit für die Wirkung ist." Carnap to Neurath, 7 October 1928, RC 029-16-01 ASP.

12. In fact, it had done so for a while: already in a letter to Carnap of December 31, 1927, Neurath spoke of the "Wiener Schule" (Vienna School) (in quotation marks). See RC 029-16-06 ASP.

13. ". . . es bestünde keine Möglichkeit, dass ein anderer die so im geistigen Leben Wiens entstehende Lücke füllen könnte. Der Schaden, den die im Verein Ernst Mach in engster Gedankengemeinschaft mit seinem Vorsitzenden vertretene Weltauffassung dadurch erleiden müsste, wäre ein tiefer und schmerzlicher." Letter from Board of Verein Ernst Mach to Schlick, 2 April 1929, reprinted in Mulder 1968, 387.

decided to stay in Vienna long-term—despite the unhelpful attitude of the Austrian ministry of education towards his request for additional provision for his chair¹⁴—only on the day before his departure for a Visiting Professorship at Stanford at the end of May. In response a letter of thanks for his “truly generous and unselfish decision to continue [his] work in Vienna despite the existing difficulties” was composed and signed by most of those who the brochure would identify as members of the Vienna Circle and few others.¹⁵

Existing documents leave the precise order of events somewhat unclear, however. Whether the plan for the conference preceded that for the brochure, or vice versa, and whether the conference was being planned already before Schlick received the call to Bonn, or vice versa, has not been conclusively established. The safe position to take is that, as Stadler put it, “Schlick’s decision to stay in Vienna stimulated work for the planned booklet as well as preparatory activities for the Conference on the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences.”¹⁶ This formulation remains suitably neutral between conflicting reports. There is, on the one hand, Frank’s failure to mention Schlick’s call to Bonn when he related the group’s plan to “present [its] brain child to the world at large” via a monograph, a conference and a journal (Frank, 1949, 38). On the other hand, Menger reported: “Great was the joy of all of us when we learned that Schlick had decided to return to Vienna for good. ‘This must be celebrated,’ Neurath said and we all agreed. ‘We must write a book outlining our views—a manifesto of the Circle—and dedicate it to Schlick when he comes home in the fall,’ Neurath added; and with his habitual expeditiousness and energy he went to work” (Menger 1982, 91). According to Menger, but not Frank, Schlick’s decision to stay in Vienna provided the original stimulus for the production of the brochure.

On this matter we can turn to Carnap’s diaries for further information.¹⁷ Carnap had learnt of the offer to Schlick already in late March from

14. All he received was a post of librarian for Waismann who already had worked at his department without pay. See Stadler 1979; trans. 1991, 72.

15. “Ihr wahrhaft grosszügiger und uneigennütziger Entschluss, Ihr Wirken in Wien ungeachtet der entgegenstehenden Schwierigkeiten fortzuführen. . . .” That letter was dated 13 June 1929, but it is unclear whether it was sent to Schlick at Stanford or whether it was given to Schlick with the brochure when he returned in October (see Mulder 1968, 388). Only Frank’s and Marcel Natkin’s signature are missing, presumably because they were not in Vienna at the time.

16. Stadler 2001, 335; cf. Mulder 1968, 387: “Als man nun anlässlich des Kongresses in Prag die Veröffentlichung einer Broschüre erwog, lag es auf der Hand, das Pamphlet Moritz Schlick zum Zeichen des Dankes zu widmen und nach seiner Rückkehr aus Amerika zu überreichen.”

17. Carnap’s diary is kept with his *Nachlass* in the Archive of Scientific Philosophy at

Ernst Cassirer during his stay in Davos.¹⁸ His diary's entries for late May reveal some of the drama that surrounded Schlick's decision. The entry for Saturday, 25 May, notes that "Schlick says on the telephone: ministry declined, so he must go to Bonn."¹⁹ Since Schlick's attempt to win further resources for his chair came to nought, that seemed to settle the matter. The entry for Monday, 27 May, then records that Carnap learnt of Schlick's decision first-hand and very early on: "10.30 met Schlick in university. He stays in Vienna! . . . He leaves this evening for America. Lunch with Waismann. [I] tell him of my plan for the brochure 'The Principles of the Viennese Philosophical School' (*Leitgedanken der Wiener philosophischen Schule*)."²⁰ No further entries pursue the matter until that for Thursday, 6 June: "Circle. Waismann, second talk on probability. . . . I tell of the plan for the brochure '*Leitgedanken*'."²¹ Carnap's diary does not state whether the plan was accepted right away by the members (*sans* Schlick), nor in what relation it stood to the plans for the conference in Prague, which finds its first oblique and laconic mention in his diary in the entry for 14 June: "In the evening my lecture in the Verein Ernst Mach: 'Pseudoproblems in Philosophy. About the Soul and God' (formulation by Neurath). . . . Afterwards a discussion about Prague. Then together in café, Neurath, Feigl, Kaspar. . . ."²² However, in the entry for Monday, 17 June, we read: "3pm lecture. Afterwards with Feigl to Mrs.

the University of Pittsburgh but, due to the personal nature of some entries, has long been sequestered. I wish to thank Brigitta Arden, Associate Curator there, and Brigitte Parakenings, Curator at the Philosophical Archives at the University of Konstanz, for their extraordinary assistance in decoding the relevant passages of Carnap's Stolze-Schrey shorthand, and the Carnap Collection Committee for permission to use this material here. All rights reserved.

18. See entry for 27 March 1929 in Carnap's diary cited in Haller 1993, 225–226, fn. 30.

19. "Schlick sagt telefonisch: Ministerium hat abgelehnt, er muß also nach Bonn." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

20. "1/2 11 Schlick in Universität getroffen. Er bleibt in Wien! . . . Er reist heute abend nach Amerika ab. Mittags mit Waismann. Er [sic!] erzähle ihm meinen Plan der Broschüre '*Leitgedanken der Wiener philosophischen Schule*'." RC 025-73-03 ASP. Since the rest of the last sentence is grammatically inconsistent with any personal pronoun but the first person singular one, it can be assumed that Carnap meant "ich": thus my translation in the text above.

21. "Zirkel. Waismanns 2. Vortrag über Wahrscheinlichkeit. Zwei Arten von Funktionen. Mit bestimmtem und unbestimmtem Umfang. Ich erzähle den Plan der Broschüre '*Leitgedanken*'." RC 025-73-03 ASP. The entry for the previous Circle meeting on May 30 only states that Waismann gave a talk on probability which gave rise to a long and lively discussion.

22. "Abends mein Vortrag im Machverein: 'Scheinprobleme in der Philosophie: von Seele und Gott' (Formulierung von Neurath). . . . Nacher Besprechung über Prag." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

Neurath. . . . Later Neurath joins us. About the Prague conference and the planned brochure.”²³ This is followed by numerous mentions of discussions of and work on “the brochure” and occasional references to the conference in Prague throughout entries for the rest of June and most of July.

This suggests the following. *Pace* Menger, even though Neurath had long been agitating for a more public profile for the group around Schlick, it appears that it was Carnap who conceived of the idea for the brochure independently of him and directly in response to Schlick’s decision to stay in Vienna. The plans for the conference, meanwhile seem to have been hatched already earlier.²⁴ If so, it may of course still be the case that an already perceived need for promotional material to be distributed at the planned conference in Prague found translation into Carnap’s idea for the programmatic brochure. And what Menger reported may well have been Neurath’s own response when he received the news of Schlick’s decision, a response which converged with Carnap’s plan. In any case, producing the brochure appears to have been Carnap’s idea.

3. The Authorship of the Brochure

Frank’s history of the Vienna Circle states that “the monograph was written by Carnap, Hahn and Neurath in close cooperation” (Frank 1949, 38). Of those mentioned, Neurath, in the short bibliography of works of by members of the Vienna Circle featured in the first volume of the series “Einheitswissenschaft,” listed “Carnap/Neurath/Hahn” as authors (Neurath 1933; McGuinness 1987, 276). Carnap’s bibliographical overview in his contribution to that series lists the brochure under the author Neurath with the addition “with Carnap and Hahn”; the bibliography of *Logical Syntax* lists it under Neurath with the addition of “with others,” and his autobiography lists it as “Hahn, Neurath, Carnap.”²⁵ Other former members of the Circle agreed with this rendition to varying degrees. For instance, Feigl recalled the pamphlet being “composed by Carnap, Neurath and Hahn, aided by Waismann and myself.”²⁶ Heinrich Neider meanwhile remarked that the programmatic essay “was produced essentially by Neurath” (Neider, “Memories of Otto Neurath,” in Neurath

23. “3h Vorlesung. Nacher mit Feigl bei Frau Neurath. . . . Später Neurath dazu. Über Prager Tagung und geplante Broschüre.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

24. Given what Frank reported about its initial reluctance (39–40; see quote above), it is unlikely that Frank’s negotiations with the German Physical Society concerning the conference were started only after May 27 and concluded already before June 22.

25. Carnap 1934; trans. McGuinness 1987, 284. Carnap 1935; trans. 1937, repr. 2002, 342. Carnap 1963, 22, fn. 5. Carnap’s autobiography does not discuss the brochure any further.

26. Feigl 1969, repr. in Feigl 1981, 70; see also his 1969, repr. in Feigl 1981, 22.

1973, 49). The editors of Neurath's *Empiricism and Sociology*, a collection of his writings which featured the first translation of *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung* in English, summed up what was known by about 1973 and since has become the standard view.

The pamphlet *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis* does not give an author's name on the title page—unless one considers “Der Wiener Kreis” as author, being printed in smaller type. This pamphlet is the product of teamwork; Neurath did the writing, Hahn and Carnap edited the text with him; other members of the Circle were asked for their comments and contributions. (H. Feigl mentions F. Waismann and himself. . .) (Neurath 1973, 318n).

Two variations on this were presented by Karl Menger in the years following. On one occasion he continued the story whose beginning we noted earlier as follows: “I did not hear about the progress of Neurath's project until late in the summer when Hahn asked me about some bibliographical details in the last proofsheets of a pamphlet that was ready for publication. . . . Neurath had completed the manuscript after several conferences with Carnap” (Menger 1982, 91). On another occasion Menger simply wrote: “The pamphlet, whose genesis I had occasion to observe, was mainly written by Neurath; Carnap cooperated to some extent; Hahn received the final draft” (Menger, “Introduction” in Hahn 1980, xiv). Clearly, if these statements are not to contradict each other, one must assume that what Menger observed was not the full order of proceedings, and that for that he relied on reports by others, even though he was present at certain junctures of the project. Most notable here is the stress on Neurath's role and the reduction of Hahn's in the production of the brochure. (Hahn, incidentally, did not refer to the brochure in any of his subsequent writings.)

In his authoritative *Neopositivismus. Eine historische Einführung in die Philosophie des Wiener Kreises* of 1993, Rudolf Haller, summarised the results of his research as follows:

The work was first written by Neurath, whose version was criticised by Carnap, Hahn, Feigl and others, however. Then Carnap took on the task of producing a revised version, based on Neurath's which is no longer to be found in Carnap's otherwise fairly complete Nachlass. Feigl, together with Waismann the closest collaborator of Schlick's, was consulted which was the reason why Carnap mentioned him to Schlick as an author of the work, alongside Neurath and himself.²⁷

27. “Verfaßt wurde die Schrift zunächst von Neurath, dessen Fassung aber von Carnap,

In support Haller referred to a letter from Carnap to Schlick of 30 September 1929 which accompanied Schlick's own special copy of brochure. Haller had quoted from it when he first had offered the above hypothesis of the production history in 1984. The relevant passage, he then said, was "confirmed by other letters" and "solves once and for all the difficult question of the authorship of the pamphlet." In the letter from Carnap to Schlick we read: "Please do not consider the content too critically but with your usual kindness and indulgence. It has been composed by Feigl, Neurath and myself through a joint effort and with more good will than quality."²⁸ In the German version of this paper Haller added that Feigl was brought in when Carnap set to do the revision and that "Hahn . . . did not have a direct part in the authorship of the manifesto."²⁹

Clearly, Haller's research cast an entirely new light on the matter. Hahn's role was even further demoted and Neurath's considerably reduced; by contrast, Carnap's role was much strengthened—in line with our finding in the previous section—and that of Feigl clarified. But did this settle the matter? In his compendium of the Vienna Circle of 1997 Stadler hedged his bets. Claiming that the manifesto was "published one month before the meeting" in Prague, he noted that "though signed jointly by Carnap, Hahn and Neurath," it was "probably first written by Neurath and then revised by Carnap . . . while the other members and adherents were asked for comments and contributions" (Stadler 2001, 335). A footnote adds that this reconstruction was "based on the diaries of Rudolf Carnap" (Stadler 2001, 335). While Stadler agrees with Haller in outlines he seems to reserve judgement on several details.³⁰

Hahn, Feigl und anderen kritisiert wurde. Sodann übernahm Carnap die Aufgabe, eine revidierte Fassung herzustellen, der die Neurathsche, die sich auch im sonst ziemlich kompletten Nachlaß Carnaps nicht mehr findet, zugrunde lag. Feigl, mit Waismann der engste Mitarbeiter Schlicks, wurde beigezogen, weshalb Carnap ihn—Schlick gegenüber—zusammen mit Neurath und sich selbst als Verfasser der Schrift nennt" (Haller 1993, 70).

28. Carnap to Schlick, 30 September 1929: "Den Inhalt betrachte bitte nicht zu kritisch, sondern mit Deinem gewohnten Wohlwollen und Nachsicht. Es ist von Feigl, Neurath und mir mit vereinten Kräften und mehr gutem Willen als Qualität geschaffen worden." Quoted in Haller 1984, repr. in Haller 1988. 31–32.

29. "In diesem Stadium wurde Feigl um Mitarbeit ersucht. Hahn, der mit Carnap und Neurath als Herausgeber zeichnete, hat keinen unmittelbaren Anteil an der Autorschaft des Manifests" (Haller 1986, 193, fn. 8).

30. Two years before Haller's 1984 paper, he had written: "Der pointiert und kämpferisch verfaßte Text der Broschüre ist—obwohl von Carnap, Hahn und Neurath gemeinsam gezeichnet—wahrscheinlich nach einem ersten kollektiven Arbeitsgang von Neurath, in einem darauffolgenden schließlich von Carnap verfaßt worden" (Stadler 1982, 177).

Still, something of a consensus emerged, but it remained vague. Note the unclarity concerning Waismann's role.³¹ Here our earlier look into Carnap's diary already suggests a more concrete answer: Waismann was Carnap's first interlocutor when he developed the idea for the brochure and most likely provided input there and then. This suggests that for clarification and further supplementation of the production history of the brochure on other issues too we may turn again to Carnap's diary and his correspondence. For there also remains the question of how and when Neurath got involved in the project. In both Haller's and Stadler's account he remains the author of the first version of the pamphlet even though, according to his diary, Carnap was its initiator.

That noted, recall that once Carnap's idea was put to the Circle it seems it was accepted at least in principle and Carnap set to thinking about it in greater detail, partly in the company of Feigl. What about Neurath's role in the very earliest stages? Carnap's diary for 27 May, when Schlick told him of his decision, also records that in the afternoon he visited "Mrs. Neurath" and that "Neurath is still in Sweden."³² Neurath is not mentioned again until Friday, June 14 (see above), on the occasion of Carnap's lecture in the Verein. Since any meetings with individual members of the Circle are meticulously noted in his diaries, this suggests that Carnap had not met Neurath until then—unless he met him at the three intervening Circle meetings (with regard to which Carnap only tends to mention the speaker and significant interventions). So it is not at all impossible that Neurath had been absent until then.

Now note Neurath's reaction in the discussion with Carnap and Feigl about the brochure on 17 June, as recorded in Carnap's diary: "He urges us not to be so unworldly."³³ The entry for Thursday, 20 June reads: "3pm lecture. Afterwards to the Neuraths, with Feigl. Neurath's draft for the brochure."³⁴ And that for Saturday, 22 June: "Meeting Verein Ernst Mach. Prague and the brochure will be done through the Verein. With Neurath

31. In addition there is the issue of the bibliography. Haller (1988, 32) cites Carnap's letter to Schlick: "Each of us did our own bibliographical annotations; but those for you and Einstein were made by Feigl, the ones for Wittgenstein by Waismann, and the ones for Russell by myself." ("Die bibliographischen Angaben in der Broschüre hat jeder selbst gemacht; jedoch für Dich und Einstein, Feigl, für Wittgenstein Waismann, für Russell ich.") By contrast, as we saw, Menger claims only to have been asked about details in the bibliography, not to have been asked to provide his bibliographical entry in its entirety.

32. "Neurath ist noch in Schweden." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

33. "Neurath ermahnt uns, nicht so weltfremd zu sein." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

34. "3h Vorlesung. Nachher zu Neuraths, mit Feigl. Neuraths Entwurf für die Broschüre." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

to his office, Feigl also. His new draft for the brochure.”³⁵ This sequence of entries clearly suggests that having learnt of the plan for the brochure and of early attempts by Carnap and Feigl at drafting it—after his return to Vienna—Neurath intervened by setting down the outlines of what he considered to be a more appropriately “worldly” manifesto.

Yet this was but the beginning of heightened activity. Consider these entries. Sunday, June 23: “Feigl here in the afternoon. About the brochure ‘Vienna School’.”³⁶ Monday, June 24: “3pm lecture. To the Neuraths, Feigl also. Discussed brochure ‘Vienna School’.”³⁷ Thursday, June 27: “3pm lecture. With Feigl plan for new draft for the brochure about the Vienna School.”³⁸ Saturday, June 29: “Afternoon and evening Feigl and Kaspar here. Work on brochure together.”³⁹ Sunday, June 30: “Afternoon and evening with Feigl and Kaspar work on the brochure. I take Feigl’s dictation down in shorthand; until 11.30.”⁴⁰ Monday, July 1: “Lunch with Hahn on Zilsel and brochure. 3pm lecture. To the Neuraths, with Feigl and Kaspar. . . . Once Feigl and Kaspar are gone, Neurath dictates brochure for me.”⁴¹ Wednesday, July 3: “Afternoon to Neurath. He continues dictation of brochure on Vienna Circle.”⁴²

Several things are notable here. First, that following Neurath’s first intervention and further discussion, Carnap and Feigl began working up a new draft; second, that Neurath intervened a second time; third, that there was a change in appellation: the name “Vienna Circle” first appears in connection with Neurath’s dictation of his second draft. This accords well with Frank’s report that it was Neurath who suggested the name.⁴³

35. “Sitzung Machverein. Prag und Broschüre warden vom Verein aus gemacht. Mit Neurath in sein Büro, auch Feigl. Sein neuer Entwurf für die Broschüre.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

36. “Nachmittags Feigl hier. Über Broschüre ‘Wiener Schule’.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

37. “3h Vorlesung. Zu Neuraths, auch Feigl. Broschüre ‘Wiener Schule’ besprochen.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

38. “3h Vorlesung. Mit Feigl Plan für neuen Entwurf der Broschüre über Wiener Schule.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

39. “Nachmittags und abends Feigl und Kaspar hier. Zusammen Broschüre gearbeitet.” RC 025-73-03 ASP. Maria Kaspar was Feigl’s fiancée and one of the signatories of the letter of thanks to Schlick.

40. “Nachmittags und abends mit Feigl und Kaspar Broschüre gearbeitet. Ich stenographiere nach Feigls Diktat; bis 1/2 12.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

41. “Mittags mit Hahn über Zilsel und Broschüre. 3h Vorlesung. Zu Neuraths, mit Feigl und Kaspar. . . . Nachdem Feigl und Kaspar weg, diktiert Neurath mir Broschüre.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

42. “Nachmittags zu Neurath. Er diktiert mir Broschüre über Wiener Kreis weiter.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

43. “When we prepared the monograph we noticed that our group and our philosophy

Menger too stated that Neurath “gave the name Vienna Circle to what had been called (and in Vienna of course continued to be called) the Schlick-Kreis” (Menger, “Memories of the Vienna Circle,” 1982, 91–92).

While he appears to have remained largely in the background so far (though he already figured in one consultation), Hahn now assumed a larger role. Thursday, July 4: “7pm at Hahn’s. With him and Neurath on brochure.”⁴⁴ The next relevant entry comes two weeks later, for Thursday, July 18: “Afternoon two hours work on brochure.”⁴⁵ Then, under Friday, July 19, we read: “5.30pm to Neurath. Hahn there. I read from brochure.”⁴⁶ Here note, first, that following Neurath’s repeated interventions, Carnap had taken over the reins again. And, second, that Hahn contributed criticism and suggestions on at least two occasions when the project was at critical junctures. But Hahn’s contribution still went beyond his critiques of Neurath’s second draft and of Carnap’s version of it. This becomes clear when, years later, Neurath wrote to Hahn: “The remark about Brentano in our brochure is haunting me. I want to know where it comes from. Didn’t you get it from a book by Höfler? Please be so kind and have a look.”⁴⁷ Neurath’s question strongly suggests that Hahn also had collaborated with him on the text of section 1.1 of the brochure, “Historical background.” (In historical matters, Carnap deferred to Neurath.)

Having received the additional comments from Hahn and Neurath, Carnap undertook to pull it all together. Sunday, July 21: “Very hot. Work hard on brochure. Frau Mauerhofer brings lunch.”⁴⁸ Monday, July 22: “As above.”⁴⁹ Tuesday, July 23: “As above.” Wednesday, July 24: “As above.” Thursday, July 25: “As above. Finished typing the brochure. In

had no name. Quite a few people among us disliked the words ‘philosophy’ and ‘positivism’ and did not want them to appear in the title. Some disliked all ‘isms’, foreign or domestic. Eventually we chose the name ‘scientific world conception’. . . . Our chosen title seemed a little dry to Neurath, and he suggested adding ‘The Vienna Circle’, because he thought that this name would be reminiscent of the Viennese waltz, the Vienna woods, and other things on the pleasant side of life” (Frank 1949, 38). It is unclear whether Frank was present in the relevant discussions about the brochure and whether he relates all the details correctly.

44. “7h bei Hahn. Mit ihm und Neurath über Broschüre.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

45. “Nachmittags zwei Stunden Broschüre gearbeitet.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

46. “1/2 6 zu Neurath. Hahn dort. Ich lese Broschüre vor.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

47. “Die Notiz über Brentano verfolgt mich. Ich möchte gerne wissen woher sie stammt. Hast Du sie nicht aus einem Höflerbuch gehabt? Bitte sei so lieb und stell das fest.” Neurath to Hahn, June 25, 1934, Neurath Nachlass 243, WKA. Hahn was unable to answer and died unexpectedly soon afterwards from the complications of a medical operation.

48. “Sehr heiss. Broschüre gearbeitet; fleissig. Mittags bringt Frau Mauerhofer Essen.” RC 025-73-03 ASP. It is likely that Frau Mauerhofer was Carnap’s landlady.

49. “Ebenso.” Same for next two days as well. RC 025-73-03 ASP.

the evening finally a thunderstorm.”⁵⁰ The next day Carnap sent copies to Hahn, Neurath and Frank. “Enclosed is the manuscript of the text of the brochure. Please insert proposed changes and additions (in printer-ready formulations, please!) and send it to me at the latest on August 2.”⁵¹ Interestingly, Carnap added beneath the collective part of the letter some remarks to Neurath that confirm the production history as so far reconstructed and throw further light on it:

Dear Neurath! You see that I could not resolve to surrender unconditionally the opus that I formulated and typed in the sweat of my brow to other hands, and be they yours. Instead, I have, after all, reserved for myself the sour duty and the sweet right of the final formulation. But at the very end, just before the printing, you may make some corrections! What I didn't take from you: of the first draft, the enclosed; of the second: clarity of signs; imperfection of our language; induction; theory of constitution; what's real is what can be integrated; decisive action instead of pedantry; philosophy of the as-if; pragmatism. These things either already appear somewhere else in a different formulation or I had objections.⁵²

So, following Neurath's two drafts—note that Carnap clearly distinguished them—and Hahn's criticisms, Carnap had taken over the production of the penultimate version which went to Hahn, Frank and Neurath for their last comments. As Haller noted, Carnap reserved for himself “the sour duty and sweet right of the final formulation,” (Haller 1993, 226, fn. 32). But note, too, the concession he made to Neurath that he could make changes at the very end. Clearly, Carnap's decision suggests a widely

50. “Ebenso. Broschüre fertig getippt. Abends endlich Gewitter.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.

51. “Hiermit übersende ich das MS des Textteils der Broschüre. Vorschläge zu Änderungen und Einfügungen bitte ich hineinzuschreiben (bitte in druckfertiger Formulierung!) und das Ex. spätestens am 2. Aug. an mich abzusenden.” Carnap to Hahn, Frank, Neurath, July 26, 1929, RC 029-15-14 ASP.

52. “Lieber Neurath! Du siehst, dass ich mich nicht habe entschliessen können, das im Schweisse meines Angesichts formulierte und im gleichen Schweisse getippte Opus nun auf Gnade und Ungnade in andere, und seien es selbst Deine, Hände zu überliefern, sondern mir doch die saure Pflicht und das süsse Recht der letzten Formulierung doch vorbehalten habe. Ganz zuletzt darfst Du aber unmittelbar vor dem Druck noch korrigieren! Von Dir sind nicht genommen worden: aus dem 1. Entwurf das Beiliegende; aus dem 2.: Klarheit der Zeichen; Unvollkommenheit unserer Sprache; Induktion; Konstitutionstheorie; wirklich ist das Eingliederbare; handfestes Tun anstatt Akribie; Philos. des Alsob, Pragm. Diese Sachen stehen aber teils irgendwo in anderer Formulierung, zuweilen hatte ich Gegengründe.” Carnap to Neurath, July 26, 1929, RC 029-15-14 ASP. There is no way of determining now what “the enclosed” was.

shared anxiety about Neurath's "style", a concern that surfaced later in that letter's addition as follows:

Please do not cross out the section titles!! Without orientation the brochure would be hellish to read. Remember that with your stuff one always has a hard time because one doesn't know which topic you are currently addressing; remember Hahn's complaint when the draft was read to him!⁵³

One polite way of reading this is that Carnap perceived Neurath's style of exposition to stand in need of academic editing (by 1929 Neurath had been out of academia for over ten years).

So by July 26 Carnap had broken the back, as it were, of writing the brochure. However, having finished the text of the brochure did not mean having finished the job overall. Thus we read: Saturday, July 27: "Typed bibliography."⁵⁴ Monday, July 29: "Typed bibliography."⁵⁵ It is often forgotten that a very significant part of the brochure was its extensive annotated bibliography of the works of the "members of the Vienna Circle," of "those sympathetic to the Vienna Circle," and of the "leading representatives of the scientific world-conception."⁵⁶ Including such a bibliography was very much Carnap's idea, as a later letter to him from Neurath indicates: "Your bibliography is a very valuable addition to our joint work. All libraries will buy the book, if only because of the bibl[iography]. Of course, this gives it a rather scholarly character."⁵⁷ (Later, on the occasion of various conferences, *Erkenntnis* also featured annotated bibliographies, then mainly compiled by Neurath.)⁵⁸

Carnap's letter to Hahn, Frank and Neurath of July 26 already contained some further questions concerning this bibliography. Most salient

53. "Die Abschnitt-Überschriften streiche mir bitte nicht weg!! Ohne Übersicht ist die Broschüre ein Greuel zu lesen. Denke daran, dass man bei Deinen Sachen immer seufzt, weil man nicht weiss, zu welchem Thema das Gesagte gehört; denke an die gleiche Klage von Hahn beim Vorlesen des Entwurfs!" Carnap to Neurath, July 26, 1929, RC 029-15-14 ASP.

54. "Bibliographie getippt." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

55. "Bibliographie getippt." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

56. The three categories are used in the bibliography at the end of the brochure. The bibliography is reprinted in Neurath, 1981, 315–336. The translation in Neurath 1973, lists the names under their various headings, but does not reproduce the bibliography.

57. "Deine Bibliographie ist eine wertvolle Ergänzung unserer gemeinsamen Arbeit. Alle Bibliotheken werden das Buch kaufen, schon der Bibl. wegen. Es wird freilich ein bisschen sehr gelehrtenhaft dadurch," Neurath to Carnap, August 24, 1928, RC 029-15-03 ASP.

58. See *Erkenntnis* 1 (1930), pp. 315–340; 2 (1931/32), pp. 151–156; 5 (1935), pp. 185–204, pp. 409–427.

amongst these were worries about what to do if Waismann would not send, despite reminders, what he had promised: the description of content of the *Tractatus* and of his own forthcoming book about Wittgenstein's philosophy. "He wanted to get Wittg[enstein's] permission, since earlier on we wanted to call him a 'sympathizer'. Given the current form of naming Wittg[enstein] (see ms p. 45), he has no cause to object in my view. Question: shall we feature Wittg[enstein] in the intended fashion even if Waismann does not answer, or even if Wittgen[stein] objected?"⁵⁹ In the end, Waismann did send the description of the contents of the *Tractatus* and of his own forthcoming book (which was never published in his lifetime) and Wittgenstein was named in the bibliography, alongside Einstein and Russell, as a "leading representative of the scientific world conception," having been mentioned three times in the text.

It was nearly another two weeks before Carnap was able to record in his diary, on Tuesday, August 6: "Finished brochure!"⁶⁰ And on Wednesday, August 7: "Brochure printer-ready to Neurath!"⁶¹ Unlike Carnap and Hahn, Neurath had remained in Vienna and it was he who dealt with the printers and the publisher. In a concurrent or accompanying letter to Neurath, Carnap acknowledged the receipt and integration of most of his and Frank's corrections, bemoaned the lack of a response from Hahn, and asked Neurath to fix some references.⁶² This Neurath did ("I only made few changes"); in addition he made some last minute decisions about type-face in consultation with Frank, arranged for the placement of promotional materials at the back of the brochure and finalized an advantageous contract with the publisher.⁶³ (The promotional materials extended over five pages and included the programmatic statement of the Verein Ernst Mach.)⁶⁴ Carnap received the proofs on August 23, noting a delay in proceedings. He wrote to Neurath: "I am waiting for your corrections, also

59. "Waismann wollte für die Bibliographie den Inhalt des Wittgensteinschen Buches (und seines eigenen) angeben. Er hat trotz Mahnung bisher nicht geantwortet. Er wollte noch Wittg.s Einwilligung einholen, da wir ihn früher als 'Nahestehenden' bezeichnen wollten. Bei der jetzigen Form der Nennung von Wittg. (vgl. MS S.45) kann er meiner Meinung nach keinen Einspruch erheben. Frage: sollen wir Wittg. in der beabsichtigten Form auch aufnehmen, wenn Waismann nicht antwortet, oder sogar auch, wenn Wittg. abgelehnt hat?" Carnap to Hahn/Frank/Neurath, July 26, 1929, RC 029-15-14 ASP.

60. "Broschüre fertig gemacht!" RC 025-73-03 ASP.

61. "Broschüre druckfertig an Neurath!" RC 025-73-03 ASP.

62. These comments featured in an addition, dated August 6, to the second page of a letter originally dated July 30. Carnap to Neurath, July 30–August 6, 1929, RC 029-15-13 ASP.

63. "Ich habe nur wenig geändert." See letters Neurath to Carnap, August 14 and August 23, 1929, RC 029-15-07, 029-15-04 ASP.

64. They are discussed in greater detail in section 5 below.

Feigl's to whom I sent it right away. Once the proofs are revised I will read them so that they can be back at the printers on September 8 at the earliest. This way the thing can be ready for Prague after all."⁶⁵

Carnap returned to Vienna on September 10. His diary notes: "In the evening to Neurath. There Hahn and Feigl. Hahn and Neurath read their lectures for Prague. Hahn's is very good; Neurath hard to understand."⁶⁶ As for the "brochure", however, all was sunshine. In an undated letter from the end of August apparently, Neurath had noted, amongst various plans for Prague: "Something else. In the final correction I want to add, somewhere where we speak of the masses who show a critical attitude, the word 'socialist'. It would be strange to avoid it altogether, especially since we talk about the 'liberals'."⁶⁷ Since Carnap had acceded to Neurath's request, no issues remained.⁶⁸ His diary for the next day, Wednesday, September 11, finally notes giving the approval to print: "To the printers. Checked corrections. Neurath arrives. *Imprimatur*. With Neurath to the publishers Wolf. [unreadable] lunch, afterwards to a café. Then sat by the Ring. I talk about Flitner."⁶⁹ This entry makes evident the sense of 'mission accomplished' that Carnap and Neurath shared that afternoon.

Of course, other things still needed to be done before one was ready for Prague. For Thursday, September 12, Carnap's diary reads: "Prepared axiomatics for Prague, finally! (In Wieseneck and Munich done nothing for it.)"⁷⁰ Then, in the entry for Saturday, September 14, we read: "13.30–

65. "Ich erwarte noch Deine Korr., ferner die von Feigl, dem ich sie gleich zugeschickt habe. Nach dem Umbruch werde ich noch die Revision lesen, die dann frühestens am 8. Sept. wieder bei der Druckerei ist. So kann die Sache doch noch für Prag fertig werden." Carnap to Neurath, August 25, 1929, RC 029-15-02 ASP.

66. "Abends noch zu Neurath. Dort Hahn und Feigl. Hahn und Neurath lesen ihre Vorträge für Prag vor. Hahns ist sehr gut; Neurath schwer verständlich." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

67. "Noch etwas. Ich möchte in der Schlusskorrektur, dort wo wir von den Massen reden, die kritisch sind, irgendwo das Wort 'sozialistisch' einfügen. Es ist komisch, wenn wir es ganz vermeiden, zumal wir von den 'Liberalen' reden?" Neurath also asked whether, if room was available, some advance publicity could be given to forthcoming publications by Hahn and his own Social and Economic Museum in the brochure. Neurath to Carnap, "ca. 29.8.29" in Carnap's hand, RC 029-15-01 ASP.

68. "So it is that in many countries the masses now reject these [metaphysical and theological] doctrines much more consciously than ever before, and along with their socialist attitudes tend to lean towards a down-to-earth empiricist view" ("The Scientific Conception of the World," in Neurath 1973, 318).

69. "In die Druckerei; Korrektur nachgesehen. Neurath kommt. *Imprimatur*. Mit Neurath zum Verlag Wolf. Mit ihm . . . gegessen, nachher ins Café. Nachher am Ring gesessen. Ich erzähle von Flitner." RC 025-73-03 ASP. Flitner was an old friend of Carnap's that Neurath knew. For more on Flitner see Gabriel 2004.

70. "Axiomatik für Prag vorbereitet, endlich! (Vorher in Wieseneck und München gar nichts getan dafür.)" RC 025-73-03 ASP.

21.30 to Prague with Feigl, who brings with him the parcel with the first brochures, Neider, Reidemeisterin, the Neuraths and Hahn (rides in second [class]), to the Conference on the Epistemology for the Exact Sciences.”⁷¹ History was in the making.

To summarize: what can be learnt from this new look at Carnap’s correspondence and diary? The widely shared view that it was Neurath who coined the term “Vienna Circle” can be taken as established. Beyond that, Haller and Stadler are confirmed in challenging the views that either the brochure was an equal coproduction of Carnap, Hahn and Neurath or that it was mainly the work of Neurath. But neither was it simply the product of a two-stage process, with Neurath producing the first and Carnap the final draft, as Haller and Stadler suggest. Rather, numerous stages in its production can be distinguished:

1. The inception of the idea by Carnap with likely early input by Waismann;
2. Carnap’s and Feigl’s first efforts;
3. Neurath’s first draft;
4. Carnap’s and Feigl’s second go (partly dictated by Feigl);
5. Neurath’s second draft (dictated to Carnap);
6. Carnap’s editing together of what had been produced so far;
7. the incorporation by Carnap of final comments by Hahn, Feigl, Frank and Neurath;
8. corrections in proof by Carnap, Feigl and Neurath;
9. last checks and joint *imprimatur* by Carnap and Neurath.

Only three days after the *imprimatur* the first copies of the brochure were ready for Prague—“just-in-time”.

4. The Reception of the Brochure

Turning now to the reception of the brochure, we find that while it appears to have made as much public impact as intended, the type of impact it did have was not always the one hoped for. This holds true not only for the public at large, but already for the members of the Vienna Circle and its sympathisers, as well as at least for one of the “leading representatives of the scientific world-conception.”

When Schlick received his own copy of *The Scientific Conception of the World. The Vienna Circle*, “bound in beautiful blue leather,” in October

71. “13 1/2–21 1/2 mit Feigl, der das Paket mit den ersten Broschüren mitbringt, Neider, Reidemeisterin, Neuraths und Hahn (fährt II.) nach Prag, zur Tagung für Erkenntnislehre der exakten Wissenschaften.” RC 025-73-03 ASP. “Reidemeisterin” is Marie Reidemeister (sister of Kurt Reidemeister and much later Marie Neurath).

1929 he was both delighted and disturbed: touched by the sentiment, he reportedly did not like the “advertising style” and the “seemingly dogmatic formulation.”⁷² Already some weeks earlier Waismann appears to have registered criticisms of the brochure which may have reflected Wittgenstein’s thoroughly negative attitude towards it.⁷³ What was the reason for Schlick’s and, indeed, Wittgenstein’s negative reaction? Was it merely that they found their own views inadequately represented?⁷⁴

In terms of strictly philosophical content, it is difficult to see what Schlick found so objectionable in the brochure. Thus it is hard to avoid the conclusion that one major reason was that Schlick objected to how his philosophy was contextualized there. Like Wittgenstein, it seems, Schlick rejected the collectivisation of philosophical work that the manifesto had praised (in the Preface and sections 1.2 and 4) and the thereby implicit demotion of their status from professor or individual genius to intellectual co-worker.⁷⁵ Even more so, the only thinly veiled references to the socialist workers’ movement were abhorrent for Schlick of whom it is reported—and documented—that he always rejected politicizing tendencies in the Vienna Circle and in the Verein Ernst Mach.⁷⁶

For his part, Wittgenstein was hostile to the undertaking from the start and he remarked in a letter to Waismann that something like a *Festschrift* would have honored Schlick in a far more appropriate fashion. Moreover, he thought he detected unwelcome local tendencies in the popularizing tone of the pamphlet: “I also think that the Vienna School should not prostitute itself like all Viennese institutions want to do on all occasions.” Last, but certainly not least, Wittgenstein was skeptical about the philosophical stance expressed in the brochure: “‘Rejection of metaphysics!’ As

72. See Mulder 1968, 390. Mulder reported Schlick’s claim in a letter from the following year “dass er sich weder mit dem reklamehaftem Stil, noch mit den etwas dogmatisch anmutenden Formulierungen der Broschüre einverstanden erklären kann.” While no quotation marks are used here, Mulders formulation suggests that the terms used were Schlick’s.

73. Carnap’s diary for Wednesday, September 25, reads: “Lunch with Waismann and Rand. Criticism of the brochure.” (“Mittags mit Waismann und Rand. Kritik über Broschüre.” RC 025-73-03 ASP.) The content of Waismann’s criticism is not further specified. For the text of a letter from Wittgenstein to Waismann of early June 1929 about the brochure, see Mulder 1968, 389–90.

74. Menger noted that Schlick “certainly would notice (though in his overly modest way probably not complain about) the fact that his own views were rather inadequately represented” (Menger 1982, 92).

75. That certainly did not sit well with what one gathers was Wittgenstein’s self-image and Schlick’s reportedly “aristocratic” personality (so characterized in Stadler 2001, 502–3).

76. See Kraft 1950; trans. 1953, 194, fn. 4; Menger, “Introduction,” 1994, xiv; and Stadler 2001, 347–348.

if *that* was something new! The Vienna School must not *say* what it achieves, but *show* it!"⁷⁷ Clearly, Wittgenstein did not share the seemingly uncomplicated anti-metaphysical attitude which the brochure expressed and most likely was disturbed to see his own foundational reflections on language and its relation to the world welded to its self-conscious scientism.

Karl Menger and Kurt Gödel also did not like the collectivist tone of the brochure nor the suggestion that all members shared the views presented in it. Even though he found it "well written and informative in various ways," Menger let it be known that henceforth he only wanted to be listed as "close" to the Vienna Circle, not as a member of it.⁷⁸ Gödel reportedly felt deeply "alienated" too; however, as a junior member, it seems he did not take any action.⁷⁹ Yet Viktor Kraft felt similarly estranged for similar reasons and did take action: in a later list of members he too appears only as "close" to the Circle.⁸⁰

Richard von Mises, finally, declined to be named even amongst the sympathizers, unlike Reichenbach, Walter Dubislav and Kurt Grelling with whom he was associated in the Berlin Society for Empirical Philosophy.⁸¹ For his part, Reichenbach tended to resist the stridency with which some members of the Vienna Circle displayed their contempt for school philosophy. This manifested itself not only in the negotiations about the co-editorship of *Erkenntnis*, but also already during the preparations for the Prague conference. Thus in Carnap's diary we read for Tuesday, July 2: "Evening and Wednesday morning long telephone calls with Neurath and Hahn. Then Neurath calls Frank in Berlin. Difficult agreement with the Berliners about Prague."⁸² And for Monday, July 15: "Neurath railing be-

77. "Aber ich bin auch dafür, dass sich die Wiener Schule bei diesem Anlass nicht prostituieren soll, wie [es] alle Wiener Institutionen bei jedem Anlass tun möchten. . . . 'Absage an die Metaphysik!' Als ob *das* was Neues wäre! Was die Wiener Schule leistet muss sie *zeigen*, nicht *sagen*!" Quoted in Mulder 1968, 389.

78. Menger, 1982, 92, fn.16, and "Introduction," 1994, xiv and p. xviii, fn.11; compare Neurath 1930, 312 and the bibliography on 335.

79. Menger 1982, 92, fn.16, and "Introduction," 1994, xviii, fn.11.

80. See Neurath 1973, 312. Menger recalled: "Like Schlick, Feigl and myself, Kraft by no means shared all the political ideas and ideals of Neurath, although the latter sometimes presented to the public, perhaps unintentionally, the idea of a politically homogeneous Circle" (1994, 65). Kraft himself stressed the unpolitical nature of the Vienna Circle and the Verein Ernst Mach in his 1950.

81. In his letter of 26 July 1929 to Hahn, Frank and Neurath, accompanying the first fully edited version of the text of the brochure, Carnap asked concerning the bibliography: "Soll Mises trotz seiner Ablehnung S. 42 unter Wahrscheinlichkeit genannt werden?" RC 029-15-14 ASP. In the end, Mises, *Wahrscheinlichkeit, Statistik, Wahrheit*, Springer, Vienna, 1928, was mentioned twice, on pp. 32 and 47 of the bibliography.

82. "Abends und Mittwoch früh langes Telefonieren mit Neurath und Hahn. Dann ruft

cause Reichenbach put the word 'philosophy' back into the invitation for Prague."⁸³ Unlike Carnap, who easily surrendered his provisional title for the brochure—"The Principles of the Viennese Philosophical School"—Reichenbach was not ready to jettison the name 'philosophy' and even insisted on calling his philosophy of natural science "Naturphilosophie."⁸⁴

Yet dissent also was not confined to those on the outside of the writing team. Menger reported that Hahn too was not too pleased with all the aspects of the brochure. Yet, having been "asked to be the principal signer of the pamphlet" by Neurath and Carnap, he did so as "one of the concessions he was occasionally prepared to make for the sake of peace" (Menger 1994, xiv and p. xviii, fn. 10). What Menger did not mention was that it was natural for Hahn to be the principal signer, given that he was Schlick's deputy as president of the Verein Ernst Mach under whose aegis the brochure was published. Since Menger did not specify which aspects of the brochure displeased Hahn, it is difficult to assess his remark. Moreover, Menger appears to have made his remark unaware that Hahn contributed comments and suggestions at several stages of its writing.

This raises the general question of who contributed which parts of the brochure. Haller is surely right when he states that "it is pretty clear that the basic conception, the title and the historical grounding derive from Neurath, whereas the passages which refer to the constitution theory and the given carry Carnap's signature."⁸⁵ But even Carnap seems to have had second thoughts.

5. Carnap's Second Thoughts

Consider the fact that Carnap obviously wished to distance himself from the contents of the brochure when he wrote to Schlick that it was written "with more good will than quality," (see fn. 27 above). This sounds weightier than mere professional modesty. It is likely that this remark reflects the criticism of the brochure that Waismann presented him with just five days earlier. But with regard to just what did Carnap take that criticism on board? May it have been the thought so aptly expressed by

Neurath Frank in Berlin an. Schwierige Einigung mit den Berlinern über Prag." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

83. "Taxi zu Neuraths. Er schimpft, weil Reichenbach wieder das Wort Philosophie in die Prager Einladung gebacht hat." RC 025-73-03 ASP.

84. See letter Neurath to Reichenbach, 22 July 1929, RC 029-15-15 ASP and compare Reichenbach 1931.

85. "Betrachtet man den Inhalt . . . so ist ziemlich klar, daß sowohl die Grundkonzeption, der Titel, wie die historische Begründung von Neurath stammen, während die auf die Konstitutionstheorie und das Gegebene Bezug nehmenden Passagen deutlich die Handschrift Carnap's tragen" (Haller 1993, 70).

Menger that the brochure “blends ideals with insights—perhaps not quite as freely as Neurath would have desired, but certainly too freely from Schlick’s point of view”? (Menger 1982, 92). Clearly, these “ideals” were political ones that Schlick did not share. But by 1929 this should not have come as a surprise to Carnap, so embarrassment about this aspect of the brochure would not seem to suffice to explain his self-deprecating description of its production to Schlick.

To be sure, the brochure was not without its imperfections in terms of production standards alone. Carnap’s proof reading ensured the absence of simple typos, but some mistakes did creep into the text and the bibliography. First, as the editors and translators of the brochure pointed out, in the quotation from Russell’s *Our Knowledge of the External World*, “Russell wrote about ‘logical atomism’, not specifically of ‘logical analysis’” (Anon. 1929, 306, and Neurath 1973, 318, fn. 3). Second, it may also be noted that while strictly speaking correct, the reference to Popper-Lynkeus’ “(allgemeine Nährpflicht, 1878)” is misleading.⁸⁶ In his book of 1878, Popper-Lynkeus did present his plan for a “general peacetime labour draft” for the first time, but his book of that title was published only in 1912 (Popper-Lynkeus 1924, 85–98; 1912; 1923). Third, the date of the publication of the “Kautsky-Festschrift,” mentioned as source for Bauer’s “Das Weltbild des Kapitalismus” in the bibliography, was wrongly given as 1929 when it was 1924.⁸⁷

In addition, we may note that Neurath wrote to Hahn several years later inquiring about the provenance of the information about Brentano that was reproduced in the brochure. Later that year Neurath also wrote to Walter Hollitscher, a student of Schlick’s who had just gained his Ph. D., with a similar query. “The brochure about the Vienna Circle contains wrong stuff about Brentano as regards his chair, his resignation etc., everything was different. Who we got it from I cannot ascertain anymore; certainly it wasn’t me as given scant biographical information I would not invent concrete numbers, but rather some behaviour or such like. I want to ask you to find out if you can where this mistake could have come from.”⁸⁸

86. Anon. 1929, 303. Note the missing capital in “allgemeine”: this indicates the concept, not the book of the same title (as the translation has it).

87. Missing in English translation; see the original of Anon. 1929, 32, or the reprint of the brochure in Neurath 1981, 316. The full reference is: Otto Jenssen (ed.), *Der lebendige Marxismus. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Karl Kautsky*, Thüringer Verlagsanstalt, Jena, 1924.

88. “In der Broschüre der Wiener Kreis steht falsches Zeug über Brentano drin, was Professur, Niederlegung usw. anbelangt, alles war anders. Wer das uns damals eingeflüstert hat, konnte ich leider nicht mehr feststellen, von mir ist’s sicher nicht, da ich bei so geringer biographischer Kenntnis keine konkreten Zahlen erdichte, dann schon lieber ein Behavior oder so was. Ich bitte Sie nun gelegentlich festzustellen, woher dieser Fehler

Hollitscher responded fairly quickly: "The passage in the brochure *The Scientific World Conception. The Vienna Circle* that deals with Brentano does not contain any errors, according to sources I consulted, experts I asked and my own modest knowledge. . . . Since there is no error, the issue of its literary source has become moot."⁸⁹ Understandably, Neurath left it there. But that is not the end of the matter (Anon. 1929, 302). Independently, Haller and Heiner Rutte, the editors of his *Gesammelte philosophische und methodologische Schriften*, note that in the Brentano passage one factual error had crept in (Neurath 1981, 302 fn). Brentano did *not* change faculties after he resigned from his professorship and he took up a lectureship instead: both were in the philosophical faculty of the University of Vienna.⁹⁰ So Neurath had been right to feel "haunted" by this passage, even though the error was hardly massive.

It is unclear, however, whether Carnap even recognized any of the problems so far mentioned. More to the point, by contrast, would seem be omissions in the bibliography concerning Schlick's ground-breaking *Raum und Zeit in der gegenwärtigen Physik*. Neither sections I-II nor sections IV and VIII are mentioned by title, unlike the other ones.⁹¹ But this too appears to be too minor a blemish to account for Carnap's comment about the brochure to Schlick. So let's turn to Schlick's complaint about its "advertising style" and "seemingly dogmatic formulations": may Carnap's qualms betoken his belated attention to these features?

Here it is important to note what precisely was at issue. Typically, one thinks of Schlick's later complaints about the exclamatory style of the first version of Neurath's *Empirische Soziologie* which in 1930 Schlick rejected for the series he edited with Frank, *Schriften zur wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung*.⁹² (A later version was accepted—but still not appreciated—and

stammen kann." Neurath to Hollitscher, November 27, 1934, in Goller and Oberkoffer 2000, 144.

89. "Die Stelle in der Broschüre *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis*, die von Brentano handelt, enthüllt, wie ich durch Nachschlagen, Befragen von Fachleuten und meines eigenen bescheidenen Wissens feststellen konnte, keinerlei unrichtige Angabe. . . . Da ein Irrtum also nicht vorliegt, ist die Frage nach der literarischen Irrtumsquelle gegenstandslos." Hollitscher to Neurath, December 8, 1934, in Goller and Oberkoffer 2000, 145.

90. Brentano resigned his chair in order to take up Saxony citizenship so as to avoid complication arising from the fact that his marriage as a former priest would not be recognized in Austria; the Austrian authorities disappointed his understanding that he would be reappointed as professor after some time.

91. Missing in English translation; see the original of Anon. 1929, 43, or the reprint of the brochure in Neurath 1981, 334–335.

92. On this episode, see Manninen 2001, 65–77 and Uebel 2007, chap. 6.

published in 1931.)⁹³ But apart from the political overtones of the introductory and closing passages of the brochure (which Carnap tried to keep as implicit as possible), there is relatively little sloganeering in it. To be sure, it is not written in the thoughtful style of Hahn's opening lecture to the Prague conference—to which Menger once compared it unfavourably (Menger, "Introduction," 1994, xiv)—but in its programmatic pronouncements it is not that much more dogmatic than two of Schlick's claims at the time. First, one year earlier, Schlick likewise had contrasted the popular sense of the rise of a new metaphysics with "the true signs of philosophical reflection in our day" which manifested itself "above all in the sciences themselves, in their methods and principles" and cited with approval Hume's incendiary conclusion to his *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.⁹⁴ And, second, one year later, that "we are at present in the midst of an altogether final change in philosophy, and are justly entitled to consider the fruitless conflict of systems at an end" (Schlick 1930; trans. 1979, 155).

The key to understanding the complaint about the brochure's "advertising style" rather seems to lie in what its present-day reader does not usually get to see. The brochure not only contained the long and detailed bibliography (which reprints and translations tend to drop) but, at the end, it also contained the additional material whose inclusion Neurath had arranged. Schlick's complaint was most likely concerned with these additions and their effect on the overall appearance of the brochure. Consider: 64 pages long, it featured the following. Title page (replicating the cover) on p. 1; copyright notice on p. 2; dedication on p. 3; table of contents on p. 5; preface ("Geleitwort") on p. 7; the text on pp. 9–30; overview of literature and bibliography on pp. 31–58; name index on p. 59; the *Aufruf* of the Verein Ernst Mach, "An alle Freunde der wissenschaftlicher Weltauffassung!" (To all friends of the scientific world conception!), on p. 60; a list of lectures given and planned by the Verein on p. 61; the programme of the Prague Conference on the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences on p. 62; an advance advertisement for two further publications of the Verein, Hahn's "Überflüssige Wesenheiten (Occams Rasiermesser)" and Carnap's "Von Gott und Seele. Scheinfragen der Metaphysik und Theologie," on p. 63; and, besides a notice that all books mentioned in the bibliography can be ordered through

93. See the comments by Schlick to David Rynin, quoted in Stadler 1997, 503.

94. Schlick, 1976; trans. 1979, 132–3 and 135. This Preface was originally written in 1928 for Waismann's exegetical book on Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*, which was to be the first volume of the *Schriften zur wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung* (but only ever appeared posthumously in its much changed 1938 version in 1976).

the publisher of the brochure, an advertisement for one recently published volume, *Die bunte Welt*, and a planned series, *Technik und Menschheit*, of picture-statistical material prepared by the Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsmuseum in Wien (Neurath's Social and Economic Museum in Vienna) on p. 64.⁹⁵ Notably, just under 10% of the brochure was made up of publicity materials.

This suggests why, for Schlick, the brochure lacked the self-contained dignity which any philosophical treatise, no matter how revolutionary, ought to possess: it set out to "sell" its point of view. What to us may appear not particularly remarkable—it was not uncommon practice then and even his own *Erkenntnislehre* featured notices of other literature by his publisher—was for Schlick a major blemish. Not just small print on the last page or the inside back cover but two whole pages in large print advertising books (not even always clearly related to the philosophy espoused) and three pages of text with publicity material for the Verein Ernst Mach—all that seems to have been far too "worldly" for Schlick's sensibility. Now combine Carnap's dawning realization of the problematic nature of this promotional aspect of the brochure for Schlick with the growing suspicion that he had not succeeded in keeping politics and philosophy separate enough on this occasion (and add awareness of the odd mistake in the bibliography)—all this prompted perhaps by Waismann over lunch on 30 September—and Carnap's remark in his letter accompanying the leather-bound copy for Schlick that it was written "with more good will than quality" begins to find an explanation that avoids straying into minor details or undue doctrinal subtlety.

6. An Anticipation of Future Debates

If the above explanation were to hold, what would follow? It is conceivable that Carnap's second thoughts led him to reflect unfavourably on Neurath's inclusion of the publicity materials (which he did not veto when they gave the *imprimatur*). But it seems that even apart from this,

95. The text of the promotional blurb on p. 60 is nearly identical with (in essentials fully identical to) that of a handbill for the founding of the Verein Ernst Mach that is reprinted in Stadler 1997, 332–3. The list of lectures on p. 61 likewise is identical with that on the handbill, albeit with the addition of Hahn's "Überflüssige Wesenheiten (Occam's Rasiermesser)" and the separation of those already given from those yet to come. (Not reprinted in any form in the brochure is the "tear here" subscription slip at the bottom of the handbill). Hahn's "Überflüssige Wesenheiten" was published the following year (trans. Hahn 1980, 1–19), but Carnap's "Von Gott und Seele. Scheinfragen der Metaphysik und Theologie" never appeared and was published only posthumously (in Carnap, 2004).

still before it came to those final arrangements for the brochure, that there did not obtain total agreement between Carnap and Neurath.

Let's enter the dynamic between them with the help of the following passage:

Since the meaning of every statement of science must be statable by reduction to a statement about the given, likewise the meaning of every concept, whatever branch of science it may belong to, must be statable by step-wise reduction to other concepts, down to the concepts of the lowest level which refer directly to the given. . . . Investigations into constitutive theory show that the lowest layers of the the constitutive system contain concepts of the experience and qualities of the individual psyche; in the layer above are physical objects; from these are constituted other minds and lastly the objects of social science. (Anon. 1929, 309.)

This clearly endorses the position of “methodological solipsism” which Carnap adopted in the *Aufbau* of 1928. To distinguish this position from straightforward phenomenalism, Schlick's distinction between cognition (*Erkennen*) and experience (*Erleben*) was adverted to next: objective, intersubjectively sharable knowledge concerned only the structural but not the qualitative aspects of experience.

Note that no mention is here made of the “materialistic construction system” that Carnap envisaged in the *Aufbau* as well (Carnap 1928; trans. 1967, repr. 2002, § 59). Yet in a newspaper article of 13 October 1929, we can read the remark of Neurath's that “all concepts are formed in the same fashion, in which on the basis of certain rules of control everything that is asserted is reduced to singular experiences which everybody can test.”⁹⁶ The formulation is somewhat obscure, but the thought seems to be that all concepts had to observe the requirement of intersubjective intelligibility. This suggests a rather different basic level of the constitution system than that indicated by allusion to the *Aufbau* in the cited passage from the brochure. Relatedly, the published text of Neurath's Prague address speaks of “scientists with a materialist basis,” of “sociology on a materialist basis,” of “materialistic empiricism,” and of “the scientific world conception in a materialistic basis” (Neurath 1930–31; Neurath 1983, 43 and 47). There is clearly some tension here: it seems that even between

96. “. . . eine Art Einheitswissenschaft anzustreben, in der nach einer Weise alle Briefe gebildet werden, in der auf Grund bestimmter Kontrollregeln alles, was man behauptet, auf die Einzelerfahrung zurückgeführt wird, die jeder überprüfen kann” (“Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung,” *Arbeiterzeitung*, Wien, 13. Oktober 1929; repr. in Neurath 1981, 347).

Carnap and Neurath some compromises had to be found to paper over what in fact were the beginnings of their differences in the Vienna Circle's protocol sentence debate over the form, content and status of the evidence statements of science (see Uebel 2007).

May it be that—"for the sake of peace"—Carnap and Neurath at the time agreed that the term "the given" as used in the brochure may, after all, be interpreted in different ways? Compare how Carnap still broached the matter in paper published in early 1932:

For our purposes we may ignore entirely the question concerning the content and form of the primary sentences (protocol sentences). In the theory of knowledge it is customary to say that the primary sentences refer to 'the given', but there is no unanimity on the question what it is that is given. At times the position is taken that sentences about the given speak of the simplest qualities of sense and feeling (e.g. 'warm', 'blue', 'joy' and so forth); others incline to the view that basic sentences refer to total experiences and similarities between them; a still different view has it that even the basic sentences speak of things. Regardless of this diversity of opinion it is certain that a sequence of words has a meaning only if its relations of deducibility to the protocol sentences are fixed, whatever the characteristics of the protocol sentences may be; and similarly, that a word is significant only if the sentences in which it may occur are reducible to protocol sentences. (Carnap 1931–32; trans. 1959, 63.)

The point at issue throughout was to keep talk of meaning related to an empirical basis. Of course, that these reductive claims were too strong—both here and in the brochure—turned out, in the end, to be independent of just what "the given" was conceived to consist of (see Carnap 1936–37). In the light of this, Carnap's and Neurath's compromise—if such it was—may appear well-considered. At the time, however, it certainly helped to support the misleading impression of the Vienna Circle as wholesale foundationalist phenomenalist and to reinforce their reputation as militant neo-Machians—despite the explicit disclaimer in the brochure to that effect (Anon. 1929; trans. 305).

7. The term "wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung"

Lastly, a word on the term "world conception" (*Weltauffassung*) which the Vienna Circle much preferred over "world view" (*Weltanschauung*). Though sometimes mooted to be so, it was not another creation of Neurath's. The book series edited jointly by Frank and Schlick since 1928 carried the title "Schriften zur wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung" (Writ-

ings on the Scientific World-Conception), so the term clearly predates the brochure. Neurath himself, moreover, is on record as claiming that the name stems from Frank and Schlick.⁹⁷ The intent behind the term was to oppose, as Frank would have put it, “school philosophy.”

Both Hahn and Neurath explained the term’s meaning in their lectures to the Conference on the Epistemology of the Exact Sciences in Prague. Hahn put it best:

The name ‘scientific world conception’ is intended both as a confession of faith and as a delimitation of a subject:

It is to *confess our faith* in the methods of the exact sciences, especially mathematics and physics, faith in careful logical inference (as opposed to bold flights of ideas, mystical intuition, and emotive comprehension), faith in the patient observation of phenomena, isolated as much as possible, no matter how negligible and insignificant they may appear in themselves (as opposed to the poetic, imaginative attempt to grasp wholes and complexes, as significant and as all-encompassing as possible).

And it is to *delimit our subject* from philosophy in the usual sense: as a theory about the world claiming to stand next to the special sciences as their equal or superior. For in our opinion, anything that can be said sensibly at all is a proposition of science, and doing philosophy only means examining critically the propositions of the sciences to see if they are not pseudo-propositions, whether they really have the clarity and significance ascribed to them by the practitioners of the science in question; and it means, further, exposing as pseudo-propositions those propositions that pretend to a different, higher significance than the propositions of the special sciences. (Hahn 1930; trans. 1980, 20)

By contrast with “world conception,” the term “world view” (*Weltanschauung*) was, as Frank put it, “loaded with metaphysical connotations” (Frank, “Introduction,” 1949, 38, fn. 24). So the scientific world conception was not to be viewed as one metaphysical world view amongst others, but as nothing more and nothing less than a properly sober, scientific attitude towards cognitive issues. Needless to say, such a claim was no less controversial then than it is today.⁹⁸

It must also be noted that even though he was happy to edit a book se-

97. Neurath to R. von Mises, 3 November 1930. RC 029-14-02 ASP. This contradicts one part of Frank’s own report in his “Introduction,” 1949, 38 (see note 43 above).

98. For some observations concerning “Weltanschauung” in the environment of Carnap’s student years, see Gabriel 2004.

ries with “wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung” in the title, Schlick himself used the term very rarely, if at all. One of these occasions was his Preface to Waismann’s planned volume on Wittgenstein which was to open that series. There “the scientific conception of the world” was called “the true philosophical advancement of mankind” (Schlick 1976, 132). And after noting that this advancement also encompasses psychology and history, Schlick remarked:

So anyone approaching our undertaking with the suspicion that ‘scientific world-conception’ in truth means simply a world-conception one-sidedly confined to the natural sciences, has already received his answer. The notion of a ‘scientific world-conception’ admits of no restrictive narrower definition here.⁹⁹

So Schlick too pledged allegiance to the cause of the unity of science which was celebrated in the manifesto that he found, as we saw, just a bit too crude. Yet anticipatory traces of his dissent can be found already in this Preface of 1928. Note that Schlick stressed, as did neither Frank or Hahn or Neurath, that the scientific world conception was a philosophical affair in a special sense: not a traditional philosophical system—and not unified science—but an activity of “clarifying the propositions that express our knowledge of the world” (Schlick 1976, 138). Clearly, this is a different conception of the scientific world-conception than that professed in the brochure (and Schlick’s later reticence in using the term may be explained accordingly).

8. Concluding Remarks

It would lead too far to investigate further here in what respects beyond the socio-political one Schlick may have felt his own views misrepresented in the brochure. But it is surely significant that Schlick published his own “Die Wende in der Philosophie” (“The Turning Point in Philosophy”) in 1930 as the opening article in the first issue of *Erkenntnis*. It takes no great leap of the imagination to realise that this paper should be considered his own alternative, altogether more Wittgensteinian manifesto (Schlick 1930). Likewise it is notable that when, one year later, Schlick’s former students Feigl and Albert Blumberg ventured to familiarise American colleagues with the new philosophy from Vienna, their presentation relies nearly exclusively on the portrayal of Schlick’s and Wittgenstein’s views, even more so that they did not even mention the doctrine of the unity of science and that their introductory bibliography does not contain

99. Schlick 1976, 135, translation changed from “world-view”: Schlick used “Weltauffassung”.

a reference to *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung*. And even though Feigl's and Schlick's anti-metaphysical tendency is very pronounced, it is expressed as a position within, not as directed against philosophy.¹⁰⁰ Together with other observations made above, this suggests that already in 1929 there existed some of the differences between the residually philosophical and the more scientific factions of the Vienna Circle, differences that only increased over the years and later became known as those between the "more conservative wing" around Schlick and Waismann and the "left wing" which included Carnap, Frank, Hahn and Neurath.¹⁰¹ Clearly, the different participants had different ideas as to what precisely the revolution meant that they were jointly advocating in philosophy.

References

- Anon. 1929. *Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis*. Vienna: Wolf. Trans. "The Scientific Conception of the World: The Vienna Circle." Pp. 299–319 in Neurath 1973.
- Carnap, R. 1936–37. "Testability and Meaning." *Philosophy of Science* 3: 419–471 and 4: 1–40.
- . 1931–32. "Überwindung der Metaphysik durch logische Analyse der Sprache." *Erkenntnis* 2: 219–241. Trans. "The Elimination of the Metaphysics by the Logical Analysis of Language." Pp. 60–81 in A. J. Ayer, ed., *Logical Positivism*. New York: Free Press, 1959.
- . 2004. "Von Gott und Seele. Scheinfragen der Metaphysik und Theologie." Pp. 49–62 in *Scheinfragen in der Philosophie und andere metaphysikkritische Schriften*, ed. by T. Mormann. Hamburg: Meiner.
- . 1963. "Intellectual Autobiography." *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, ed. by P. A. Schilpp. LaSalle, Ill.: Open Court.
- . 1928. *Der Logische Aufbau der Welt*. Berlin: Bernary. Trans. *The Logical Structure of the World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967. Repr. Chicago: Open Court, 2002.
- . 1934. *Die Aufgabe der Wissenschaftslogik*. Wien: Gerold. Trans. "The Task of the Logic of Science." Pp. 46–66 and 282–285 in McGuinness 1987.
- . 1935. *Die Logische Syntax der Sprache*. Vienna: Springer. Trans. *Logical Syntax of Language*. London: Kegan and Paul, 1937. Repr. Chicago: Open Court, 2002.

100. Feigl and Blumberg 1931. The introductory bibliography is given in the first footnote there.

101. The first use of these expressions in publications was Carnap 1936–37, 422, and 1963, 57–58.

- Feigl, H., and A. Blumberg. 1931. "Logical Positivism. A New Movement in European Philosophy." *Journal of Philosophy* 28: 281–296.
- . 1969. "The Wiener Kreis in America." *The Intellectual Migration 1930–1960*, D. Fleming and B. Baylin, eds. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Repr. in Feigl, H. *Inquiries and Provocations. Selected Writings, 1929–1974*, ed. by R. S. Cohen. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1981.
- . 1969. "The Origin and Spirit of Logical Positivism." *The Legacy of Logical Positivism*, P. Achinstein and S. F. Barker, eds. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press. Repr. in Feigl, 1981.
- Frank, P. 1929. "Was bedeuten die gegenwärtigen physikalischen Theorien für die allgemeine Erkenntnislehre?" *Die Naturwissenschaften* 17: 971–977 and 987–984. Trans. "Physical Theories of the 20th Century and School Philosophy." Pp. 90–121 in Frank 1949.
- . 1949. *Modern Science and its Philosophy*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gabriel, Gottfried. 2004. "Carnap Brought Home." Pp. 3–20 in S. Awodey and C. Klein, eds., *Carnap Brought Home: The View from Jena*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Goller, P., and G. Oberkofler, eds. 2000. "Otto Neurath-Walter Hollitscher. Briefwechsel (1934–1941)." Pp. 141–210 in H. Hautmann, ed., *Die Alfred Klahr Gesellschaft und ihr Archiv. Beiträge zur österreichischen Geschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna: Alfred Klahr Gesellschaft.
- Hahn, H. 1930. "Die Bedeutung der wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung, insbesondere für Mathematik und Physik." *Erkenntnis* 1: 96–105. Trans. "The Significance of the Scientific World View [sic!], especially for Mathematics and Physics." Pp. 20–30 in Hahn, *Empiricism, Logic and Mathematics*, ed. by B. McGuinness. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980.
- . 1930. *Überflüssige Wesenheiten (Occam's Rasiermesser)*. Vienna: Wolf. Trans. "Superfluous Entities, or Occam's Razor." Pp. 1–19 in Hahn 1980.
- Haller, R. 1984. "Was Wittgenstein a Neopositivist?" *Fundamentae Scientiae* 5. Repr. pp. 27–43 in Haller, *Questions on Wittgenstein*. Routledge, London, 1988.
- . 1986. *Fragen zu Wittgenstein und Aufsätze zur Österreichischen Philosophie*. Rodopi: Amsterdam.
- . 1993. *Neopositivismus. Eine historische Einführung in die Philosophie des Wiener Kreises*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hegselmann, R., and G. Sigwart. 1991. "Zur Geschichte der 'Erkenntnis'." *Erkenntnis* 35: 461–471.

- Kraft, Viktor. 1950. *Der Wiener Kreis*. Vienna: Springer. Trans. *The Vienna Circle*, New York: Philosophical Library, 1953.
- Manninen, Juha. 2001. "Das verbotene Buch des Wiener Kreises." *Topos* 17: 65–77.
- McGuinness, B., ed. 1987. *Unified Science*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Menger, Karl. 1994. *Reminiscences of the Vienna Circle and the Mathematical Colloquium*, ed. by L. Golland, B. McGuinness, A. Sklar. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- . 1982. "Memories of Moritz Schlick." Pp. 83–103 in E. T. Gadol, ed., *Rationality and Science*. Vienna-New York: Springer.
- Mises, R. v. 1930. "Über kausale und statistische Gesetzmässigkeit in der Physik." *Die Naturwissenschaften* 18: 145–153.
- Mulder, Henk. 1968. "Wissenschaftliche Weltauffassung. Der Wiener Kreis." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 6: 386–390.
- Neurath, O. 1930–31. "Wege der wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung." *Erkenntnis* 1: 106–125. Trans. "Ways of the Scientific World Conception." Pp. 32–47 in Neurath, *Philosophical Papers*, ed. by R. C. Cohen and M. Neurath. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1983.
- . 1928. "Gründung des 'Verein Ernst Mach.'" *Der Pionier* 3, no. 12: 9–10.
- . 1928. "R. Carnap, *Der Logische Aufbau der Welt* und *Scheinprobleme der Philosophie*." *Der Kampf* 21. Repr. pp. 295–297 in Neurath, *Gesammelte philosophische und methodologische Schriften*, ed. by R. Haller and H. Rutte. Vienna: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1981.
- . 1930. "Verein 'Ernst Mach,' Wien." *Erkenntnis* 1: 74.
- . 1933. *Einheitswissenschaft und Psychologie*. Vienna: Gerold. Trans. "Unified Science and Psychology." Pp. 1–23 and 274–278 in McGuinness 1987.
- . 1973. *Empiricism and Sociology*, M. Neurath and R. S. Cohen, Eds. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Popper-Lynkeus, Josef. 1912. *Die allgemeine Nährpflicht als Lösung der sozialen Frage*. 2nd shortened ed., Mikola: Vienna, 1923.
- . 1878. *Das Recht zu leben und die Pflicht zu sterben*. Vienna. 4th ed. Vienna: Röwith, 1924.
- Reichenbach, H. 1931. *Ziele und Wege der heutigen Naturphilosophie*. Leipzig: Meiner.
- Schlick, M. 1930. "Die Wende in der Philosophie." *Erkenntnis* 1: 4–11. Trans. "The Turning Point in Philosophy." Pp. 154–160 in Schlick, *Philosophical Papers vol. 2*, ed. by H. Mulder and B. van de Velde-Schlick. Dordrecht: Reidel, 1979.
- . 1976. "Vorwort zu Friedrich Waismann, *Logik, Sprache, Philosophie. Kritik der Philosophie*." Pp. 11–23 in F. Waismann, *Logik,*

- Sprache, Philosophie*, ed. by G. P. Baker and B. McGuinness. Stuttgart: Reclam. Trans. "Preface to Friedrich Waismann, *Logik, Sprache, Philosophie. Kritik der Philosophie*." Pp. 130–138 in Schlick, 1979.
- Sommerfeld, A. 1929. "Einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zur Wellenmechanik." *Physikalische Zeitschrift* 30: 866–870.
- Stadler, Friedrich. 1982. *Vom Positivismus zur Wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung*. Vienna: Löcker.
- . 1979. "Aspekte des gesellschaftlichen Hintergrunds und Standort der Wiener Kreises am Beispiel der Universität Wien." *Wittgenstein, der Wiener Kreis und der Kritische Rationalismus*, ed. by H. Berghel, A. Hübner and E. Köhler. Vienna Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. Trans. "Aspects of the Social Background and Position of the Vienna Circle at the University of Vienna." Pp. 51–79 in *Rediscovering the Forgotten Vienna Circle*, ed. by T. E. Uebel. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991.
- . 1997. *Studien zum Wiener Kreis*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp. Trans. *The Vienna Circle. Studies in the Origins, Development and Influence of Logical Empiricism*. Vienna-New York: Springer, 2001.
- Uebel, Thomas. 2007. *Empiricism at the Crossroads. The Vienna Circle's Protocol Sentence Debate*. Chicago: Open Court.