Annals of the Academy of Romanian Scientists
Series on Philosophy, Psychology, Theology and Journalism
Online ISSN 2067 – 113X Volume **6**, Number **1–2/2014**

PAUL FEYERABEND AND THE FORGOTTEN 'THIRD VIENNA CIRCLE'[*]

Friedrich STADLER[**]

Abstract. The study contradicts the image of Feyerabend as a herald of postmodern "anything goes" and as destroyer of rational philosophy and anarchist, in an approach of the formative intellectual socialization of Feyerabend in Vienna, until his move to England and America. It shows a deep rootedness in the Austrian tradition of philosophy and science, which can be detected up tohis return to Europe. At the same time, the text presents a consistent intellectual profile that tracks the empirically oriented complementarity of science and art and science of history and philosophy of science toward an abstract, normative philosophy of science at various levels, with a loose agenda. This is conceived in the form of a historically oriented tbsrelativism and aims rather to interpret Feyerabend's contribution as a continuation of the productive approaches spilled into the History and Philosophy of Science since Mach than considering his work a big break or settlement with the philosophy of science, as evidenced also inFeyerabend's notes, in his autobiography.

Keywords: Feyerabend, rationalism, empiricism, relativism, Vienna Circle, Austrian philosophy.

Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994): "The Worst Enemy of Science"?

Even though many years have passed since his death, Paul Feyerabend continues to be discussed – by philosophers and the scientific community – but he is also the subject of a broader public debate. Especially in the German-speaking world, his image as an *enfant terrible* of philosophy continues to be nourished by fragments that have appeared posthumously (Feyerabend 2005). His image remains a complex and contradictory one. As an icon of 'anti-science' or 'worst enemy of science' (cf. *Nature* 1987/ *Scientific American* 1993) his oeuvre has assumed a *life* of its own, and his name has become a popular instrument for polarizing different camps in intellectual debates.

While his work continues to be studied since the publication of his successful book *Against Method* (Feyerabend 1975), it is surprising that the period preceding it has hardly been examined with the exception of a few studies (e.g., Haller 1997, Hochkeppel 2006; and only recently after completion of my German

[*] Friedrich Stadler (ed.): *Vertreibung, Transformation und Rückkehr der Wissenschaftstheorie. Am Beispiel von Rudolf Carnap und Wolfgang Stegmüller*, 2010, pp. 169-188.

[**] Professor PhD, Vienna University, founder and director of Vienna Circle Institute.

version: Radler 2006, Oberheim 2006). This is even more extraordinary in view of the fact that this phase was decisive for his intellectual development. One can even say that the later Feyerabend returned to the early subjects of his Vienna period. In short, there are more continuities than ruptures in his biography and more consistencies than contradictions in the theoretical aspects of Feyerabend's philosophical work.

My main argument is directed against the usual research trend of an exclusive poststructuralist interpretation (as evident, for instance, in a workshop in Paris on *Against Method:* Grebovicz 2006). I claim that throughout his whole life Feyerabend was actually a philosopher from Vienna or a Viennese philosopher in spite of some significant intellectual developments – even if he himself may not have subscribed to this statement. Moreover, I would also argue that even after he left Vienna he remained closely bound to Austrian philosophy and the Central European tradition of science, so that it is difficult to understand his intellectual development without this context. This was already confirmed in his selective autobiography *Killing Time* (1994), which given his focus and his diction by means of which he sought to consolidate his identity – like any other self-portrayal – is problematic if it is the *sole* source of information and often results in misleading cliches. However, there can be no doubt that the main themes and issues of his writings are already present here, even if the impressionistic arrangement of fragmentary memories culminates in an autobiography with a teleological slant. In the following this will be briefly illustrated from a biographical and philosophical perspective.

Feyerabend in Vienna: The Forgotten "Third Vienna Circle" 1947-1954

After a brief sojourn in Germany (Weimar) during which he pursued artistic interests, Feyerabend returned to Vienna and began studying at the University of Vienna in 1947. He first enrolled in history and sociology, and then later began studying physics with Hans Thirring, Karl Przibram and Felix Ehrenhaft and philosophy with Alois Dempf and in particular with Viktor Kraft. (See Feyerabend 1995, 87-110.)

The young student's intellectual development was significantly influenced by an important institutional international platform, i.e., the "Austrian College / Forum Alpbach" founded in 1945 by the two brothers Fritz and Otto Molden in the context of the US cultural policy in the Cold War period (with OSS/CIA and the "Congress of Cultural Freedon"). This forum, which still exists today, initiated a number of activities and events (Molden 1981; Auer 1994). Here Feyerabend for the first time came into contact, as of 1948, with philosophers of science, most of whom lived in exile, and with the rest of the scientific community, including Karl Popper, Friedrich A. von Hayek, Hans Albert and with members of the former Vienna Circle, e.g., Rudolf Carnap, Herbert Feigl, and Philipp Frank. Even for

Wolfgang Stegmuller, who did not succeed in getting a position in Austria, Alpbach provided an entry to the international network of philosophers and scientists.

Within the context of this unique forum that contributed to making scientific and cultural life less provincial at the beginning of the Second Republic, a separate "working group for natural philosophy" was founded. The so-called "Kraft Circle" organized regular discussions and publications from 1948 to 1954. Viktor Kraft was the academic director and Feyerabend served as the students' speaker. If one looks at the list of participants from Austria and abroad and the reception of this group it is not an exaggeration to refer to it as the "Third Vienna Circle". To date, this circle has hardly received any recognition (Stadler 2006). The members of this circle included Bela Juhos, Walter Hollitscher, Ernst Topitsch as well as students such as Johnny Sagan, Heinrich Eichhorn, Goldberger de Buda, Peter Schiske, Erich Jantsch as well as visitors from abroad such as Elisabeth Anscombe, Emil J. Walter, Georg Henrik von Wright, Edgar Tranekjaer-Rasmussen and the prominent visitor (at least one time) Ludwig Wittgenstein (in 1950). In his memoirs Feyerabend comments on this as follows: Kraft was a leading member of the Vienna Circle. Like Thirring he was forced to retire after the "Anschluss" (annexation) of Austria. He was a mediocre speaker but a brilliant and thoughtful thinker. He anticipated some ideas that were later ascribed to Popper...

He knew most of us from the seminar and expressed a desire to meet regularly. This is how the Kraft Circle evolved, a sort of student counterpart to the old Vienna Circle. We were given a room on Kolingasse, the office of the Austrian College, and met twice a month. We discussed concrete scientific theories. For instance, we devoted five sessions to non-Einsteinian interpretations of the Lorentz transformations. Our main topic was the question as to the existence of an external world. (Feyerabend 1995,104)

In retrospect, Feyerabend criticized the view of science as a system of statements based on his reading of the journal *Erkenntnis.* Broadly speaking, this position was related to the attempts to legitimize a critical and constructive realism with a hypothetic-deductive methodology, wliich Kraft had already addressed in his monograph *Die Grundformen der wissenschaftkchen Methoden* (1925). (On Kraft, in comparison to Feyerabend, see recendy Radler 2006).

All of these discussions are very clearly reflected in Feyerabend's (still unpublished) dissertation titled *Zur Theorie der Basissate* (*On the Theory of Basic Statements*, 1951), for which Kraft had served as advisor. In his CV, which Feyerabend had submitted with the papers for his dissertation defense, he describes his personal motivation and the background of the subject. In the following the translation of this important document reads:

I, Paul Feyerabend, was born in Vienna on January 13, 1924, where I attended primary and secondary school. My interest in philosophy was based on

my intense interest in the natural sciences. The books I read included those by Duhem, Mach and Dingier. 1942 to 1945: military service, followed by a year in the military hospital; one year of study at the state Music University in Weimar. I then moved back to Vienna. One semester of history and art history, six semesters of astronomy, physics and mathematics, before finally switching to philosophy. In this connection the discussions conducted in a small circle directed by Prof. Kraft in the style of the Vienna Circle which dealt primarily with issues related to theory of science were very useful. Here, with the inspiration I received from Prof. Popper (London School of Economics), I became interested in the subject I was to deal with in my dissertation. Since 1948 I had had the opportunity to take part in discussions from which I was able to benefit a lot for the final version of this dissertation. I benefited the most from my discussions with Prof. Walter Hollitscher (Berlin). If not from his arguments then through his repeated encouragement to verify more precisely my philosophical views and to substantially correct them (from the Machian positivism to the position I took here). I also benefited from my discussions with Mrs. Anscombe (Cambridge) on the problems of UG [= Untersuchungsgegenstand/subject of investigation, F.S.]. At that time she presented to me a number of formulations diat struck me as being completely incomprehensible and which accompanied me for a long time in an unresolved fashion (as well as several formulations that I had picked up from a discussion with L. Wittgenstein who participated in an evening discussion in Kraft's circle.)

Over the course of time, I found ways to understand these ideas - less through reflection than through an unconscious process of development. They are presented in my dissertation. Today they seem to me to be the right interpretation of those formulations (which does not have to meant that this interpretation is historically correct). I was able to discuss the basic ideas of an earlier version in a lecture I gave to the philosophical society in Uppsala (Sweden) and in small circle in Copenhagen with Prof. Marc-Wogau and Prof. Joergensen (with the latter I also had some private discussions. I am much indebted to both discussions.

Prof. Kraft drew my attention to some dreadful confusion in an earlier version as well as to several ambiguities.

I am very indebted to Prof. Tranekjaer-Rasmussen (Copenhagen) for some significant aspects of the basic position. He allowed me to read two still unpublished manuscripts, which elaborate on what he only alluded to in a lecture given at Alpbach in 1948 (to which there have also been numerous references.).

I hope that I will soon be able to discover a theory of physical knowledge on the basis of this (still incomplete) preliminary study." (signed: Paul Feyerabend)

According to the dissertation defense file no. 18.107 of the University of Vienna, this decisive study by Feyerabend, which to date has hardly received recognition was fully approved by the first reader Viktor Kraft who wrote the following:

The dissertation shows extraordinary talent. This is already reflected in the curriculum vitae which does not fit the normal mold at all. The subject of the dissertation is the role that perception statements play in the empirical sciences which has been discussed in modern empiricism. The studies of the dissertation, however, go far beyond this fundamental task in that from there address the definition of the subjects of physics and of the non-physical sciences, in particular, psychology, and thus resolve the opposition of phenomenalism and physicalism. It is the fundamental vantage point of the study to clearly distinguish between two different types of perception statements. On the one hand, the description of perception statements as characterized by an immediately given central function, and on the other hand, its verifying function. With regard to the former, the role of perception is defined as prompting a certain statement; it is exhausted in merely exerting a function of motivation. This way, the content-statement also becomes understandable from experience. However, a perception assertion is not logically distinguished from another one, it does not obtain this way any absolutely certain validity as the theory of "Konstarierung" assumes. like any other scientific statement it has to be verified. This procedure of verification is analyzed in detail and a separate theory of reliable observation developed. Thus the author opposes, with extensive criticism of the dominant view that the percepdon statement constitutes the logical foundation of empirical knowledge. He points to the indispensable condition that it is always one theory that establishes the foundation for making use of perception statements. Only within a theory does it assume a specific logical function. Basically, the results of this study deserve recognition for the following reasons: they are new and are really of lasting value. The reflections are on an exceptionally high level, and especially in the final part of the dissertation they show logical perspicacity, and are often developed logistically. The author is extremely well versed with the relevant Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian literature. However, he also refers to the original passages of classical philosophers. Given the wealth of questions addressed, his presentation is very condensed and often based on so many prerequisites that his ideas are not always easily accessible. The study thus stands out from the average dissertations and must thus be given the highest mark.

Vienna, June 12, 1951

(signed: V. Kraft, F. Kainz)

The final exams in the subjects of philosophy and psychology with the examiners Viktor Kraft, Friedrich Kainz and Hubert Rohracher received "outstanding mention" and his one-hour exam in physics was also deemed as being "outstanding" by Hans Thirring and E. Schmid.

What stands out here, in epistemological terms, is Feyerabend's unique reconstruction of the basic statement problem, including the protocol statement

debate, in the Vienna Circle, taking into account die contemporary experimental-psychological research with a precise reformulation of the Duhem-Neurath-Quine diesis regarding die fundamental dieoreticity ot all empirical statements, that is to say a modern discussion of the Quinean "Two Dogmas of Empiricism" (1951). Indeed, the archives of the Austrian College contain a manuscript by Feyerabend titled "Die Dogmen des Logischen Empirismus" (*The Dogmas of Logical Empiricism*) on which a lecture given the same year was based, (cf. Stegmuller 1993).

In the years 1949-52, Feyerabend traveled abroad - first to Scandinavia where he met with Louis Hjelmslev, Tranekjaer-Rasmussen, Joergen Joergensen, Konrad Marc-Wogau, Anders(?) Wedberg and others. In this connection it must also be noted that the intense scientific communication between Central Europe and the Northern countries since 1900 – as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon world – shows a considerable, yet hardly noticed reciprocal continuity before, during and after World War 2. This communication thus represents an exception in connection with the *Cultural Exodus of Logical Empiricism.* The major role played by Eino Kaila and Arne Naess is illustrative of this "Nordic connection" which has been neglected by historians. It was also evident in the journal edited by Ake Petzall *(Theoria,* 1935 ff) and is continued to the present day by]aakko Hintikka and his students (Hintikka 2006). It is also no coincidence that Kaila visited the Schlick Circle on several occasions and in his writings criticized the so-called "logistic neo-positivism" (1930) in the spirit of an epistemological realism, but also in agreement with Kraft. By the same token, Arne Naess' early study of Neurath and Carnap in his dissertation and in *Erkenntnis und ivissenschaftliches Verhalten* (1936) seems to be an anticipation of Feyerabend's skepticism vis-a-vis science as a system of statements. Nevertheless, Feyerabend was not exactly accepted as a "hero of the greens" by Naess, who was later to become the philosopher of the ecological movement. (Naess 1980). Naess also happened to be die one who made a futile attempt to organize the sixth – and last – "International Congress for the Unity of Science" in Oslo after die Second World War erupted. The second congress had taken place in Copenhagen in 1936 under the aegis of Niels Bohr and Joergensen). The themes Nordic philosophers were interested in – such as realism/materialism vs. phenomenalism and the relationship of psychology and philosophy ("psychologism") – were those that also played an eminent role in the classical Vienna Circle of Schlick's group and the Third Vienna Circle. Feyerabend was also to a lesser or greater extent interested in these themes.

At the initiative of Kraft, who already had emeritus status at the time, Arthur Pap (1921-1959) was invited to the Philosophy Department of the University of Vienna as a Fulbright visiting professor in 1953/54. This permitted a short-lived revival of analytic philosophy in the tradition of the exiled logical empiricism. (Pap 1955). The promising philosopher hired the highly talented Paul Feyerabend

as his assistant. The latter edited the Pap's lecture manuscripts for the book *A.nalytische Erkenntnistheorie. Kritische Ubersicht u'ber die neueste Entwickhtng in den USA und England,* which was published in 1955 by Springer Verlag. This book – "dedicated to the Vienna Circle as a commemoration and a revival" – was a reconstruction and critical further development of scientific and analytical philosophy in the wake of the exodus of Logical Empiricism – by the way, also written by an emigrant whose family had been forced to move from Switzerland (Zurich) to the US because of their Jewish background and for political reasons.

There, Pap studied at Columbia University and at Yale, also with Ernst Cassirer, Ernest Nagel and Charles Stevenson. Later he came into contact with Rudolf Carnap and Herbert Feigl, with whom he maintained a life-long friendship. Before this, he has also translated Kraft's *Der Wiener Kreis* into English (1953) and after his return to the States in 1955, he had a research stint at Feigl's "Minnesota Center for Philosophy of Science" before he succeeded Carl G. Hempel at Yale. His last book only appeared after his premature death under the title *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* (1962).

Arthur Pap who at that time, even at his young age, was already a renowned representative of analytic philosophy, had hoped – in vain – to receive a permanent academic position at the University of Vienna. His unexpected death at the age of 28 was due to an insidious kidney illness (Keupink/Shie 2006) – by the way, a similar tragic life as that of F. P. Ramsey.

If he had been able to stay in Vienna his presence may have ensured a longer influence of the "Third Vienna Circle" and possibly a position for Feyerabend. The latter (who had originally wanted to study with Wittgenstein) had studied with Karl Popper at LSE in 1952 who wanted to hire him as an assistant. Feyerabend did not accept his offer but he did translate Popper's voluminous oeuvre *Open Society* into German. One of the first reviews of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* in the context of Austrian philosophy (Ernst Mach, Heinrich Gomperz) is another result of these activities. His first academic position in Bristol (UK) – together wit Stephan Korner – in 1955 marked the beginning of Feyerabend's international career and also de facto the end of the short-lived revival of the Vienna Circle during the Second Republic, even though his contacts with Vienna and Alpbach were never to be severed. Before he left he wrote an unpublished, informative and balanced manuscript on the "Geisteswissenschaften in Osterreich" (Humanities in Austria, 1954), in which, in a chapter on philosophy, he presents a very detailed description of the specificities and deficits of the post-war era.

That same year, Feyerabend was able – through Pap's intervention – to meet Herbert Feigl (1902-1988) in Vienna, which was to be decisive for his further career and the "Vienna Circle in America" (Feigl 1968/69) at the Minnesota Center. In the *festschrift* for Feigl that he edited together with Grover Maxwell, he writes:

I first met Herbert Feigl in 1954, in the pleasant and stimulating atmosphere of a Vienna coffeehouse. I was then an assistant to Arthur Pap, who had come to Vienna to lecture on analytic philosophy and who hoped, perhaps somewhat unrealistically, that he would be able to revive what was left from the great years of the Vienna Circle and the analytic tradition there... After a lecture, which frequently turned into a heated debate with the attending metaphysicians, we would both retire to the professors' room in the philosophy department and discus? what had just happened. Pap was alternately depressed and incensed what he thought was the impertinence of those who approached philosophical problems without any knowledge of logic and of analytical techniques, and he contrasted their easily produced Sprachttaumereien with the much more modest results which analytic philosophers had achieved by hard work (1966, 3).

One final manifestation of the philosophical subculture of the Kraft Circle was his *festschrift* which – edited by Ernst Topitsch (1960) – for the last time brought together students and disciples of Kraft in a remarkable volume on *Problems of Philosophy of Science,* including, Hans Albert, Franz Austeda, Rudolf Freundlich, Bela Juhos, Hubert Schleichert, Wolfgang Stegmuller, Emil J. Walter. Even Feyerabend figured among the contributors, dealing with a central theme of the Kraft Circle: "The Problem of the Existence of Theoretical Entities" (published in Feyerabend 1999). This discussion to be conducted over many years was triggered by Herbert Feigl's article "Existential Hypotheses: Realistic vs. Phenomenalistic Interpretations" (1950) which was largely a justification of "empirical realism". In Feigl's postscript (1981) a continuity of realism in the philosophy of science becomes visible as a variant of Logical Empiricism since the early Schlick and can be traced in contemporary science all the way up to Wilfrid Sellars, whose relevant contributions he favored the most. Feyerabend, who already received a call to Berkeley in 1958, once again addressed the relation of theoretical and observation concepts on the basis of a correspondence theory with a causal theory of experience: "This is the solution which we suggest for the problem of theoretical entities: each observation language contains theoretical elements (tills is a result of the renunciation of sense data)." Feyerabend 1960,70)

Austrian College / Forum Alpbach and the "Minnesota Center for Philosophy of Science" 1945-1965

The parallel philosophical initiative accompanying the Kraft Circle was die above-mentioned "Forum Alpbach" of the "Austrian College". There, in the first decade, an innovative renaissance of exiled scientists took place in a dialogue between Austrian philosophers and visiting scholars from abroad. Thus, for a short time, there was a sort of alternative intellectual forum which represented a contrast to the conservative-clerical "long fifties" of the Cold War (Hanisch 1995).

The contemporaneous presence of both traditional philosophers and liberal Hayek, Machlup, Haberler) and neo-Marxist (Adorno, Horkheimer, Marcuse, Bloch) thinkers resulted in a strong revival of the emigrant's science - including nine Nobel prize laureates. Highlights of the annual meetings regarding philosophy of science were the appearances of Rudolf Carnap (1964), Herbert Feigl (1961, 1964), Philipp Frank (1955) and Karl Popper (regularly from 1948), with Erwin Schrodinger figuring as a regular guest in the midst of the *"Intellectual Province"* (1965) of the post-war vears. While it is not easy to reconstruct the history of reception, there is at least one striking manifestation: the book series titled "Wissenschaftstheorie, Wissenschaft jnd Pliilosophie" (Philosophy of Science, Science and Philosophy) edited by Simon Moser together with Otto Molden, the founder of the Forum Alpbach, published by Vieweg Verlag (Braunschweig). In this book series important selected writing by scholars such as Hans Reichenbach, Imre Lakatos, Heinz v. Foerster, as well as Feyerabend's *Philosophical Papers* appeared in two volumes: *Der wissenschaftstheoretische Realismus und die Autoritat der Wissenschaften* (1978) and *Probleme des Empirismus* (1981). In his autobiography (97ff.) Feyerabend described the role of Alpbach and of the Austrian College which he attended for the first time in 1948 for his intellectual development:

The society had been founded in 1945 on the initiative of Otto Molden, Fritz Molden ... and other members of the Austrian resistance. In his book Der andere Zauberberg (The Other Magic Mountain) Otto Molden describes the ideas and events which led up to the first meeting in Alpbach, a small village near Brixlegg in Tyrol. Alpbach soon became an international center of intellectual, artistic and economic exchange. A student who had lunch here could find a seat next to Lise Meitner, Bruno Kreisky or Dirac. He could bump into Arthur Kostler, Anneliese Maier or Ernst Krenek ... I visited Alpbach about fifteen times, first as a student, then as an instructor and finally, on three occasions, as the head of a seminar.

On his first visit in August 1948, the young student already met Karl Popper who made a great impression on him compared to the German professors. This early appreciation was also reciprocal as was evidenced by Popper's later offer to Feyerabend to serve as his assistant at LSE.

In Alpbach the radical thinker also met two Austrian philosophers and communists – Hans Grumm (1992) and Walter Hollitscher (Klahr Gesellschaft 2001) – who were to win over Feyerabend for realism. It was mainly with Schlick's student Hollitscher, who at that time was still a psychoanalyst and philosopher, that he maintained a deep intellectual friendship until the end of his life in spite of political differences. Feyerabend recalls the influence (1995, 100 f.):

Walter Hollitscher needed two years to convince me that circularity represents a gain and a practical enrichment and not a disadvantage. Walter showed me that scientific research can be conducted with realistic concepts. 1

answered that scientists unfortunately had not given up their metaphysical eggshells. Independent of metaphysics scientists had results to show which were accepted by everyone, Walter said: this is also true for the positivists, whereas an antiseptic language and a rigid logic would not lead us forward. The argument made me fall silent for a while but a bit of doubt still remained. Walter moved from physics to politics and that meant: Marx and Lenin. On this issue 1 resisted his deliberations like a stubborn donkey.

Thanks to Hollitscher Feyerabend also came into contact with Bertolt Brecht whose offer to become his assistant in Berlin he rejected – something he later described as the greatest mistake of his life.

In a letter to Hollitscher (Sept. 5, 1977) Feyerabend defended himself against the reproach of irrationalism in *Against Method:*

All professional critics of science have jumped at my jokes and analyzed these in philosophical terms, but no one has discussed what prompted these jokes, i.e., the historical material, and some have even claimed that they do not have anything to do with the subject at hand (i.e., theory of science, history of science). ... The main argument of the book, which I never formulate explicitly is: the appraisal of methodological (and logical) rules should be left to concrete research. Scholars invent and study material as well as intellectual instruments of measurement. Of course, the abstract reflections of philosophers are taken into account but they are not considered to be useful because there are philosophical or logical arguments for their "rationality". This idea is not new at all, but apparently many philosophers of science are not familiar with it.

In Alpbach Feyerabend was very quickly involved in the conference activities. In 1955, the physicist and philosopher of science Philipp Frank, once a prominent member of the Vienna Circle and an Einstein biographer came to Alpbach from Harvard (Reisch 2004) to lead the "Erkenntnis and Handlung" (Knowledge and Action) study group.

Feyerabend describes this as follows (1955, 140):

Philipp Frank was a joy. He was very educated, intelligent, witty and a skillful narrator. When he had the choice between explaining a problem with a story or an analytic proof he always opted for the story. Some philosophers did not like that at all. But they always failed to recognize that science is also a storj', not a logical problem. Frank elaborated that the Aristotelian objections against Copernikus converged with empiricism, whereas Galilei's law of inertia does not. As in other cases, this remark lay nascent in my mind for years. Then it began to grow. The Galilei chapters in *Against Method* are a late outgrowth of this idea.

Even though, in the case of Alpbach – as opposed to the Kraft Circle – we cannot speak of a uniform trend in philosophy of science, but the regular discussion of philosophy, science and Weltanschauung, and its reciprocal influences and foundations, in the context of an international forum was certainly

one of the prime factors determining the re-transfer or the new beginning of modern philosophy of science in Austria/Germany after World War 2:

Particularly important was the fact that representatives of philosophy and of the individual disciplines who had emigrated from Austria and other European countries in the 1930s especially because of the political developments and had, in the meantime, found international recognition, came to Alpbach – for instance, the philosophers Karl Popper, Herbert Feigl, Rudolf Carnap, Philipp Frank, Walter Kaufmann, Karl Lowith, Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, and Ernst Bloch, the legal expert and legal philosopher Hans Kelsen, the sociologist Theodor Geiger, the economists Friedrich August von Hayek, Fritz Machlup and Gottfried Haberler. They met there with younger scholars such as Wolfgang Stegmuller, Ernst Topitsch, Paul Feyerabend, Bernulf Kanitscheider, Paul Weingartner, Karl Acham, and Rudolf Wohlgenannt, who showed interest for their works. And they could also talk with representatives from the Eastern Bloc who were happy to take advantage of this occasion (Albert 1994, 18).

In his description of a 2nd generation philosopher of science who himself had been .i participant it becomes plausible how the local culture of science had, thanks to a younger generation of Austrian philosophers, exerted a rather strong influence - which in the case of Feyerabend and Stegmuller can be illustrated particularly well. Stegmuller 1979; see also: http://univie.ac.at/ivc/stegmueller.

After leaving Austria in 1956 Feyerabend led a study group “Stetige und unstetige Yeranderungen in der Natur” (Permanent and non-permanent changes in nature) and, together with Herbert Feigl, a study group on “Grundlagenforschung und Lmzelforschung” (Basic research and individual research) (1964). Still in 1965, he conducted a study group with the title “Philosophy of the exact natural sciences”.

Especially Herbert Feigl, Schlick's student, who had emigrated to America already in 1931, was to become one of Feyerabend's most important philosophical influences. As mentioned above, Feyerabend had met Feigl through Pap in Vienna in 1954. After Feyerabend's appointment in Berkeley Feigl was particularly important for Feyerabend as his host at the “Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science” (which Feigl had founded and run from 1953 on). Feyerabend's sojourns at the MCPS (1957, 1959) had brought forth his essays “Explanation, Reduction and Empiricism” (1962) and - most important enough - the first version of “Against Method” (1970) which went unnoticed for a long time. During this time he also wrote his biographical sketch of Feigl in *xht festschrift* that he co-edited with Grover Maxwell: *Mind, Matter and Method. Essays in Philosophy of Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl* (1966). All of these texts are informative documents of this reception to be explored. Herein Feyerabend confirms the impact of Feigl's “Existential Hypotheses” in the Kraft Circle after even Wittgenstein's personal appearance could not convince him on the problem of the external world (Feyerabend 1966, 4):

It was at this stage of confusion and uncertainty that our attention focused on Feigl's "Existential Hypotheses". Our debates now took a completely different turn. This paper, taken together with Kraft's own contributions and with the ideas which Popper had explained to us on the occasion of his visits to the Alpbach Summer University in the summers of 1948 and 1949, greatly diminished our doubts about realism. There were still some points, which were not entirely clear, and I hoped for an opportunity to discuss the matter with Feigl in person. Another problem that had come up with the *realism-positivism* issue concerned the application of the calculus of probabilities.

Feyerabend's first meeting with Feigl in Vienna in 1954, where he discussed die issue of applying probability impressed the former because of Feigl's convincing common sense style in the context of a philosophical realism (preferring Popper as opposed to Wittgenstein.) It was also not surprising that Feyerabend was to be a guest at the Minnesota Center twice, whose intellectual climate he describes as follows (Feyerabend 1966, 9):

The atmosphere at the Center, and especially Feigl's own attitude, his humor, his eagerness to advance philosophy and to get at least a glimpse of the truth, and his quite incredible modesty, made impossible from the very beginning that subjective tension that occasionally accompanies debate and diat is liable to turn individual contributions into proclamations of faith rather than into answers to questions chosen. The critical attirude was not absent, on the contrary, one now felt free to voice basic disagreements in clear, sharp, straightforward fashion. The discussions were, and still are, in many respects similar to the earlier discussion in the Vienna Circle. The differences are that things are seen now to be much more complex than was originally thought and that there is much less confidence that a single, comprehensive empirical philosophy might emerge.

This general description obscures how productive Feyerabend was at die MCPS under the direction of Feigl with whom he corresponded from 1957 to 1968. The following manuscripts can be found at the center (cf. "The Book", Walter Library, University of Minnesota):

1955: Carnap's Theory of Interpretation of Theoretical Systems
A Note on Carnap's New Criterion of Empirical Science
1957: Replies to Hempel and Carnap
1957: On the Quantum Theory of Measurement ... Appendix
1958: An Attempt at a Realistic Interpretation of Theoretical Knowledge Complementarity; Reply to A. Griinbaum; Some further Comments on Conventionality in Geometry (ad Reichenbach); Further Notes on Conventionalism; Comments on Rozeboom
1959: Reply to Hanson
1960: Explanation, Reduction, and Empiricism

From the older friend's perspective the acquaintance with the younger Viennese philosopher was as follows (Feigl 1968, 668):

I met Feyerabend on my first visit to Vienna after the war (my last previous visit was in 1935.) This was in the summer of 1954 when Arthur Pap was a visiting professor at the University of Vienna. Feyerabend had been working as an assistant to Pap. Immediately, during my first conversation with Feyerabend, I recognized his competence and brilliance. He is, perhaps, the most unorthodox philosopher of science I have ever known. We have often discussed our differences publicly. Although the audiences usually sided with my more conservative views, it may well be that Feyerabend is right, and I am wrong.

This, perhaps, also alludes to Feyerabend's first publication of *"Against Method"* (15 chapters and 1 appendix comprising 114 pages as opposed to the German edition of 1983: 19 chapters with 3 appendixes) in volume IV of the *Minnesota Studies for the Philosophy of Science,* a still existing series formely edited by Feigl and Maxwell. But the origins of *Against Method* are not mentioned in the biographical and autobiographical literature on Feyerabend. The editors of this special volume IV of MSPS on *Analyses of Theories and Methods of Physics and Psychology,* Michael Radner and Stephen Winokur (1970) describe the contribution together with the essays by Feigl, N. R. Hanson, Carl G. Hempel, Mary Hesse, Grover Maxwell, Joseph Margolis and William W Rozeboom as a thoroughly "normal science" result of related conferences and discussions at the MCPS. Against this backdrop, it is now surprising to see how simplified and vaguely Feyerabend writes about the evolution of what was to become a bestseller – its history has meanwhile been excellently reconstructed in the volume edited by Matteo Motterlini, *For and Against Method* (1999). In the preface to the German edition of *Against Method (Wider den Methodenqrvang)* Feyerabend writes:

In 1970 Imre Lakatos, one of the best friends I ever had, pulled me over to the side and said: "Paul, you have such strange ideas. Why don't you write them down, and I'll write an answer, we'll publish the whole thing and have a great time." I liked the suggestion and I began sat down to work. The manuscript of my part of the planned book was finished in 1972 and I sent it off to London. There it disappeared mysteriously. Imre Lakatos who loved dramatic gestures notified the Interpol, and in the event Interpol actually found my manuscript and sent it back to me. 1 read it again and rewrote most of it. In February of 1974, only a few weeks after I had completed my revision, I published my part without his reply. (Feyerabend 1986, 11)

This de-historicizing description seems to be motivated by the fact, that for the successful *agent provocateur* of philosophy of science (or criticized as "Salvador Dak of Philosophy") the context of the third Vienna Circle associated with Kraft and the Vienna Circle in America around Feigl (1968) was not being

opportune anymore. The success of his - largely justified - criticism of the normative philosophy of science ("received view") had apparently prompted him to this move even without the planned additional contribution from the critical-rational Lakatos. He now advocated a new image as an icon of post-modernity and of epistemological and cultural relativism. It was only at the end of his life that he returned to the Vienna roots of his intellectual development, i.e., the programmatic unity of philosophy and history of science, with Mach, Boltzmann, Alois Riegl and the historical tradition of Logical Empiricism, even if he later criticized the Vienna Circle in an undifferentiated way in connection with Karl Popper.

Feyerabend's Philosophical Return Home 1980 ff.:
Ernst Mach and the Historical Tradition in the Theory of Science

By the time Feyerabend received a call to the ETH in Zurich in the 1980s, he had returned both physically and mentally to his early intellectual socialization by rereading Mach and elaborating his relativism and pluralism, after he had already earlier (in 1962) advocated a concept of incommensurability (although critically of Kuhn) and his contextual theory of meaning. This process seemed to take place in parallel to the edition of his two volumes *Philosophical Papers* (1981) and in parallel *Ausgewahlte Scbriften* (Selected Writings) (1978 and 1981), which he reworked and added postscripts to. It continued with the appearance of his book *Farewell to Reason* (1987), which was published in the German translation as *Irrwege Her Vernuft.* (1989).

In his essay "Mach's Theory of Research and its Relation to Einstein" (Haller/Stadler eds. 1988), which he dedicated to Adolf Griinbaum, he lauded – without any reference to Machians Philipp Frank or Richard von Mises – his heuristic and historical approach to research (cf. Stadler 1982, 123ff. and 1988, 40f). At stake here was preference of a historico-critical theory of research as opposed to the rationalist, abstract-theoretical tradition in philosophy of science. He continued this reconstruction of Mach's oeuvre which he already had formulated in *Erkenntnis fiir freie Menscben* (1980, 273f.) the following way:

Mach's critique was part of a general reform of science in the sense that it linked criticism with new results. However, the positnists and their relendess opponents, the "critical rationalists" proceeded from some petrified components of science, which are no longer accessible to research, and reinforced them with the help ot philosophical arguments (Popper's "contributions" to realism.) Mach's critique was dialectic and productive, the philosophers' critique was dogmatic and without results.

Feyerabend saw Einstein, Bohr and Otto Neurath as also belonging to this tradition, without retracting his global criticism of the Vienna Circle. Following this rehabilitation, Feyerabend sought to pay homage to Mach's theory of research

between abstraction and fantasy independent from his phenomenalistic epistemology, by means of which the dualisms of theory *vs*. experience, philosophy *vs*. science, materialism *vs*. idealism as well as history of science *vs*. theory of science were to be overcome:

Together, Mach's arguments result in a philosophy of science that differs from positivism, converges with Einstein's approach to science and moreover present some sensible objections to the 19th century notions of the atom and the theory of relativity. ... It is also proven that Mach's 'epistemology' is no epistemology. Rather, it is a general scientific theory (or a draft of a theory) which, in terms of form (but not in terms of content) is comparable to an atomism which, however, differs from all positivist ontology (1988, 435f.).

To sum up, as this case study in the history of science nicely shows, Feverabend finally recommends skepticism vis-a-vis established opinions. Reading original texts, for him, serves as a corrective, and he also recommends recognizing the simplification of established opinions as well as "pseudo-disputes" like the one between positivism and realism and the confusion resulting from purely philosophical systems. Finally: systems are a blessing for those who want to remain philosophers if they do not want to recognize the histories of science with relate "myths" as a salvation.

Concluding Remarks

Surveying the above findings on the early Feverabend between 1945 and 1955, one obtains the following image which both complements and revises the results of previous studies.

The intense focus on the period following the publication of the book *Against Method* (1975) deflects attention from the strong impact, and the reciprocal influence of the "Third Vienna Circle", the Kraft Circle in Vienna of the post-war years and the Austrian College/Forum Alpbach up through the 1960s. Moreover, this intellectual constellation revealed a certain continuity in connection with the Minnesota Center for the Philosophy of Science. Here Herbert Feigl was most influential for the "Vienna Circle in America" both as an individual and in terms of the subjects he dealt with, e.g., materialism-realism-idealism, relativism, theory and experience, confirmation and validation as well as explanation and prediction, which continued to form the range of the pluralistic discussions within philosophy of science.

Even if this philosophical development which can be easily traced in Feyerabend's *Selected Writings* in English and German and his autobiography, as fragmentary and selective as it may be, reveals significant elements of this development, this process has hardly been taken into account in particular in die German-speaking countries. This was also backed by Feverabend himself who in view of the international bestseller of *Against Method* (1976) and *Science in a*

Free Society (1978/German 1980) let himself be celebrated as the post-modern relativistic thinker of "anything goes" and of "anarchistic epistemology".

Only in the last decade of his life in Zurich, his philosophical roots that ranged from Mach to the Vienna Circle and the "Scandinavian connection" became more visible in a systematic way. The reasons for his neglect of autobiographic factors and historiographic lacunae could be found in his vehement and even polemical break with Popper's critical rationalism but also in the simplistic and holistic perception of logical empiricism (as an ahistorical analytic theory of science.) But even the awareness of the non-reductive naturalism and relativism advocated by Otto Neurath and Philip Frank whose positions were thus often criticized in the Cold War years, should have mitigated this opposition precisely in view of the rediscovery of Ernst Mach. This to be claimed even if a critical stance towards rationalism and post-enlightenment philosophy of science remained a difference. In no way does any of these results limit Paul Feyerabend's undisputed originality and intellectual autonomy, the qualities of this often so misunderstood creative thinker and convinced democrat.

It thus does not appear exaggerated to refer to Paul Feyerabend as a philosopher from Vienna and to align him with the Vienna Circle, as someone who was so strongly influenced by this group (from the first to the third Vienna Circle, including Wittgenstein and Popper, from the "other Magic Mountain" to the "Minnesota Center) and who towards the end of his life returned to these philosophical traditions in a both constructive and provocative way.

In his last interview Feyerabend (1994) himself gives an answer to the question why he did not return to Vienna and whether he associated unpleasant experiences with this city in his typical way:

No, no. My experiences there were excellent, it was wonderful. There were good people there. You know, we physics students stormed the philosophy lectures, stood up in the middle of them and said: "That's all nonsense what's being spoken here." Then we were kicked out of the lectures.

What the person being interviewed here so elegantly remained silent about was the deplorable fact that both as a highly talented young scholar and as internationally renowned philosopher he was never asked officially to return to Vienna. He himself returned in spirit – but the potential and results of this move have yet to be appraised.

Personal Reminiscence

The author of this text unfortunately did not have a chance to meet Feyerabend in person. However, he did have the great pleasure of hearing him speak at the old Vienna city hall. Before that event he sent me a nice postcard, after I had sent him a copy of my book on the reception of Ernst Mach (1982) with a reference to his own Mach reading. He then wrote me the following card

(originally in German), in his typically capricious and provocative style anticipating some arguments I have just presented:

Dear Mr. Stadler – many thanks for your nice collection of gossip – by which I mean your report on the positivists, their precursors and successors. I have only taken a quick glance at various parts of the book and I was delighted to find so many familiar names, above all, my teachers Thirring, Kraft and Hollitscher. (THEY were my teachers and not this windbag Popper.) A further teacher, unfortunately no longer alive when I was a student, was Mach and as a convinced follower of Mach I am presenting a further exegesis which more or less contradicts everything which erudite gendemen such as Hol-ton and others presently have to say about Mach (Gereon Wolters however agrees with me.) Yes, and perhaps we'll bump into each other some time, (signed Paul Feyerabend).

Note: The "further exegesis" alluded to here were the enclosed proofs of Feyerabend's above cited essay "Mach's Theory of Research and its Relation to Einstein" (first in: *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science,* vol. 15, no.l.) The text also appeared in *Farewell to Reason* (1987 and in subsequent German translations in: Haller/Stadler (Hrsg.), *Ernst Mach - Werk und Wirkung* (1988), Feyerabend, *Irrwege der Vernunft* (1989, with an addendum 1988).

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

First published in English in:
The Migration of Ideas. Ed. by Roberto Scazzieri and Raffaella Simili. Watson Publishing International, Mass. 2008, pp. 203-224.
This article is a slightly revised version of my "Paul Feyerabend - Ein Philosoph aus Wien", in: Friedrich Stadler, Kurt R. Fischer (Hrsg.), *Paul Feyerabend – Ein Philosoph aus Wien.* Wien-New York: Springer 2006, iv-xxxiv. Basically it is the text of the annual lecture delivered at the Philosophical Society of Finland, Helsinki February 28, 2007 during my stay at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki.
The author began his studies related to Feyerabend in his dissertation on Ernst Mach (published in 1982). This was followed by a chapter in the final report on the research project on the history of philosophy of science (Vienna: Federal Ministry of Science and Research 1997).
These studies were continued in my monographs extending the period to 1934 or 1938 *(Vom Positivismus fur 'Wissenschaftlichen Weltauffassung"* (Vienna-Munich: Locker 1982) and *Studien fum Wiener Kreis* (Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1997, English edition: *The Vienna Circle.* Springer: Vienna-New York 2001).
Further related publications by the author are listed in the subsequent references.

REFERENCES

Hans Albert, ,,Wissenschaft in Alpbach", in: Alexander Auer (Hrsg.), a.a.O. *Forum Alpbach,* 17-22.
Alexander Auer (Hrsg.), *Das Forum Alpbach 1945-1994.* Wien: Ibera Verlag-Europe-an University Press 1994.
Aufkldrung und Kritik. Sonderheft 8/2004. Schwerpunkt: Ernst Topitsch.

Hans Peter Duerr (Hrsg.), Versuchungen. Aufsatze zur Philosophic Feyerabends. 2 Bande. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1980/81.

Herbert Feigl, *Inquiries and Provocations. Selected Writings.* Ed. by Robert S. Cohen. Dordrecht-Boston-London: Reidel 1981.

Herbert Feigl, "Existential Hypotheses. Realistic Versus Phenomenalistic Interpretations", in: *Philosophy of Science* 17/1950, 35-62. Auch in: *Ebda.,* 192-223.

Herbert Feigl, "The *Wiener Kreis* in America" 1968/69, in: *Ebda.,* 57-94.

Paul Feyerabend, *Zur Theorie der Basissdt^e.* Unveroffentlichte Dissertation. Universitat Wien 1951.

Paul Feyerabend, Die Geisteswissenschaften in Osterreich. Unveroffentlichtes Manuskript. Wien 1954. (163 pp).

Paul Feyerabend, "Wittgenstein's Philosophical Investigations" in: *The Philosophical Review* 64/1955, 449-483. Auch in Feyerabend 1981, 293-325.

Paul Feyerabend, „Das Problem der Existenz theoretischer Entitaten", in: Topitsch (Hrsg.), a.a.O., 35-72.

Paul Feyerabend, "Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge", in: Michael Radner / Stephen Winokur (Eds.), *Analyses of Theories and Methods of Physics and Psychology.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1970, 17-130. (= Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, Vol. IV, ed. by Grover Maxwell and Herbert Feigl).

Paul Feyerabend / Grover Maxwell (Eds.), *Mind, Matter, and Method. Essays in Philosophy and Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1966.

Paul Feyerabend, "Herbert Feigl: A Biographical Sketch", in: *Ebda.,* 3-16.

Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method. Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge.* London: New Left Books 1975.

Paul Feyerabend, *Science in a Tree Society.* London: New Left Books 1978.

Paul Feyerabend, *Erkenntnisfurfreie Menschen.* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1980.

Paul Feyerabend, *Wider den Methoden^vang. Ski-^pv einer anarchistischen Erkenntnistbeorie.* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1976. Revidierte und erweiterte Fassung 1983.

Paul Feyerabend, *Der wissenschaftstheoretische Realismus und die Autoritdt der Wissenschaf ten. Ausgewdblte Schriften,* Band 1. Braunschweig-Wiesbaden: Vieweg & Sohn 1978.

Paul Feyerabend, *Probleme des Empirismus. Schriften %ur Theorie der Erkldrung, derOuantentbeorie und der Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Ausgewdhlte Schriften,* Band 2. Braunschweig-Wiesbaden: Vieweg & Sohn 1981.

Paul Feyerabend, *Imi'ege der Vernunfi.* Aus dem Amerikanischen von Jiirgen Balsius. Frankfurt/M.: 1989.

Paul Feyerabend, *Zeitverschwendung.* Ubersetzt von Joachim Jung. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1995.

Paul Feyerabend, *Knowledge, Science and Relativism. Philosophical Papers,* Vol. 3. Ed. By John Preston. Cambridge University Press 1999.

Paul Feyerabend, *Die I ernichtung der I ielfalt. Ein Bericbt.* Aus dem Englischen von Volker Bonigk und Rainer Noske. Hrsg. Von Peter Engelmann. Wien: Passagen Verlag 2005.

Kurt R. Fischer / Franz Wimmer (Hrsg.), *Dergeistige Anscblufi. Pbilosophie und Politik an der Universitat Wien 1930-1950.* Wien: WUV Verlag 1993.

Philipp Frank, *Modern Science and its Philosophy.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1949.

Philipp Frank, *[Yahrbeit- relatir oder absolute* Mit einem Vorwort von Albert Einstein. Zurich: Pan-Verlag 1952. Margaret Grebowicz 2006: Organizer of the Symposium *"Against Method:* Thirty Years Later." Abstracts of the 6lh International History of Philosophy of Science Congress, Paris, 14.-18. Juni 2006. *Abstracts,* 64-67. Hans Griimm, *DreiLeben. Krieg, Partei, Atom.* Wien: Locker 1992.

Rudolf Haller, „In memoriam Paul Feyerabend", in: Friedrich Stadler (Hrsg.), *Bausteine Wissenscbafflicker Weltaujjassung.* Wien-New York: Springer 1997, 91-100.

Ernst Hanisch, *Der lange Schatten des Staates. Osterreicbische Gesellscbaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrbundert.* Wien: Ueberreuter 1995.

Jaakko Hintikka 2006. *The Philosophy of Jaakko Hintikka.* Ed by Randalle E. Auxier and Lewis Edwin Hahn. Chicago-LaSalle: Open Court 2006. (= Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. XXX).

Willy Hochkeppel, ,,Propheten im eigenen Lande ... Ober den Umgang mit einem groCen philosophisch-wissenschaftlichen Erbe in der 2. osterreichischen Republik. Impressionen eines AuBenseiters", in: Gerbert Frodl / Paul Kruntorad / Manfried Rauchensteiner (Hrsg.), *Physiognomic der 2. Republik von Kaab bis Bruno Kreisky.* Wien 2006, 115-151.

Gerald Holton, *Thematische Analyse der Wissenschajt. Die Pbysik Einsteins und seiner Zeit.* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp 1981.

Paul Hoyningen-Huene, "Paul Feyerabend", in: *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* 1997/28,1-18.

Paul Hoyningen-Huene, ,,Paul Feyerabend – ein postmoderner Philosoph?" in: *Information Philosophic* 1/2002, 30-37.

Paul Hoyningen-Huene, ,,Paul Feyerabend und Thomas Kuhn", in: *Journal for the General Philosopy of Science* 33/2002, 61-83.

Alfonse Keupink / Sanford Shie (Eds.), *The Limits of Logical Empiricism. Selected Papers Arthur Pap.* Dordrecht: Springer 2006.

Alfred Klahr Gesellschaft (Hrsg.), *Ziviscben Wiener Kreis und Marx. Walter Hollifscher (1911-1986).* Wien 2001.

Viktor Kraft, *Die Grundformen der wissenschaftlichen Methoden.* (= Sitzungsberichte der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philos.-histor. Klasse 203). Wien 1925, 1-104.

Viktor Kraft, *Der Wiener Kreis. Der Ursprung des Neopositivismus.* Wien-New York: Springer 1950. 3. Auflage 1997.

Alfons Keupink / Sanford Shieh (eds.), *The Limits of Logical Empiricism. Selected'Papers of Arthur Pap.* Dordrecht: Springer 2006.

Otto Molden, *Derandere Zauberberg. Das Phanomen Alpbacb.* Wien-Munchen-Zurich-New York 1981.

Matteo Motterlini (Ed.), *For ami Against Method, lmre Lakatos and Paul Feyerabend.* Including Lakatos's Lectures on Scientific Method and the Lakatos-Feyerabend Correspondence. Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press 1999.

Matteo Motterlini, "Paul Karl Feyerabend", in: Sahotra Sarkar / Jessica Pfeifer (Eds.), *The Philosophy of Science. An Encyclopedia.* New York-London: Routledge, 304-310.

Arne Naess, *Erkenntnis und wissenschaftliches I 'erhalten.* Oslo 1936.

Arne Naess, ,,Paul Feyerabend – Ein Held der Grunen?", in: Hans-Peter Diirr (Hrsg.), a.a.O, 184-199.

Eric Oberheim, *Feyerabend's Philosophy.* Berlin-Wien: De Gruyter 2006.

Osterreich – Geistige Proving? Wien-Hannover-Bern: Forum Verlag 1965.

Arthur Pap, *Analytiscbe Erkenntnistheorie. Kritiscbe Ubersicbt iiber die Entwicklung in USA und England.* Wien: Springer Verlag 1955.

John Preston, *Feyerabend. Philosophy, Science and Society.* Cambridge: Polity Press 1997.

Willard Van Orman Quine, "Two Dogmas of Empiricism", in: *Philosophical Review* 60, 1951, 20-43.

Jan Radler, *Victor Krafts honstruktiver Empirisnius. Eine historische undpbilosophische Untersuchung.* Berlin: Logos Verlag 2006.

George Reisch, *From the Icy Slopes of Logic. How the Cold War Transformed Philosophy of Science.* Cambridge University Press 2004.

Friedrich Stadler, „Philosophie – Zwischen Anschluss' und Ausschluss, Restauration und Innovation", in: Margarete Grandner, Gernot Heiss, Oliver Rathkolb (Hrsg.), *Znkunft mit Altlasten. Die Universitat Wien 1945 bis 1955.* Innsbruck-Wien-Miinchen-Bozen: StudienVerlag, 2005, 121-136.

Friedrich Stadler, „La contribution du retour d'exil des intellectuels a la culture scientifique de la Seconde Republique", in: *Exit et retour d'exil.* Etudes reunies par Paul Pasteur et Friedrich Stadler. Rouen 2004, 37-54. (= *Austriaca* 56/2003).

Friedrich Stadler, "The 'Wiener Kreis' in Great Britain: Emigration and Interaction in the Philosophy of Science", in: Edward Timms / Jon Hughes (Eds.), *Intellectual Migration and Cultural Transformation. Refugees from National Socialism in the English Speaking World.* Wien-New York: Springer, 2003, 155-180.

Friedrich Stadler, "Transfer and Transformation of Logical Empiricism: Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects", in: Gary Hardcastle / Alan Richardson (Eds.), *Logical Empiricism in North America.* Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press 2003, 216-233.

Friedrich Stadler, „Zur politischen Relevanz und zum kulturellen Kontext des Logischen Empirismus", in: Michael Heidelberger / Friedrich Stadler (Hrsg.), *Wissenschaftsphilosophie und Politik / Philosophy of Science and Politics.* Wien-New York: Springer, 2003, 9-24.

Friedrich Stadler, „Wendung und Verblendung – Walter Hollitscher zwischen Wiener Kreis und Marx", in: Alfred Klahr Gesellschaft (Hrsg.), *Zwischen Wiener Kreis und Marx. Walter Hollitscher (1911-1986).* Wien 2001, 59-63.

Friedrich Stadler 2006: Organizer of the Symposium „On the Banishment and Return of the Philosophy of Science after World War II" im Rahmen von HOPOS 2006, 6th International History of Philosophy of Science Congress, in Paris, 14.-18. Juni 2006. *Vgl Abstracts,* pp.82-86.

Friedrich Stadler „History of Philosophy of Science. From *Wissenschaftslogik* (Logic of Science) to Philosophy of Science: Europe and America, 1930-1960" in: Theo Kuipers (ed.), *Handbook, of Philosophy of Science. General Philosophy of Science – Focal Issues.* Elsevier, pp. 577-658.

Friedrich Stadler, "The Vienna Circle. Context, Profile, and Development", in: Alan Richardson / Thomas Uebel (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion of Logical Empiricism.* Cambridge University' Press 2007. (forthcoming)

Wolfgang Stegmiiller, *Rationale Rekonstniktion von Wissenschaft und ihrem Wandel.* Mit einer autobiografischen Einleitung. Stuttgart: Reclam 1979.

Ernst Topitsch (Hrsg.), *Probleme der Wissenschaftstheorie. Festschrift fur Victor Kraft.* Wien: Springer Verlag 1960.

Gereon Wolters, *Mach I, Mach II, Einstein und die Relativitatstheorie.* Berlin-New York: de Gruvter 1987.