

Kurt Gödel's "Protokolle" notebook, 1937–38

*Box 6c, folder 81, Kurt Gödel Papers, the Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ, USA, on deposit at Princeton University Library.*

Gabelsberger shorthand transcription by Dr. Erich Ruff  
Translated from German by Marilya Veteto Reese  
Edited by Stephen Budiansky

The transcription and translation of this shorthand notebook from the Kurt Gödel Papers was generously supported by a research grant from the Zukunftsfonds der Republik Österreich. We thank Prof. Christian Fleck of the University of Graz for facilitating the project

Published with permission of the Institute for Advanced Study, which holds literary rights to all of Kurt Gödel's work

Note on the text

Illegible words in the shorthand text are indicated by ellipses ( . . . )

Words written in longhand in English in the original are indicated by *italic*

Contents: see also last page!

1. Relationship to other people (how I should behave in general (rules of etiquette), in regard to politics, association, to family, to students, toward Adele, colleagues, women, in case of questions, soirees (ball) )

1'. How have other people behaved toward me and how they likely will behave (individuals, colleagues, group, family. Especially who are my friends and who my enemies.) Especially pleasing to me are relationships of other people toward me, also notes about America and Vienna . . . meaning – conversational record

2. Attributes of my person (bodily and spiritual) attractiveness, health, intelligence, knowledge, aptitude of particular activities (lecture), value of works and source of these attributes

2'. Understanding life before now, why one or another thing happened – my feelings regarding other people (autobiography) my work and my pleasures and sufferings – and causal connection

3. Same of other people (attributes, life, events of their life) (known to me)

. . . mathematics (object lesson), soc . . . , psychology, study of demons, educational system

Question Do people want to push me against my inclination into some kind of public activity (profession) or will this activity be a pleasure (significance) to me

17 July 1937 von Neumann
--------------------------

Comment Lie that Carnap told me end of August 1937 (3 + 1½<sup>h</sup>) Café Arkaden

1. Trial Dubislav (friend gravely injured)

2. Carnap after being in Chicago already employed applied for further leave

3. Dubisl[av] has no prospects in Prague. Hempel and I recommended by Frank No reasonable person a prospect, the intent is to make it into a position in botany, Christian ancestry required

4. In a Nazi weekly an article about white (or something like that) Jews, i.e., Christian Jews primarily meaning Heisenberg, who is still daring to declare the Einsteinian theory as something fundamental

5. A pupil of Scholz wants to study physics (under Heisenberg) but ~~does not dare to~~

Given this situation Scholz does not dare (in the interest of the Institute) to submit an application for an extension of the fellowship for him so he can work under Heisenberg, thus he must change from theoretical physics to mathematics

6. Bachmann writes in Mind regarding the discussion about Perelman, he has definitively solved the antimony problem and would like to request that he not be excluded from such discussions in the future

7. Scholz previously in Kiel, Protestant Theology now in Münster teaching exclusively about foundations of ~~propositional calculus~~

A course of two years propositional calculus 1–2 semesters – Question of interpretation plays a major role (what Carnap views as nonsense because everything is clear anyway) – Scholz supposedly had studied physics too as professor (went to lectures) – about own . . . logic he himself is completely unclear (supposedly wishes to join with Behmann): this according to statement of assistant Behmann who supposedly knows everything that Scholz knows and in addition even more (previously Carnap said Scholz in his heart was against National Socialism but did not dare to even say so)

8. Carnap maintains: Meister Catholic, Spann National Socialist, Bühler he does not know and ~~but~~ Külpe, Reich (Social Democrat), Eibl Catholic not a pupil of Gomperz – aside from that he is said to be unsuited to give information not only on this as well as the later social question.

9. Worldview of the intelligentsia quite undetermined. Answer: pointing to the group who like the Catholic faith but do not like strict churchgoing (. . . large group) –

10. Number of teaching positions in the world, 1/3 possibly too high in England, and America more than 1/3

11. Student material in Vienna and Prague no difference – In America prior experience lower (do not know what sine is) but mental independence greater (no submissiveness to authority)

12. Size of audience in Vienna 50–100 (as somehow determined exactly how I do not know)  
in Prague 10–12, in America 2–5, in Prague and America all there out of interest

13. Colleagues – Chicago Morris (Pos.) Benjamin (physicist) and one quite unclear metaphysician – President Hutchinson [*sic*: Hutchins] is supposedly a Thomist (but does not teach) – as to predecessor or whether new teaching position quite unclear

Information (that is not so exact . . . some kind of old fellow, abdication etc.)

14. In Prague once taught science teaching (division of science etc.), history neither in Prague nor in Chicago

15. in Chicago 1937/38 to spend a whole year on this also foundations (in the summer) 2 assistants . . . not permitted (originally it was to have been 4) these are Hempel and Helmer

16. Regarding my career

1.) he could possibly (pay) for a brief invitation for me for foundations for summer 1938 . . . – he did not quote me – whether he should accept the invitation

2.) I should concentrate on America possibly accept summer-institute position – There is demand for “teaching experience” especially in the English language

4.) In Prague suggested Hempel with me but no prospects of pushing through any reasonable one

5.) Foundations of mathematics are not connected with position (but would be in a philosophy department)

6.) Prospect in Vienna: I have actually worked quite a bit on analysis etc. so that it would be easy for me to publish something about that

7.) At Institute for Advanced Study they are tired of foundations (who was supposed to have said that I have forgotten) – he himself had been invited to the university as a guest professor but had declined.

8.) Living off of stipends will not be possible long-term

9.) Advises me to release a new edition of my Princeton lectures (also wants a copy from me)

10.) Advises me not to lose any time but to accept everything in America immediately – Notre Dame is likely to be extended after all.

17. He has now spoken to Gomperz – who said that Critique of Pure Reason and *Meaning* and Testimony were the only things that he had read 2 times (which however was not even true had read Aristotle 6 times) he is traveling via Italy to America there he is teaching Introduction to Philosophy (also named the place but forgot, think Illinois) his book about teachings of worldview was quite old (otherwise nothing more specific)

18. Rose Rand – said was megalomaniacal (Waismann and Gödel were small lads in comparison to her)

Reproached him for not inviting her to America, does not want to learn English before knowing definitely, she was financially doing very poorly, she was living off of practically nothing (Kraft and Neider have collected a private stipend for her) – she had not published anything – her works were very immature and often beside the point – tells her he prefers to be alone with me because there is something personal to discuss

19. Suggestion regarding translation Wesnierski with seminar duplication then consider writing a known logician with a named price

20. Convention in Paris was not at all interesting – only spoke to colleagues in the field (Bernays etc.) not at all with metaphysicians – the representative of Austria (believes it was perhaps Sauter)

babbled nothing but nonsense, namely that the world is only waiting to be redeemed by philosophy –

(Makes fun of Franco and Mussolini) – Conference on unification of logical symbols also nothing (Bernays is in favor of several suggestions, time not yet ripe) and preliminary discussion similarly not

21. Book recommendations. Jespersen (Copenhagen) Philosophical Grammar  
Here also much linguistic material.  
Vorländer History of Recent Philosophy

22. Platonism and mythological theology acknowledged by him – terms are not “mental” objects (e.g., “red” is a physical property distinct from the word)

Empirical science must fight against mythological theology – he wanted to emphasize specific distinctions between Protestantism and Catholicism in this regard but Neurath rejected it – (on the other hand he said he didn’t know mythological Catholicism) – “the inner part of Sirius 20000 years ago was hot” is *completely testable* is admitted

it is acknowledged that limitation via *Reduction* praised too narrow especially due to transition between thing and coordinate language – the things constructed out of the coordinates are somewhat different than the original i.e. constitution of space makes the difficulty – refraction error ( $c_1 + c_2$ ) is accepted

23. Feigl he saw 2 times Menger not

24. Faradin no teaching position in Berlin but rather only Habilitation completed (false information)

what Behmann is living off of he doesn't know, one cannot live off lectures without a teaching position even in Germany

Behmann was very friendly toward the regime despite career advancement very hindered due to the field

Decline in university study in Germany due to lengthy duration of service 3 years – therefore studies must be undertaken very superficially – whether a decline in academic professions he does not know, could be simplification of administration, reduction of high school output, decline in diseases, lower allocation of funding to church and university

25. Remark on difference of

Russell's definition of identity as basic concept and furthermore

*typical ambiguity (straightened out formula's) inappropriate language, a type . . .*

Question What is the actual reason why I am so bad at deductions (at least whenever I am supposed to determine something quickly) so that I do not notice contradictions in others or with what I know – do not notice (not right away)

Example conversation with Carnap: low aptitude inadequate training and inadequate attention, the knowledge ~~on which~~ (out of which contradictions are to be deduced is too loose (lively) ) – You do everything too hastily

and everywhere (quickly), the ~~listening~~. You are almost never entirely on the job and consider nothing thoroughly – You do everything with haste (lack of time) – especially in acquiring knowledge (learning) you should make note of the propositions you want to strictly formulate (in a methodical fashion) and decide for yourself which ones you want to remember  
 i.e., speed, haste in everything you do is the reason – this has its reason in part (large part) in the fact that material existence is not secure – 2. reason for the hastiness is fatigue (poor sleep and too little rest)

Comment Dependence on outside value judgment (sign of regard etc.) is partly due to the fact that one is not secure in one's own value judgment

Program Determination of what is important in own conversational notes

Program What do you believe, both factual and value judgements

Question Why is it so embarrassing to me that other people know everything about me? Because it is the basis for a value judgement and each value judgement is embarrassing to me either

1. it is too favorable (they expect something good of me, hold me in esteem), then it is embarrassing due to disappointment
2. They know the truth, then no esteem which is also embarrassing (particularly due to . . . staying in bed a long time) 2. Idiocies with Adele (sadism and the like) (no pure love). 3. Lack of knowledge in profession 4. Over-estimation of self 4' was under-estimation of others
5. silly behavior (throughout the house) 6. Indecisiveness (abandonment of everything needing to be accomplished) 7. Emotionlessness e.g. toward Papa (inability to enjoy)

8. Insufficient ability to comprehend and synthesize 9. Foolish behavior (at home) (laughing, talking in a high voice, making faces, possibly twisting around language) 10. Bad lectures (nerves and insecurity in company) 11. Limited knowledge 12. Doing nothing (accomplishing) 13. For the nonsense in my physics notebook

These are numerous “demerits” of the person which would encourage no one to want to be like me (rather the opposite) and which secondly make it seem impossible for me to accomplish anything for the good of others –

oddly enough the embarrassment is diminished by clearly articulating all of one’s bad qualities

Observation by others is embarrassing to you, because you believe they expect something grand ~~and by the same token~~ and the disappointment is embarrassing just as every deed is embarrassing because you set your expectations for yourself too high – because it’s less embarrassing to do something badly without anyone watching than with observers. (therefore fear but also even when perceiving oneself) – Why e.g. are you ashamed of your work notebooks? 1. Because titles are bad 2. Because certain things don’t make sense in their own notebook 3. Because the content is bad because the content is too private  
Every action must be learned i.e. you do it badly at first (some learn quicker some learn more slowly) e.g. language

Question is that really as just stated or is there also a method of learning where at no time the stage of “doing badly” is passed through but rather merely the stage “doing more simply but correctly” (language learning of children!)

Question Does one feel ashamed only for something bad (faultiness, incompleteness, sin) or does one also feel ashamed for certain things because they are “too private” –something “done badly” can occur in 2 ways.

1. Because one can do no better (incapability) 2. Because one wants to do no better (meanness)

is actually both a sin or only the second – one is ashamed for the first more than for the second

Comment The honing and the use of the senses (facial-, taste-, smell-, sense of touch, sense of hearing) is perhaps advantageous in order to lend content to the initial concept (to give a basis)

Conversation with Waismann 4 September 1937 7–10 p.m. Café Arkaden

1. Has a 2 year old child – lives in summer in Grinzing otherwise Liechtensteingasse – his wife on this day returning to settle in the city
2. Hopes to be done with his book in 6 weeks – this is to have 300 pages – wants to give me some chapters to read still – especially about hypotheses
3. Goes to Cambridge in 6 weeks for 3 months – no stipend for longer – what will become of him then he has no clue
4. Had taught courses on: Introduction to Logic and Epistemology (similar Schlick Proseminar)  
ca. 15 in class – about Wittgenstein (on request of the class) but soon got off Wittgenstein and dealt with questions independently – Foundations of Arithmetic, Foundation of Geometry, Differential and Integral Calculus for Political Economists, (1 hour long a whole year) – the remaining courses mainly 2 hours ca. 25 in class, few mathematicians (Södermann and Mostowski)

View of Schlick about hypotheses

In his last course about Wittgenstein as well as Izumi, Pieper & Lieb, mathematicians are the most intelligent students, in second place linguists, in last place chemists, psychologists not very clever

Number in attendance at Schlick lecture is unknown to him – most go to Reininger for the minor

Lecture by Schlick (that he gives me) taken down by a female student not very reliable

5. Asks me about Mayrhofer and the circumstances in the seminar – I say Mayrhofer personally very likeable I do not know works any more closely ( . . . . . and analysis)

6. With Carnap only briefly and only spoke personally

7. Asks me about my work (of Continuum I say nothing) result about Axiom of Choice he finds very significant

10. Factually: First of all by discovering whether the problem really only became more precise in the course of the investigation, and comparing that with the problem of a game whose rules were not yet known – We are in agreement that

1. His observations for a formalized mathematics not applicable except only for pre-formalistic studies

2. It is a matter of embedding the problems in decision-defined systems, not merely in systems

3. Even in the pre-formalistic stage the type of formalization is in most cases

for all reasonable people determined beforehand

11. He initially had no rejoinder to my objection that if demonstrative definition belongs to the grammar of a word then every false statement violates the rules of grammar

12. Regarding the task of philosophy (that it is to discover functional grammar) he expresses concepts in agreement with Carnap – difference only

1. that is his current understanding: i.e. up to now no other problems have occurred to him

2. the purposes can be different: in this moment nothing else occurs to him than prediction and simplicity

further agreements

1. he says that he claims nothing

2. the statements of his treatise are sensible (concept of the ladder one must discard is abandoned)

13. To my objection: If meaning = rule of usage of a word, then everyone comprehends the meaning and rule of the usage and vice versa – counterexample incomprehensible objection – he refers to empirical concepts and loses himself in ambiguities.

14. Regarding the noncharacterizability of number domains I say

1. also not to characterize structure the means of P axioms

Number itself not already previously known

2.) everything applies for the 1st Type (i.e.: the concept of the natural number (the finite amount, the progression) is not definable via logical terms without using the concept of sets)

3.) My proof of this fact – the place where it does not work for the 2nd Type is the transition from consistency to the existence of a model

15. At the Volkshochschule he taught mathematics by himself, a multi-year course on planimetrics, stereometry etc. – which he gave up voluntarily – who his successor is he doesn't know

16. He believes Schlick was right that certain particular statements exist (that are not hypotheses) e.g. I now see something red – these are the end points of verification<sup>x</sup> (from them themselves nothing follows except when they are turned into hypotheses) – Tarski had explained to him it was quite clear that each statement was a hypothesis –

<sup>x</sup>compare Schlick treatise on Foundation of Knowledge – asks me if I believe that each statement of science is a hypothesis which I affirm

17. The statement there is a “concept of prime number” distinguished from the sign and of the conceptualization has meaning if imbedded in a system (Prime. Math.) – but on the other hand he says again,

yes what does that mean, it would have to say something about observations as previously agreed to according to the criterion: meaning = rule of grammar

18. Says since Mach the combativeness of Positivism ever more diminished – after the events of the last few years he himself no longer wishes to be labeled a Positivist⊗ he makes no assertions (also none that are negative about metaphysics) – regarding my objection that (disavowal) of metaphysics is the core of Positivism he says he is historically not precisely informed but believes that “the Founder” A. Comte was a religious zealot

19. His entire discussion did not appear enlightening since he did not address what one said to him but simply repeated his assertions (of course still less says something enlightening himself)

Contrast to Carnap

⊗ I have the impression that he represented this mild form of Positivism and agreement with Carnap only toward me and I wonder if perhaps for the reason of a relationship with Carnap

Wald telephone conversation (early September 1937)
--

1. Is going with a Rockefeller Stipend for 3 months to Geneva (return early December) to the International Labor Agency working on cost of living of the various countries (had written a piece promised for September) –
2. Found a generalization of a certain probability formula, about which will report at the Colloquium
3. Von Neumann will write him about September if sent to Princeton
4. Had previously worked in the Institute for Economic Research (without definitive position but with stipend) (Rockefeller or something similar)
5. Will have nothing in Geneva to do with the university
6. Regrets that I am holding no lectures and asks me about the reason
7. Doesn't know if Menger might not come back after all though Bullit even seems to believe this

Comment a walk has similar effect sometimes as a visit to Adele – everything suddenly has a reasonable meaning and the confusion disappears

Comment America from the standpoint of money

Salary – living America – travel – Rekawinkel – Aflenz + saving . . . M + saving own expenses Vienna  $\simeq$  = D

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{Ship Paris train Italy insurance} \\
 3900 - 1000 - (800 + 200 + 200 + 100 + 100) - 2000 \\
 + 400 + 400 \simeq 300\$
 \end{array}$$

other Activa :

1. pleasant sea trips, Venice, New York, music, Aflenz, Paris
2. useful English, spiritism and demon, rationalism, ?Problem Adele temporarily taken care of

Passiva :

1. unpleasant ? Rekawinkel, Purkersdorf partially.
2. injurious 2 1/3 years loss of time, failed to save up money in time, miss out applying in Vienna for Math position unprepared (Menger, assistant, Fr), mental incapacitation

21 September 1937 Taussky 11-1 in her apartment

1. She was 34/35 in America 1000\$ – 800\$ cost of living at the college deducted for 8 months as *fellow* did not teach courses

35/36 in England *fellow* Cambridge (stipend from the university) no or few courses

36/37 Cambridge *fellow* (100 pounds cost of living deducted)

*fellowships* reputedly not very highly paid – 3 hours lecture on algebra up to inclusive of the theorem every algebraic field is a subfield of a cyclotomic field – ostensibly 5 students

37/38 *Lecturer* London was to teach differential equations and old fashioned geometry 5 hours a week – her appointment was printed in the Times – a photo – for newspapers (unrecognizably printed sits on the table – is to be published in a newspaper ((Times). She has been given the rights for all newspapers) – is to teach elementary courses – shows me tasks from projective geometry which is required for Master's exam namely: the following is to be proven:

1.) ~~can~~ a pair of points which are inverse with respect to a circle transforms via inversion at any given circle into the same

2.) reciprocals of a cone segment at the focal point is a circle (indicates: the 4 harmonic point must always be found)

3.) If  $p_1 \dots p_i \dots p_1' \dots p_i'$  2 projectively related series of points of a conic section, then the intersection of  $p_i p_k'$  and  $p_k p_i'$  all lie on a straight line

4.) If a triangle that is polar to a conic section  $K$  is inscribed to another conic section  $L$  then there are limitless other  $\Delta$  which have these characteristics in relation to  $K$  and  $L$ .

thus students learn to solve many more tasks – but supposedly algebra exercises are very easy in comparison to Vienna – I set the following algebraic problem to someone and they could not solve it

Problem are the individual elements  $g$  (that is element with inverse) themselves the group elements in a finite group in every integral ring? – they proved that it is true for algebraic group – I ask how it stands with the whole-numbered matrix rings-associated group should have the order  $n^2$  – the usual units at any rate make up no group but possibly there are units that make up the group – surely not among those of the order  $p^2$  – because these are always abelian: admits that the problem has already been solved or is difficult

Wittgenstein is said to teach phenomenally – if one enters his room it is at the risk of being thrown out – terrible for England – supposedly very unpopular

1936/37 in Norway in isolation – his fellowship is not being extended – wants to study medicine (previously he had wanted to go to Russia) – has supposedly discussed the philosophical implications of my work with 4 people – asks if I know him well –

in Cambridge only one algebraician Hall

Hardy<sup>x</sup> had the same position in Princeton as I – it was quite extraordinary he knows nothing of difference in pay for different people – as title she thinks then not *Fellow* but *visiter[sic]* (but then not clear that it is for pay)

In new apartment supposedly previous only poor people – It is unhealthy to move into an apartment in which no one has lived ( $\text{Ca(OH)}_2 + \text{CO}_2 = \text{CaCO}_3 + \text{H}_2\text{O}$  breathing air!) but now it was different – (I say only the class from which the poor come has changed) – all in all she doesn't understand how a rich man does it who builds himself a villa – in a new house the rent is raised after a year supposedly or one is

<sup>x</sup> looked up 1936/37 first semester

thrown out – her apartment ca. 250 m (but she does not know that) (Hahn ditto)  
. . . 227 m Josefstadt circa 194)

Dissertation Fröhlich this fellow completed it in the 7th semester in a (half) year because his father had promised him a trip to Rome if he got done soon – from a practical standpoint she did the dissertation (he would have needed at least 3 years) – Furkl was below 0 – admits I was right that he was only able to talk pretty – then again she says he wasn't all bad – if Hahn had known how bad he was he would have never allowed him to become a doctor – Hahn had already looked so haggard back then that she didn't want to bother him with anything – he had been in need of rest – she didn't know what Fröhlich was doing these days (probably he had been taken the exam to be certified as a teacher) – in his dissertation he had already jointly proven a very significant theorem about . . . – Taussky had learned a great deal about set function from it –

fellow students in Vienna all want to take the exam to be certified as teachers – she didn't know how many, also she didn't know the number of students in Cambridge (believes not considerably more than in Vienna) – really, no one knew the number – they say Wittgenstein even had an altercation over priority with a female pupil (she didn't know if that was really true, however)

Her objection about Fr was that he taught too easily (only once, about class theory, did he lecture with much difficulty)

Analytical number theory there are no texts for – only so neglected in Vienna, otherwise the most important part of number theory London –

regarding synthetic-projective geometry (solving problems) most likely read Helly

Amer. Math. Soc. (Assoc. Adv. Science she had started)  
book from Math. Soc. she had received recently and thrown away

Scandal in the mathematical association nowhere to be read in print – some received additional mailing (she herself hadn't) – asks if I am a member – she herself hadn't paid in a long time (always sent only 3 marks owed 6 marks – I always top her even in this regard)

also in her case the smaller sum had been accepted because had not sent it –

Fr had been ill (also been in the hospital for some time) doing a true healthcare there – now well again

The illness bore a long name – she had therefore not been able to speak to him at all about matters of science –

Now he was quite chipper again (especially mentally) – he was planning on canceling lectures again the first few days –

Menger as they thought was not yet quite definitive (= is listed under *staff*) says it would be lovely if I were to get his position – but she herself didn't now how she was going to give her lectures<sup>x</sup> and could also not solve the problem – hoped to learn it from one of the older female pupils ( <sup>x</sup> prepares each class individually) – it was a Nazi paradise in Vienna now – all of the ones they didn't want were now gone – when will she be forced out? W was a Nazi and anti-Papist

but cloister people (nuns) he liked very much – he had impeded Menger's appointment with every (also by some not unobjectionable) means known to him

–

in the case of Scholz she says “wonder if Furtwängler will do that for him?” – in England one could run a windmill indoors with windows closed – poorly heated and damp – therefore also everything England schmattisch and stunted

she knows nothing about Waismann's trip to England

in closing I speak to the sister: thank her for the card from India – 4 months there at Christmas – climate quite tolerable – She hadn't seen any fakirs there. People levitating was based on suggestion – it was always lovely when one had acquired a new, enriching experience

– I had been a contributor to her trip to India – but she could no longer say if she had gone because I had said yes or because I had said no – she could no longer recall the card – the sun will set in the East before that is over with there –

Menger was there only a couple of days – the interesting things can only be found after a few months – the English also had a completely false image of Vienna

Nöbeling had been a Dozent in Erlangen – scientifically speaking no one hears anything from him anymore (except did acknowledge false proof of fundamental theorem) – when is a theorem proven (Definition?)

asks me if I received September about hypercomplex system (that I don't know) proved there only reverse of previously discussed theorem – gives me separatum a task together with Fr

session report Academy Vienna about semi-rings (completely trival theorem)

in England she had been part of terribly many associations – she was looking forward to solving problems (2 years ago it would have been horrible to her) asks me if I like doing it (no)

E - S in the group ring over a finite group always 0 divisors because divisors of E -  $S^n = 0$  if  $\phi$  of  $S = n^n$  over infinite group

one can view ring

1. only sum with finite number of members
2. power series with finite number of different values

the entire group ring therefore leads to symbol operating with finite (or infinite) series of numbers out of the underlying ring

Taussky begins studies with Hahn differential calculus (therefore a year younger?)  
H. Furt wanted to impress her with elegance

H. . . Leng telephone conversation 21 September

1937

previously at a high school then several years ill now at a vocational school with physics

recommends 2 2-room apartments in Grinzing to me, building 2 years old (without guarantee)

Room 50-60 schillings with bath and telephone

K. Gödel conversation 23 September 11:15–12:45

was in Steiermark 4 weeks 14 days Trofaiach (roughly August)

from there Eisenerz, Lake Leopoldstein etc. lovely excursions

paid for the room 4 schillings a la carte on the whole cheaper than 5 x 60 room and board

drove 2 times through Aflenz each time 4 hours ate at Schöggls-Aflenzerhof – very classy set up – the church was very lovely and old (just as the figures on the portal) – how old it doesn't say – the parish hall (with the stationer's) is now painted on the outside with frescoes scenes from the

history of Aflenz with Latin inscription<sup>x</sup> (Afelence) – there were very lovely people there –

the lakes on the way to Seewiesen I am also familiar with – the bronze chamois is really poorly depicted ⊗ possible that chamois were really there – Anflenz was interesting (where one looked down on the train station) – there is some kind of plant (outbuildings?) – Seewiesen is the lovely one – in the park they have just set up a loudspeaker (because something was ruined?) –

from the house above the park he received a card from someone (already previously) – was not at Bürgeralpe but as far as Admont (not by foot, to my question), visited the abbey there and the library which pleased him very much – nice manuscript (written by a nun) and incunabula – on the way back they stopped in Steinhaus and remained for a time ?Rettenbach? or some such, there very lovely and quiet and undisturbed – in the vicinity several mountains which they enumerated (among them Wechsel other than that I can't remember) – the Gesäusestraße is now very lovely (entirely paved) – Frau Schöggel is a nice lady

⊗ had read in a magazine (artists' journal) that this had been done only recently

<sup>x</sup> only Karl Gödel has good eyes (distance vision) and therefore noticed this at once

Now she will stay 1 month in Freistein – in Czechoslovakia every foreigner who wants to stay longer than 2 months needs a permit – this costs 20 crowns (for people who have property – I tell them that  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the villa belongs to me, supposedly  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the house also belonged to ~~them~~ his wife)

But they give the officers grapes etc. and by that means she comes several times a year for 2 months at a time – furthermore foreigners<sup>x</sup> can be disappropriated – her issue in this matter is not yet concluded – at Freistein it is not permitted to photograph the fortifications no kind of camera at all may be brought in (previously told once that supposedly an air force maneuver had taken place there) – . . . not to take walks in certain areas – for the Czechs as we know are afraid above all else of being overrun by Germany truly such a small people will go quite mad if it comes to anything like that – has several picture frames in Freistein these he could not bring in due to customs – once she had to pay customs on one of these cutwork blouses and a frame onto which a canvas is stretched (as 4 pieces of wood for use) . . . – looks in my presence at an old picture of a hunting lodge (probably by . . . ) and criticizes it – the two walkers seem to fall over toward different sides –

<sup>x</sup> in the border regions

~~could~~ deciphered the year number 1900 – I say back then the hunting lodge looked quite different –

this year they don't need any Czech money any longer (it had been a bad year this year he said with a laugh) – he repeatedly wishes me luck with my apartment hunt – recommends the Agency Vest (had seen this one quite frequently, describes exactly how to get there, furthermore recommends an apartment to me Anhofstraße Hietzinger Hauptstraße – from Hietzing it takes 35 minutes to get to the University –

– Hietzing is not high up is a kind of Riviera – highway so far below Wieden ~~that to~~ that once there was sunshine in Wieden highway had fog – Paula once got a lung catarrh after two days in a new school – K.G. says he as an old man would quite like ground floor apartment in order not to have to climb stairs in my case it would be something different – speaks of a combined living room and kitchen – in a sublet one still has to pay gaslight etc. extra and the surcharges are annoying (perhaps there were also decent ones) – in Währing quite a few apartments were to be had still in the areas with fine large houses – ~~they could~~ they know a judge who also paid for furnishings and fixtures left by previous tenant – another example 3 rms 5th floor (not garrett) 80 . . . – new rent 1500 schillings furnishings and fixtures, at Gürtel's

Saturday 2 October Meeting at Zilsel's Währinger Straße 71  
4–7:30 p.m.

present: as I arrive Fräulein Weisskopf (sister of the physicist, who has been in Rochester since 4 days ago) co-worker of Frenkel

Name of book "Desires and Duty"

Dr Hollitscher first studied medicine then philosophy then medicine again (psychiatry) – not yet quite finished loves the lectures by Poetzl

later arrive: Neider and

Rand (the latter then in the 2<sup>nd</sup> District and is a refugee from Lemberg) lives with grandmother

Kröner pupil of Gomperz

(Kraft excused self due to intestinal flu, Frenkel excuses self due to work at Bühler, Schächter was invited did not decline and also not coming)

next time will be invited in addition

Dr. Eckstein gifted pupil of Schlick

Veitlberg speaks Russian well (ditto Maenchen)

Dr Menzel ? very gifted certainly only will say something when essential

Mrs.?

I suggest Dr. Beer – Zinsel says don't I actually know younger people whereupon I respond that only Menger colloquium was in my lecture and suggest Wald . . . if he is interested (which I doubt)

Zinsel praises Wald and says he had been a regular in the Schlick circle – he says the meetings should take place every 14 days and the circle should be considered an extension of the Gomperz circle – Saturday is set as the day – since someone has a conflict on all other days (I am the only one who has no conflict on any day)

Kröner says he likes to make excursions on Saturdays whereupon Neider

retorts “endum” considerations were not to be heeded – (incidentally the Bühler colloquium is mentioned – Weisskopf maintains that one hears reasonable things there sometimes – Hollitscher says yes, during the breaks – another Bühler event is labeled a “circus” because it is set up less like an amphitheater) – Ziesel addresses me the entire time as Professor and says to me jokingly he heard from someone that I was already an associate professor (he doesn’t say ‘nothing of the kind’) – it was customary that Dozents become this after 4-5 years (asks me since when I have been a Dozent) – however lectures given in the meantime are less important than written works (asks me when last published I say 1934) – asks me whether there is such publication difficulty in mathematics too (in philosophy – I say for philosophy there is the *Philosophy of*

*Science* – response smiling as during this entire conversation – Hollitscher asks me if I am teaching – I tell him semester after next – he asks me what about and when because he would like to come – I say “Axioms of Set Theory” probably afternoon

I tell Neider that I have kept up the rotation up to now – this would be the first interruption –

Program:

1. Kröner reports on some (2) treatises by Schlick
2. Neider reports on a Russian book by Schuiakoff ? about dialectical materialism translated into English

the arguments are always of this kind: this is what Mr X claims and he was executed therefore false (book costs 8 schillings)

3. Zisel asks me if there is anything new in foundations – in particular conference in Poland – Friedrich had traveled there (says he is a Hahn pupil and specialist in algebraic functions) – I say regarding whether foundations had come up I did not know

anything more specific (does not believe it) – one has to wait for the report – the important recent work had been by Gentzen but only mathematics interesting – (in the questions of Zilsel's there is always something threatening: "Don't you actually know younger people" "what is new in the area of foundations" Kröner "the book by Black on foundations is something I surely know about") – in the end he requests a report from me about the state of the freedom of contradiction question – I accept (~~but in the end~~ gave a lecture in Cambridge I would only have to translate into German but then I say it is too primitive and in the end I say one should not count on me in 6 weeks because trouble – Neider says I should not prepare myself but rather just like in the coffeehouse back then Natkin and Feigl – I say that was physics – Zilsel shows me a scrap of paper and says that had been his entire preparation – Zilsel would welcome my report because one could learn something from it (with special emphasis) – Rand sits the entire time with her head on her knees – ~~asks only once~~ and sleeps, asks only once whether

one couldn't perhaps light the light which I pass on to Neider who says one should ask Zisel

(Light was not lit but rather the entire time only the lamp on Zisel's table) –

Hollitscher already leaves about 6 o'clock and Neider remains seated in his spot – at the end a letter from Thomas Mann to Zisel read aloud by Neider – writes that he had read with great interest a cultural philosophical treatise by Zisel – his time had been taken up by the new journal – Zisel wrote him that he unfortunately couldn't spare the time for belles-lettres but always read his thing with interest – Zisel is of the opinion Mann takes himself for a semi-scientist –

the magazine is a mixture of Materialism, Christianity, etc. Zisel praises it and him (supposedly his wife as well) – Hollitscher recounts that Kastil was an especially enchanting person had given an incomprehensible talk about time and once told how splendidly he had eaten in a cloister – Zisel says

in answer to my question, he let himself be pensioned off from Innsbruck because there were too many Nazis there for him, then he had lived in Vienna – Hollitscher thinks that, speaking about the Nazis, there are after all sensible questions (for example whether Einstein was a Jew), on the other hand is merely nonsense here –

Program – possibly the cultural-philosophical matter from the papers of Schlick – whether these will be published is as yet undetermined

Discuss 2 questions from Zisel

### 1. Certainty of confirmations

Zisel vs. Schlick – I can't say does it sting me now or not (he had a very bad stomach and had to be careful of eating when an attack began)

I say it is only a matter of whether there are meaningful propositions not if all are like that

(which is not taken up) but rather Hollitscher says – one has to ask oneself what point is there of doubting a confirmation and must

think about the grammar of the word “doubt” – Zilsel says to him the problem does not seem important to him –

2.) Interpretation of the probability statement about hypothesis –

the election in Argentina will turn out so and so means under similar circumstances in similar countries will in 90% of cases be so and so –

Carnap ⊗ positions himself against allowing frequency interpretation – only wants some typology – (at the most degree certainty, very certain, which Zilsel takes for somewhat metaphysical) – Hempel attempts to disprove with 3 arguments

1.) the continuum allows no frequency interpretation

2.) if  $p \supset q$  is 90% probable has the same significance as in 90% of cases  $p$  entails  $q$ , then  $p \supset q$  and one  $q$  one  $p$  does not have the same probability

3.) (past and future?)

in the discussion there is constant confusion of probability of a statement and statement in which a probability

⊗ is *Meaning and Test*.?

occurs – then also exactitude of laws of nature and probability that they are valid  
–

then Ziesel formulates an incomprehensible problem and asks threateningly if anyone could help him –

then he says he had now found that the statement in 90% of the cases the superluminal velocity is not attained has contradicted the theory of relativity – then he says the doubt of the hypothesis is not what that means ~~only in quite exclusive cases not~~ except in quite exclusive cases –

finally I point to the difference between “it is probable that always  $p \supset q$ ” and “ $p \supset q$ ” in 90% of the cases \* – the theory of relativity is ~~must be~~ understood primarily (whether the other interpretation remains logical for it is another matter – I point to Mult. of the probability in several laws – Ziesel says if 5 laws with 9/10 thus the entire theory is  $(9/10)^2$ ) – even theory in the 2nd – Ziesel says he believed this differentiation was amiss – finally Ziesel asks me threateningly if I consider it an abuse of mathematics if one says that the probability is  $\frac{1}{10^{18}}$  ? the sun will not rise tomorrow? – I say yes because

\* that is to say there are other rules governing this statement

knowledge does not determine Pot. – Zinsel is addressed as Herr Professor as well

3.) Question it was a correct comment from Neurath – that in principal every sentence could be invalidated – but one must add 1. not all sentences can be equally invalidated (for example impossible to maintain all physicists and chemists are swindlers)

2.) in the place of the invalidated others always enter, e.g. “at the Ehrenhaft Institute they always work with dirty hands”

I ask whether that is an observation about factual methods of science or if it is a proposition *decision* whereupon he says that is both at the same time – *Decision* means “we call that science” – Neurath he calls an absolutist in this context – regarding 2.) is also mentioned this case applies if one were to suddenly slay all Jews whereupon Rand leaps up and says: they haven’t slain them all yet and it is also not at all possible to slay all of them

Zisel says of Kraus he was ? an evil Brethanist?

Neider relates that Dubislav had loved her and shot himself several weeks ago – reported in the Prager Tagblatt but did not raise it so sensationally – it had been quite a similar situation as before (Carnap told about) – Dubislav had alternated between manic and depressive states – the killing had occurred in the depressive phase – also his books written in that phase (in the books and treatises he had not expressed any opinion of his own, only reported) – also in his lectures he had been very uneven – sometimes straight-out brilliant and innovative sometimes much worse

Zisel asks if Söderberg was still in Vienna

Schapira 4 October 1937 6–6:40
--------------------------------

1. one determines whether an apartment is subject to rent control by asking the previous tenant or having a showing by the landlord – each apartment can be put under rent control by the landlord
2.  $\frac{1}{4}$  of apartments are not under rent control
3. if not acknowledged as tenant one is not automatically made a tenant after any time

4. process of giving notice takes 2 notices 5 months and costs 250 schillings for a 3 month apartment

Process of vacating 2-3 months

5. Agreement on a rent controlled apartment contrary to law is invalid – ditto rent limitations in a contract

6. nonetheless Marshall can hand over the apartment to me for a lower rent but do not believe 120 schillings because 50 schillings residential building tax is still to be paid

7. Agreements of non-rent-controlled apartments subject fall under price-gouging laws – exceeding 50% is gouging – decision depends on income status of the tenant, whether under financial straits, or ill-advised etc.

8. Peacetime rent determined by the residential tax declaration 1914 or 23 presented by the landlord or Magistrate Office of Residential Tax

9. Only claim to community housing via report (Vaterländische Front) legal preference

given those who are evicted without grounds and living in unhealthy apartments etc.

10. also in subletting one can remain living there until the court has decided about the matter of dispute tells me about a case about shaking out the dustcloths and bedding of a party on an upper floor

advises me to take a newly built apartment and to heat it at my own expense for 3 months

for the time being subletting something roughly 50-60 schillings elegantly possible

I have from time to time a very strong urge to laugh but it is clear that he started it

when I go there he asks me what's new when I say nothing special he says in disbelief "oh?"

6 October telephone conversation Frenkel
--

(in the Psychological Institute 5 p.m.)

1. Bühler Colloquium begins not until 13 October – then also program that they will give me
2. Bühler dislikes idea of guest because he has a closed circle of pupils where very incomplete matters are discussed
3. She will however tell Herr Professor and it would be very unpleasant to her if turned down which in analogous case already was the case
4. a series of talks open to the public for a fee was already arranged by the Psychological Insitute.

Starting end October. Every Monday in the large lecture hall of the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Physical Institute. – always three people giving a talk.

A lecture (the first?) “The New German Human” of an “Incarnation”

I ask if I have understood correctly she asks a 2<sup>nd</sup> person present and repeats it – one about “religious ecstasy” of hers – she had occupied herself with this field superficially – she will have a program sent to me

5. she was in Paris over the summer where also spoke with Positivists then 14 days in Bad Gastein to do a healthcure for rheumatism

5. I say I had been in Vienna over the summer but hadn’t found it unpleasant now I am apartment hunting but it hadn’t been very easy (which she affirms)

16 October 11– 1 R. Rand.
---------------------------

Carnap tonsil operation and in fact a tuberculous tonsil – hadn’t been in the high mountains or at the sea but instead in low mountains – also lived on an uppermost story of a house without a bath – she once tutored in a house with central heating only warm from 10:30–1

only a few parties and all of them related to the landlord the whole thing due to economy – there are terribly frugal people e.g. they work, if they have their schnapps and spend the night outdoors are content, then again there are people with money who have standards – she doesn't go to Zisel's because she finds it all too stupid – asks me if I know of anyone from whom she could learn English of course at no cost

I advise her to do conversation in exchange for German through the newspaper – I have to go open the door for beggars several times (one of them is coming back the next day) – one who looks very like Dr. Reichel offers me buttons for 2.20, turns down 20 groschen in assistance – tells me he went to college and is sorely tried by fate – in the end I buy safety pins for about 40 groschen.

I show them to Rand and notice they are badly hardened she says they are too big but otherwise good – she pulls out a very tiny and even worse hardened one and says she bought it in a very good store – asks me about Wesnierski translation and composes something at the end for subscribing I sign as the first one (after I hesitated due to the word interesting) – make her aware she needs to ask permission from L.

she will write to Kot about it – price is set at 10 schillings

(vacillate about it between 8 and 10 schillings) – tells she heard Wald will be offering a course – I say he is not in Vienna – she says it would be good if I didn't accept everything – I say I didn't know if as Dozent I even was allowed – she will only speak about Carnap when I have read it – I regret no table of contents in the publisher's proofs and say table of contents is the most important thing and it could make sense to publish only the tables of contents which makes her laugh – tells me Bühler rejected her work – Pötzl had sent her to him –

Bühler had invited her to Weimarerstraße and received her in his dressing gown spent an hour with her not letting her get a word in and told her he did not want to discuss but to instruct her even “puffed” her (sat down next to her and almost beat her up) his objections (which she lists) were insignificant – he had been terribly nervous (a hysteric)

I tell her my fears about the apartment she reassures me – the area is more elegant than Promenadengasse, therefore better traffic and easier to reach she had once

gone to see Frau Hahn it took forever

19 October 5–5:30 Psychological Institute
---

. . . Dr. Wolf tells me where Frenkel is (with . . . Charlotte Bühler)

Frenkel is speaking to someone and says she'll be right out – in the meantime Dr Wolf says she can certainly invite me to Frenkel's lecture today, "On the . . . Type in Drama and Epos"

a statistical study – I say Frenkel will be out shortly – she leaves me standing there, somebody needs me for a "Weight Experiment" – to my question why he is targeting me he says he is simply looking for someone – first a complicated set of typed instructions after reading them he tells me the same thing in a couple of words –

I get offered two each (red and green) weights (different shapes) and am to say only when asked which is heavier – the first 3 have left heavier, with decreasing difference; on the 4<sup>th</sup> he asks me, it seems noticeably heavier right – on the 5<sup>th</sup> ? he asks me, the same?

I say identically heavy – afterward I say it must have been a matter of a contrast experiment and my judgement was wrong this he confirms and says that doesn't matter it won't cost you your head

lying on the table is a drawing that would interest me but he says thank you and I go –

~~Frenkel comes out wants to introduce me to Bühler but comes back and says~~

Frenkel calls me in – I say it would be better if I don't talk to Bühler until next time because today it didn't work out – she wants to ask Bühler anyway, but comes back and says it wouldn't be possible now and it also would not look good if I didn't stay here in the case of an affirmative answer

22 October Frau Feigl and Rand
--------------------------------

¼ hour in the auditorium of the university

Frau Feigl spent 2 years in Vienna studying child psychology with Bühler in order to get her doctorate – has enrolled in a course roughly 150 schillings which is not in the Course List (she says) – receives monthly 50\$ from Feigl – I say one can live very well on that if one is only interested in philosophy – she thought about sometimes eating in the cafeteria – there (says Rand) the daily special without meat costs 60 groschen with meat 95 groschen – I say difference to a restaurant is very small and tell of the bad sauce I once ate there – Frau Feigl says she will live with Weng

Baiertokeg 8 2 rooms in sublet with . . . (is in the phone book) – she once saw me in Liebiggasse I had looked at her she didn't know what I was thinking (probably nothing) – she had thought I was in America

asks me if I am a Dozent – whether I enjoy teaching – said her child is 4 years old and tells everyone her mother went to Vienna to buy a lapdog

but there is an import ban on dogs – Carnap has a car but pays little attention to her –

Feigl has no car but does have a maid (or at least ½) – you have the choice between the two

she had been to the opera recently – but no atmosphere at all only a couple of ~~Englishwomen~~ old Englishmen

but still it was nice to be living in Vienna – in Chicago there was opera year round and . . . only half that – after all when one has money it is nice to live anywhere – speaks of me as if I had a lot of money – I say yes in the country and she asks me if I feel like living in the country – she hadn't any interest in philosophy any longer and no longer came to the Zilsel evenings – Rand asks me about my new address which I tell her – at the end

Frau Feigl shows me a piece of paper with her telephone number and says – you won't remember it anyway – the beginning of the conversation is comprised of a phone call by Rand

Dr. Gödel –

Frau Feigl looks like she's gotten old and grey, so initially I was not sure if it really was her

Frau Feigl asks where there is a restaurant in the vicinity I recommend Regina to her, she asks me where I eat – I say at home –

5 November Mayrhofer 12–12.30 in his room
---

the last years annually 100 majors for teaching certificate with – 130 beginners every year

this year only 50 more beginners, than 45 expected – Austria has it covered for decades from now with high school professors – my question whether hours are distributed among many he affirms and says yes after year then one or the other succeeds in getting a place – in response to my question as to according to which factors the position is filled he says:

yes they have to ask “?” – due to favoring of humanities by the government ~~for a while those who immediately finished~~ a few cohorts were immediately accommodated but now that chance also already passed – Furtwängler had had himself put on leave for this semester – Hofreiter is holding his seminar which he certainly can do well and the lecture on differential and

integral calculus <sup>x</sup> – Furtwängler is weak but nonetheless as of today has given 50 candidates the teaching certification exam – he recently gave 30 term paper assignments but only 3 had done them –

I ask the others aren't doing them? he says oh yes but they take so long – I am surprised that so few drop out in the course of their studies (130–100) but he confirms it – in the seminar he lectures himself <sup>o</sup> – the students can hardly learn how to lecture from a talk – he is going by the book that appeared in 1935 by Carathéodory about calculus of variations namely he takes the first chapter about differential equations – his proof of the . . .

theorem (ordinary existence proof) pleased him very well (step function instead of polygon) – but the book was very difficult to read – you have to first rearrange the words to put the concepts in the right order – that is confirmed by others too – but it is a standard work – I ask if eigenvalue theory comes up in it – he says after looking in the subject index (he calls it table of contents) no – asks: you mean the eigenvalue theory of differential equations of the 2<sup>nd</sup> order – I say yes – later I refer to it again with partial differential equations and mention oscillation of a membrane – according to him Furtwängler should teach 1, 2 years but whether the government will allow it is questionable – in the previous semester he introduced only a Riemann integral term in n-dimensions – one could prove the same statements as via Leib. integral – in response to my objection, but there surely were functions that are not Riemann integratable but Leib., he says well the existence criteria are different but the statements are the same – that the proofs then are often more complicated (e.g., limit statement) he admits, but sometimes they are

<sup>o</sup> also already in the past two semesters

<sup>x</sup> analytical geometry in the prior semester

also easier e.g. sum theorem – in his lecture he did function theory – had begun with the one-to-one continuous mapping – (talks rather incomprehensibly for me) had defined the ~~Riemann~~ analytical function via diff. by means of power series, which he had thought also contributed a little something – now he had proven that the conf. mapping was isogonal and isometric (the proof somewhat simplified) – now he plans to prove the reverse that would be much better than talking about linear mapping for 20 pages – I affirm that and say this should be addressed in the exercises – he also would like to deal with algebraic functions in this semester, which is not too much if one only covers the general theorems – I say it depends on what one wants to cover – 2 proseminars he covers Fourier series – so far he has talked about limiting oscillation and continuous convergence that could be very useful, but the class might have held it against him that he had discussed the thing so much in terms of set theory, though only “limit point” had come up.

Fourier series had been ideal for proseminar (then again he says seminar) – he contradicts himself about whether he will be addressing elliptic integrals and inverse – theory of algebraic functions was really not too much he repeats – he had the intention in his lecture of combining the following books:

naturally Knopp, both Bieber books, Osgood, Courant – Hilbert (whose extent he wants to approximately attain) – he would of course have to let much fall beneath the table because with Menger there are 3 professors gone – about the books I am to ask Schubert or . . . who is mostly in Hornich’s room – or Hofreiter who he said is however

probably not here any longer and tomorrow Saturday not at all – Journal of Symbolic Logic<sup>x</sup> had been ordered and therefore some kind of a correspondence – the books received for reviewing had decreased much in number and that was an advantage – always a lot in the past he hadn't known whether to read them or not

<sup>x</sup> it was possibly at Furtwängler's but had been no point for he never looked at it anyway

5 November Schubert 5 minutes
-------------------------------

(successor of Pilcz)

Schubert looked like Boschan – blond, tall, weak, half-blond moustache and light blue deepset eyes – met him at entrance of Hornich's room – he is very accommodating – brings me the Journal of Symbolic Logic after we have looked for it together – but regarding the first volume I have to contact Mayhofer (says some oddly unfitting title) – Lewis-Langford

Is neither in the list of books he has received to date (nor on the pages prepared for the catalogue) – which he looks through in front of me – they are in the drawer of the desk – the books are entered here after they come back from the discussion – there are still ca. 50 slips not yet entered

I meet Clemens in the corridor and he thanks me in a very friendly fashion

5 November Rose Rand (Z's room) task to inform Liebermann soon – she promised to tell Steinhaus and will then call me in Himmelstraße – after I previously said that no telephone – she asks me for the address that she said she had already forgotten

she will not come to Zisel – she doubts that *Meaning and Verification* will be discussed – she hadn't even read the invitation – asks me if the great arcs of the Carnap . . . disturb me – for that reason, Schächter hadn't been able to read it – wants to ~~apply~~ appear in 14 days – asks me if she can once again bother me which I affirm – Wesniewski she does not want to take back until I assure her that I have read him

13 November 1937 – while reading Hartmann philosophy in Göschen suddenly no longer weary of life

15 November 1937 5–6:45 with Frenkel Café Schottentor

I say I live alone and eat in restaurant have a 1 ½ room apartment about 100 schillings

(this she does not find expensive) with poor central heating and dogs barking in the night

she says am I not lonely if I live alone – she herself doesn't know if she'd like that (perhaps) – (I say that is quite tautological) – she finds Frau Feigl completely changed – she had become frivolous and unserious – she will

not return again had spoken very openly (almost really went on and on) about her marriage in German-English

(say I did not notice) she had made an “arrangement” regarding her child – I say she had been serious (in the sense of not happy) – she said she had indeed been severely depressed

studying child psychology – had not ever observed such a change in a person –

the program of the Bühler Collegium she had forgotten to bring along – the last time had been: “Experience of Nature Among Youth” – a paper that had been created under her guidance and did not please her –

she had worked for 8 hours in the Institute on dissertations – she had 80 dissertants all the time

they distributed themselves across 3 cohorts of first to third year students of whom each year 15–20 get done

most of it out of devotion (such as art history) – her investigation of “What do Humans Know of Their Own Behavior” is however far from being finished and that Bühler always forces them to talk about it before completion –

~~ask but~~ she said she only intended to talk to serious people about it after a half year –

so am I not serious? No she isn't talking to me about it after all – whenever she talked to me everything became so clear (like with Carnap) – inspiring for further work

even Carnap must think so for he had been in Vienna only 2 days and both days with me

Dempf had come from Germany and was a Christian mysticist (Ecke-

hardt his area of expertise) – the question whether there were any phenomenologists left from among the Husserl pupils – she says no they all call themselves Husserl pupils – Bühler had been the very co-founder of the school of thought (she says at first) through experimental introspective methods but desk psychology was never one of his pasttimes – his findings, theoretical worldview was that of Külpe (critical realism), views Kant as the greatest philosopher in response to my question (from Brentano influence too however) – but in response to my question how Kant fits in with Külpe she said that he himself didn't seem all that clear about it – his lecture about logic and theory of cognition was on the whole poor (in contrast to the very good one about psychology) also the topic interesting e.g. sleep and dream nevertheless the one about logic well attended (300 listeners) for the students choose lectures according to what they can use and have also no criticism – I say she seems to have criticism after Hildebrand (she said there are other reasons for that) –

I say though Kastil teaches well and also has only a few students – but that probably has

political reasons – which she denies – it is because he addresses the completely boring subt. of Brentano (he is a complete Brentanist) which she herself doesn't know precisely – her experimental questions (e.g., color theory) Bühler was very good and inspiring in his lecture – I say that is likely the main task of the Institute

she says yes of Brunswik (but otherwise not) – her work on self-assessment was a linchpin for psychoanalysis but that was not clear to Bühler

every student in the Institute knows that better than Bühler – she says Bühler rejects psychoanalysis without putting anything in its place and without knowing it precisely – that happened very frequently – asks me if I know the theory of language – I say only very superficially –

I am very jolly the entire time – at the end I can't find my coat – tell the cloakroom attendant the monogram in the hat whereupon found in the 1st wardrobe is with hers under one number which she brings shortly thereafter amidst apologies and especially polite to me –

asks me about Rand she had heard that she was especially intelligent, whether that was true

she had said to Neider it was a scandal that she and not Frenkel had an assistant's post (though she certainly could given her social position – it was going very badly for her – she lived

with her mother very poorly (refugee from Poland she confirms) she admires her because she will nonetheless accept no support – I say she couldn't be that bad off because she had been in Tirol (trip!)

she says Kraft teaches very charmingly) was the only Empiricist at the moment nonetheless no students – I say Gomperz teaching again after all – she says he is at the moment and mostly in America – asks me if Schächer is not very bright

I say I don't know – whether Zilse on that I say I don't know him exactly but likely introduces me to a gentleman and lady (right at the start) and says I know the gentleman from the Schlick Circle.

I tell her about the attempt that one had made with me in the Institute she doesn't know what it is about – asks me if previously I was at Bühler's she could not recall because she had been so busy (I misunderstand her as to whether I had been at a Bühler lecture)

of her work she recounts that the transformation of the actual characteristics into those believed (e.g., aggression doesn't offer any thing per se) depended only on the characteristics not on the character types – I ask if character type is easily determined namely the "Spranger" types she says the Spranger types are less appealing to her than the Kretschmer types – these were easy to determine – there were only 2 psychological (athletic is in the psychological sense = schizoid)

cyclothymic (Bühler views as schizoid) – Carnap was schizoid

(I plead the round head she says I don't have a clear memory of him but then affirms)

Preference for the purely formal is directly a test for schizoid<sup>x</sup> – I say I come from physics tend to gain weight and have a round skull as a cyclothymic male, she maintains however that I am schizothymic – hysterics are always cyclothymic

find contact extremely easy – I say I had not taken hysterics to be typically schizothymic – the connection between body structure and character not so entirely accurate but 2 mental types (including hybrid) – Brunsvick was typically schizoid (in response to my question who was actually a schizoid – in the case of women the determination is much more difficult overall) –

asks me whether I'm not teaching – she would have thought so and why I am not teaching (which I do not answer)

she should really read ca. 8 more books in order to speak about religious ecstasy and will then give a review of the literature – there are some delightful books about it, e.g., Janet – she was unable to set up experiments about it in the Institute – I point out Grabmann The Interior Life of

<sup>x</sup> also not easy to get to know

Saint Thomas (she says but couldn't go into greater detail) –

no one in the Institute understood anything about it – the topic had been chosen by Fräulein Gola because it would probably draw a crowd – the listeners are probably the same ones as for Krise und Neuaufbau<sup>x</sup> namely primarily “society ladies” – she believed she spoke very unclearly (acoustically) Peruta I said he had understood nothing of her talk because he is too high for her – about religion and ecstasy a fellow from Graz (? Mole ?) was originally to have spoken but then cancelled

the next time someone in the Colloquium is to speak “about motion” from which standpoint she did not know – she had first been supposed to give (a professional talk) about Women In The Field but but that had been too vague for her – you could say what you want –

regarding her work (= experiments on 40 people) she gives an example – someone who was very social characterized herself as not very social but very intelligent in order to explain her success with her colleagues – total agreement between behavior and self-assessment had been never found anywhere – also there was no pure negative type (who sees himself in every regard as worse) – after a half year she hopes for more

<sup>x</sup> she was never there hence knew nothing definite

definitive results – I tell her it would interest me very much if I could then meet with her again – she said she hopes that will be the case earlier – it is discussed that I call her up Wednesday before the start of the semester regarding the topic – there is also the question raised whether the psychology students are already a select group (affluent) (no feelings of inferiority) – she would like to do the same experiment among analyzed people she believed then the results would be better

She says there is a psychoanalytical group in Vienna this is comprised in part of psychology students and in part of medical students in part of laymen – 2 years psychiatry is required – the non-physicians may have had no right to treat patients (Kris an example) but they in fact treat cases sent to them by doctors under the rubric of lessons in psychoanalysis – Ernst Kris did not want to give me lessons sent me to Hartmann – he had much to do even had rejected a patient recently – says that Frau Feigl is 33 years old but looks as old as Frau Bühler

she finds the talk by Skubl very amusing the gap in memory after the accident was real it was supposedly Schuschnigg – the man with a too-small heart had been funny the mother of the man had probably told it to him over tea and he had believed it –

The talk by Voegelin had been pitched for Peruta – her talk was the most scientific she feared no one understood it or that she had not been heard –

I say I had heard her very clearly

8 November 1937
-----------------

Lecture Voegelin (Frenkel, Skubl)

Problem of the historical falsehood lies in religiosity in the broadest sense (conquering of a power of society)

4 December 37 Hans Lang how . . . are they singers and many other delightful songs

Zilsel Neider–presentation on aesthetic philosophy 4–7:30 p.m.
--

Dialectical materialism bearing the title Textbook of Philosophy by Schirokoff.

1932 published in Russia – no longer to be found even in antiquarian bookstores probably no longer considered officially recognized appeared 1937 in English translation in London with a 150 page introduction about history of philosophy by an English communist

1. Thesis: Every motion (change) is created by an inner opposite (Antagonism)

that applies even for mechanical motion for historical it is exemplified by the development of the Soviet Union

closest to “Diamat” are Schlick and Krotsche

polemicalizes in particular against Kautsky's opposition to human nature (therefore something external) is the catalyst – further also polemicalizes against Trotsky<sup>x</sup>

(socialist left with the main thesis 1. Communism only outlook if all over the world simultaneously)

2. the peasants in the country are enemies and must be fought against just like the capitalists

and against Bucharin (right) he maintains one could make a pact with the capitalists just as with the farmers (immortalization of Nepp) – Bucharin was sentenced to 7 years in prison (rumors that he was shot to death are false however)

the first who had had the correct view of progress is Heraclit (representative of a brutal bourgeoisie), but quote from him is wrong) and Hegel representative of revolutionary bourgeoisie (at the time of his revolution the bourgeoisie was closer to the absolute truth than now)

all political errors stem from a false philosophy

---

Einsch Dempf and Kastil are all not in one another's good books – Dempf appears a specialist in the research of Plato – requires orientation in the secondary subject

<sup>x</sup> Main works besides Russian Revolution his autobiography but apparently others beyond that

regarding the latest research on Plato –

Alexander also significant modern philosophy as well as Krottsche

Hegel's Encyclopaedia in Russia 30,000 copies

Tolstoy some work 300,000 copies in a few days

Hitler says in Mein Kampf: one must pitch one's speeches to the least qualified if one speaks to the entire populace this way the level cannot be low enough

unclear Russian philosophy is calculated for the populace, who are impressed whenever everything can be reduced to one principle, and the political measure impresses them more if it is philosophically grounded

Gomperz was not happy because 10 hours of teaching duties and one year not twice as much as a ½ year

in addition he is being pushed off onto lecturing – but that does not matter to him

2. Revolution contrast the motion does not necessarily continue further (it could e.g. energy of the working class . . . , it also happens that progression does not take place)

3. Polemic against “mechanistic” viewpoint (“unity of science”)

1. progress does not take place via the old elements in new combination but rather offers something quite new

2. there are various stages of motion (mechanical, biological, thinking, sociological)

and the higher stage forms can not be explained by the lower ones

e.g. philosophical revolution through development of the older ones

#### 4. Polemic against the petit bourgeois Machism (Relativism)

there is an objective and recognizable reality and there is an absolute truth which is increasingly approached in progression = the existence of objective reality Lenin had proved<sup>x</sup> by assuming certain simple statements (e.g.: (capitalism leads to socialism))

#### 5. Polemic against Vitalism (Driesch) only quite brief

#### 6. Polemic against Nominalism

the logical principles are according to Lenin – reaction petrified by milleniums of experience (established in response to a question by Schächter)

Examples for unity of opposites as developmental principle: 1 opposition between worker and peasant as developmental principle of communism 2. opposition between consumption and proletariat leads to increase of productivity

(this would be the right way to overcome the conflict, Trotsky would overcome it by

Stalin very sick writer (according to Hollitscher)

<sup>x</sup> empirical criticism

cutting production in the branches of lesser demand, which is a typical mechanistic solution –interpretation by Trotsky to continue war against Germany because either victory in all the world or communism not possible in Russia, false because development via inner opposition results therefore environment unimportant) 3. Opposition between form and material the machines lead to new materials (kinds of steel) 4. Opposition between absolute and relative was the principle of the development of knowledge

regarding the reasons for the kind of unclear metaphysical books in Russia the following opinion was expressed

1.) it makes an impression on the masses (political activity impresses them more whenever philosophical underpinning) (Beer)

2.) that is a revolution against the philosophy of the opponent (Hollitscher)  
Zinsel's objection: then the reaction would be 2000% stronger than the cause

3.) it is a "touching" attempt to unite with the historical given (Zinsel) discussion between Hollitschen and Zinsel about the role of the special "dialectical" in Marx – Zinsel thinks that is only the rubble which masks the very significant empirical achievements of Hegel and Marx apparently he also thinks

the authors did not care about it except for the empirical – Hollitscher ascribes more significance to it

says there are relatively many writings of Marx and Engels which are purely philosophical (e.g. Polemic against Stirner) – by Marx there was an treatise about class terminology entirely along the lines of the book by Hempel ? Pollak? <sup>x</sup> – he says it was fruitful for a logician to have to deal with it in order to bring clarity to it

Zinsel says the entire things shows (e.g. jumping from quantity to quality (heating up of water) is likewise (the very terminology quantity and quality antediluvian) was nonsensical and one should cleanse Hegel and Marx of it then would remain – very significant empirical achievement left

---

present are: beside Neider and Zinsel: Weiskopf, Hollitscher,

Schächter, Juhos, Kraft, Beer, Eckstein,

Menzel and one other gentleman whose name I do not know

---

<sup>x</sup> Hempel, ?Pollak? about class terminology

5 December Sunday sermon Suso Waldeck

all humans bear a feeling of guilt in their breast but the “strong” repress it with violence

5 January Rand 6–8 Künstler Café

they think it’s particularly awful café (people as well as appearance)

she was examined by Reininger 1.) primarily about Rationalism supposedly

1. about the activity of God in Spinoza and in Descartes and about the difference between the two – in the case of one he intercedes in the other not

2. about Kant synthetic unity of apperception but then he breaks off right away again because he sees that she can do it well

3. Leibniz 3 kinds of perceptions, clear, unclear, mixed

asks about the definition of “clear” (this is not a basic concept) but rather clear = defined

biographical determination and works only very little (like the name of Schopenhauer's main work) and who the post-Kantians were – asks too some about Hegel, Fichte, Schelling – Reininger ruins her commendation

with Meister she had agreed Middle Ages<sup>x</sup> and the book “The Objective Spirit”

asks her about problem of universals (<sup>x</sup> There are many church fathers listed by name as to how they behaved in the trinity dispute, these names he exempts her from)

especially High Scholasticism (Meister is enthusiastic about the Middle Ages in general) – asks her the various answers to this question with the names of those she gave – outside of High Scholasticism nothing about the Middle Ages not even Augustine – he also asks why “objective spirit” not a contradiction and says she should translate it into an adjective (what does this mean? she doesn't mention it)

Reininger she studies Deussen, Falckenberg and his books

there is an Austro-American agency Dir. Denger

Professor of Economics in Vienna directs family exchange and American stipends in Austria

(university stipends in Vienna don't exist, that is only a fairytale)

turn her down – mainly Bühler determines the Austrian Rockefeller grants and he will most certainly not give her one because she would at most say bad things about him

Reininger then asks her about Locke and Comte

Mayrhofer puts apparently intelligent examples even in the secondary examination, and sometimes nastily

she is doing the secondary examination with Mayer and Schweidler

(Experimental physics, mathematics, heat and mechanics in their development)

Erkenntnis will no longer appear but is to continue in America primarily in English (letter from Carnap)

her work about Realism-Problems was finally accepted by Bühler after all and will appear

there are ca. 8 subscriptions to date for Wieszniarki but she will run off more copies 50 p – is printed with a typewriter

on waxed paper – one-sided page 30 groschen – she had received a charming letter from Kotarbinski – she would donate a copy for the Mathematics Seminar – is surprised that I prefer to lecture than write – Södermann is a polymath and a horrible person, however Mostowski very pleasant she had sent him up to me – Meister demands Greek and Latin technical terms

11 January Söderman 4.30–7 in his apartment Dorithgasse

Dubislav double suicide in a (particularly) horrible way – he was to return to Germany since no prospect of professorship in Prague because unpopular in Germany – on the last evening a discussion at Fräulein ? planned but canceled because he wanted to be alone with her – happened then

once he had tried to stab the eyes out of a woman but she had been able to save herself with a few scratches – has a demonic influence on women (wife of Frank calls it hypnotic) –

1. Christian Morgenstern poems in his library (all Gallows Songs) among them: the Ode of the Seven-Swine, The Idea of the Dog (= dead dog)

Fisherman's Night Song (without words)

## 2. Studying Philosophy

### 3. Hempel on Typology (logic applied to Kretschmer) Jentsch is an antipode of Kretschmer

Experiment that apparently argues against Kretschmer – name the colors of various colors, when red do not name instead press a button – here the cyclothymes divide into 2 classes on 2 different sides of schizothymes. – Should be a proof for Jentsch – . . . last year Kretschmer also established a psychologically athletic type (characterized by “toughness”) –

schizothyme said to be a well-defined type but cyclothyme defined by everything that is not schizothyme – Kretschmer (born 1888 still living) – (a work Brilliant People) – Goethe said to be cyclothyme so the categorization intelligent = schizothyme not entirely but almost entirely

4. Hempel on concept of truth (own brochure in Holland)

(Hempel was now longterm assistant of Carnap)

5. Flaubert Collected Works 12 francs in Paris he could not resist because books are so cheap

6. Vol 3 of the publication of Brentano Society a work about value theory and theodicy

7. Scholz research on logic (there were 12 notebooks already released)

8. Scholz (1937) ?

he is now going to Scholz (February 1937 for one semester) Scholz wanted him to already go there in the fall

from that a definition a textbook is ~~a book that deals with science~~ rules a textbook of science and the like according to Södermann misuse of the logical as compared to Hempel useful application of the logical

Cassirer was in Vienna discussion at Kraft's (discus. very lively) there exists nearly no difference between Vienna Circle and them – for a category only as rigid as it says nothing (e.g. causality) – difference only inasmuch as meaning of a word exists not in its grammar but rather must be something intuitively given – did not speak publicly

Paris lecture that has something to do with logic 1. unity of science 2. logic and mathematics 3 ——— in 1. a lecture which includes the following: Positivism is the case of Lucifer and the processing of the divine into matchsticks

from Brentano there is to be a complete aesthetics on moral grounds published (bad pictures highest art form) in his last period Brentano was a Realist – he was blind in his last years and spoke often with pupils – the notes of these conversations still exist – he himself

wanted them published after his death – besides that notes of lectures and own lecture manuscripts exist in his literary estate (also about logic) the entire estate administered by the Brentano Society (there are three copies of each piece of paper and the original is in a safe) – notes of the conversations in part dictated by himself and many hastily and illegible

Twardowski is still living and holds Circle about philosophical questions – up to now of Brentanoist logic only theory of categories, origin of ethical knowledge, observations in psychology (2nd vol. – toward Husserl and Meinong he was very angry in his last phase – logically significant the general sentences as negative existential statements and addition of the condition of existence to save . . . – thought about the Russellean antinomies much in his last years – translated into his language they are as follows: someone thinks the concept of doing which does not fall under the concept he is thinking of (he says it differently)

8 January 1938 Zilse 4:15–7:30

present: Neider, Rand, Fraenkel, Veitlberg Schwächter, Södermann, Juhos, one other?

Schwächter speaks about his most recent work that appeared in Holland: difference between religion and science is that in the case of religion it is a matter of norm, also that the assertion presented as justification of the norm has a value (is, for example defended quite differently than in science) the word “faith” is à qui veut when a religious person says he believes in the resurrection of the body that means something quite different than a scientific statement – by the way he doesn’t believe what he’s saying himself (that is only one aspect of the problem)

Mostowski 18 December 1937 11.30–1 (at my place)

1. Tarski has proven the Axiom of Choice under the condition that for every cardinal number there exists a larger inaccessible cardinal (inaccessible in the sense of  $\aleph_{\alpha+1} = 2^{\aleph_\alpha}$ ) – dependent on one then being able to carry out the theory of von Neumann within every similar subsystem – for him that was the first convincing proof for Axiom of Choice

2. from his talks it follows apparently that the measure problem (existence of a total set function is not solved for real numbers

3. Explicitly he says that it is not solved for the first accessible number

4. regarding the question whether the non-existence of a decomposition of  $\aleph_1$  into more than  $\aleph_1$  greater than the cardinality  $\aleph_1$  with finite . . . continuum follow he does not know

5. Gentzer believes the consistency of the analysis will follow from his method and that should appear soon – what kind of an ordinal number will that be that he needs (I say probably the kind that results from proof for the constituency of the continuum)

6. ~~Bernays himself has~~ Gentzerian proof for number theory was not clear to him at all

6. Bernays (returning from Paris) was very interested in my model and claims that he can prove that there are  $\aleph_1$  sets of natural numbers (first type)

(asks if he is allowed to tell about my lecture in Poland)

7. at the Paris conference Gentzer had only talked general (philosophical) things

Tarski had read a chapter of his popular book aloud this was pitched at high school students and as such very good

H. Porkert 15 May 1938

is a member of the N.S. since 1932 (previous membership lapsed due to financial difficulties)

1 year probationary time in the case of each member – since 1932 counts as “Old Member”

met Hitler when he was 18 – he wanted to get a position at a construction firm but had no luck went as a volunteer to war – at 15 had a teacher introduced to politics (through “Deutsches Heim”) then often accompanied him on propaganda tours and was once on a list – his party was that of Schönerer (died 1917) this split itself and fell apart due to Wolf. Founded the “Großdeutschen” (. . . in contrast to the “Altdeutschen”) the majority of the students on his side – committed adultery against his Corps colleague Schalk dueled with him Schalk was unfair in it and because of that loses a court case against him – aside from that Wolf had some kind of an affair with sugar factory (Zuckerl-Wolf) – Party program 1. Antisemitism 2. Germanicism 3. break with Rome – continuation after the war by Hitler in Austria.

in Austria founded 1923 (in Germany 1922) – Kittel was the husband of his sister . . . of the Schönerer Party (Hussar first lieutenant, large property owner, forestry inspector – he has a stroke because of his son Edi who is a bounder – his wife is still living – his son Otto is magistrate in Brück daughter Friedl a large house in Vienna on Ringstraße a second daughter Hilda apparently in the homeland (Brück) ) (until) (informant Adele – H.P. had an attack of nerves in his youth – after several days on a trip he had eaten nothing not slept and had a lot to drink

first during an overnight stay he gets up again 10 minutes after going to bed because he hears he is already being woken up – then in the train he has the impression he must leap from the train – then he travels home and has a terrible night cannot sleep has heart palpitations fear unrest (he does not want to take bromide) – then he eats 6 pairs of sausages and a lot of liverwurst and then he is restored again but then he tells of his boyhood pranks

1. ignited fireworks so that the firemen and the watch had to come out (at the Schloßberg in Brück)

2. Goes with his brother Heinrich (9 and 12 years old) alone to a distant excursion site where there is a castle with a fishpond – on the way only saved from an express train by being thrown down by a signalman – upon arrival the castle owner is on his deathbed – after returning they get beatings with a knotted rope – enters in his youth into holy circles and

Monastery Neuburg in and out like a child at home (gets the key for parts not accessible to anyone (informant Adele) – takes part in their festivities – knows several who have relinquished their cassocks (an engineer) another (Father Robert), curses that he went into a monastery because of an unhappy love in his youth – all of them are terribly fat – takes part in numerous political events of his relatives about whom he tells funny stories – ~~but notices~~ oddly enough I feel somehow at home in his stories – there are 2,000 planes on the Czech border – ~~2~~ ~~whole~~ this thing will be ended within 2 months via invasion – . . . and Adele owe their lives to the message of a doctor (that “the studio” was ruined) then . . . had come and then he didn’t care

Addresses

Kulmus Fritz II Sterneckplatz 9 (Room number 23)

on 6 December 1937 Solarium Stolzaple (Steiermark)

Program 1. What consequences does a self-release form have? How to reverse it?

Back to the loony bin