

# Chapter 3

## “Who Is Ichheiser?”: A Person Who Failed Himself and the World



Christian Fleck

Born on December 25, 1897, in Krakow, Poland, then part of the Habsburg Empire, Gustav Ichheiser is one of those refugee scientists who had to establish himself within the United States (US) without financial support by the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars (EC). His eventful, three-decade-long life in the US was marked by no highs but numerous lows, all of which were so unusual that they deserve a closer look. Looking more closely at outliers—speaking here in statistical terms—may help shed light on the more common cases: was it a summation of small incidences or a single factor acting toward a causal effect?<sup>1</sup>

Ichheiser arrived in the US for the first time in 1940 as a 43-year-old. His EC files include only a few pages and hardly help to reconstruct his attempts to establish himself in the US.<sup>2</sup> In May 1938, Betty Drury sent a detailed letter to Fritz Redl, who had turned to the EC in the cause of Ichheiser a few days earlier. Redl, who had lived in New York since 1936, was a former Austrian high school teacher and a Viennese-trained psychoanalyst who had primarily worked as an educational counselor in Vienna. Apparently he met Ichheiser in that environment, who was at that time a psychological vocational counselor in Vienna; Ichheiser had probably turned to Redl to ask him for help in his efforts to reach the US. Either way, Redl mentioned

---

<sup>1</sup>Here, I am following Lazarsfeld's (1962) recommendation, which unfortunately has received little recognition elsewhere, to pay more attention to those cases that deviate from the norm; see Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg (1949–1950), Kendall and Wolf (1955), and Lazarsfeld (1962).

<sup>2</sup>None of Ichheiser's personal papers remained intact, which meant that the reconstruction of his life became the work of various “detectives” over the years: Marianne Egger de Campo, Reinhard Müller, Dietmar Paier, and Dirk Raith were able to gather valuable information from archives or from interviews for Ichheiser's life story as it is presented here. Early on, Rudmin, Trimpop, Kryl, and Boski (1987) had drawn attention to Ichheiser. The various interpretations offered by Rudmin et al., however, were not always verifiable.

C. Fleck (✉)

Department of Sociology, University of Graz, Graz, Austria

e-mail: [christian.fleck@uni-graz.at](mailto:christian.fleck@uni-graz.at)

in his letter that the American consul in Poland had advised Ichheiser “he would get a quota if he just could produce a letter from some scientific institution verifying that he was a scholar of some standing and could do interesting and valuable work in the US.”<sup>3</sup> Ichheiser’s birth and his having lived in both Vienna and in Warsaw from 1934 are all plausible reasons for why he went to the American Consulate in Warsaw, despite the fact that the Polish immigrant quota for the US was hopelessly overbooked.<sup>4</sup>

In addition to kind words of thanks for the provided information, which was going to be useful for the EC’s future work, Drury’s letter contained the usual indications: there was no active placement; one had to wait for requests from colleges and universities; the EC only felt responsible for professors and lecturers who had been dismissed from German universities; and, anyway, due to the current prevailing economic conditions, there were practically no vacancies.<sup>5</sup> Redl’s mentioning that the letter did not necessarily need to contain an actual job offer was not even deemed worthy of comment. Pro forma invitations were not eligible for the EC. This exchange of letters led to the EC creating a personnel file on Ichheiser, but for the time being, that file remained very thin. New information was not added until 2 years later.

Two-and-a-half years after Redl’s request, Ichheiser arrived in the US, thanks to the help of the British refugee relief committee. From Warsaw, where he had settled after the annexation of Austria, he had turned to the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning (SPSL) in London to obtain a transit visa for the UK. The British Home Office granted him the visa in the spring of 1939 because the SPSL had not only pointed out that Ichheiser’s residence permit in Poland was time limited but also that Ichheiser was only in transit on his way to the US and thus it would provide for him during his stay in London. The SPSL, whom Ichheiser had first contacted in May 1937, had detailed information on him from a questionnaire they had sent him and which he had completed and returned, along with other documentation.

Ichheiser listed Leopold von Wiese, Karl Mannheim, Richard Thurnwald, and Franziska Baumgartner as references. Mannheim had testified favorably at the SPSL, and Marie Jahoda willingly provided information about Ichheiser. Both highly praised his skills as a psychologist and his being well versed in the broader field of the social sciences. This, as Mannheim stressed, was quite unusual for a psychologist. Nevertheless, the Assistant Secretary of SPSL, Esther Simpson, recommended in November 1938 that Ichheiser contact his American colleagues, “since prospects in that country are much better than in Europe.”<sup>6</sup> Unidentified

---

<sup>3</sup>See Fritz Redl, April 20, 1938, EC, Box 75, File Ichheiser, Gustav, NYPL. A typing error must have occurred in respect to Redl’s reference to a quota visa, as this was most likely a nonquota visa. Unless otherwise stated, all documents relating to the EC are contained in this file.

<sup>4</sup>Thernstrom, *Harvard encyclopedia of American ethnic groups*, p. 493f.

<sup>5</sup>Drury to Redl, April 20 and June 3, 1938. Upon Redl’s request Drury included Ichheiser’s CV in a second letter and sent it back to Redl.

<sup>6</sup>Esther Simpson to Ichheiser in Warsaw, November 14, 1938, SPSL, file “Ichheiser,” SPSL Archive, 1933–1987, Department of Special Collections and Western Manuscripts, Bodleian Library, Oxford.

American friends of Ichheiser’s had “mobilized a senator from Ohio to write to the American Consul General in Warsaw in my [i.e., Ichheiser’s] matter.” In January 1939, Ichheiser informed Mannheim that the one singular affidavit would not suffice, but that a second was on its way.<sup>7</sup> In reality, nothing was moving along, merely his permit of residency, which he, even though born in Poland (under Habsburg rule), required as an Austrian citizen, seems to have been repeatedly extended to Warsaw.

Thanks to ambiguous letters sent from the SPSL to the British consulate in Warsaw, Ichheiser was finally able to travel to London in the spring of 1939, “Should Dr. Ichheiser have the necessary means for his maintenance in this country for that period [of waiting for the US visa], this Society would be very happy to support his application for a visa for Great Britain,” and a few days later, “We have now ascertained that adequate means will be available in this country for Dr. Gustav Ichheiser until such time as he becomes established here or goes to the United States of America, for which country he has an affidavit.”<sup>8</sup> The (private) Institute of Sociology had promised, through the intervention of Mannheim, to ensure Ichheiser’s financial support for two years and supplied him with a letter containing this information.

After Ichheiser’s arrival in London, the Institute of Sociology was unable to follow through with this promise. Morris Ginsberg and Ludwig Wittgenstein (who insisted on remaining anonymous) handed the SPSL checks for Ichheiser, and Marie Jahoda, who herself had arrived in England in 1937, thanks to a similar letter from the Institute of Sociology. The “Non-Aryan Relief Committee of the Council of the Christian Churches Bristol” had helped for funding Ichheiser’s accommodations in Bristol, where he hoped to remain until the US entry visa arrived. However, Ichheiser soon had to leave Bristol, as he was interned as an enemy alien. In October 1940, the SPSL closed the Ichheiser case. In a last letter to Esther Simpson, Ichheiser thanked her for her help.

The contrast between the British and the American Relief Committee could not be any clearer. The extent to which the British attended to the help-seekers extended far beyond their financial means, which in this and many other cases meant their survival; without favorably skewing the information required by the UK authorities and without the help of SPSL employees, Ichheiser would have shared the same fate of his mother, his brother, his sister-in-law, and his niece and would have been deported from Warsaw into one of the death camps. The American refugee helpers certainly empathized with those seeking help to a comparable degree on a personal level, but their strict compliance to the law (an employee of the EC would have never sent ambiguous letters to US consulates) and their refusal to aid individuals with more than good advice practically reduced for Ichheiser the benefits of their help to zero. While SPSL helped a large number of people with small sums and great commitment, the EC was only able to record those cases as positively completed

---

<sup>7</sup>Ichheiser to Mannheim, January 19, 1939, SPSL, file Ichheiser, Bodleian Library.

<sup>8</sup>SPSL to Consul General, British Embassy, Warsaw, November 23 and December 20, 1938, SPSL, File Ichheiser, Bodleian Library.

when third parties were involved that wanted to help a refugee scientist through wage subsidies. The number of those who appealed to the EC for support rose drastically through SPSL's political decisions to specifically advise their protégés to try their fortune in the US.

Gustav Ichheiser's endeavor to reach the US was primarily supported by colleagues. Most did not know him personally but had been asked by others to attend to his matters; only few were aware of his publications. In addition to the aforementioned Fritz Redl, only Marie Jahoda of all those previously named actually knew Ichheiser personally. She had worked as a student with him in the Vocational Counseling Bureau of the City of Vienna, in which Ichheiser was actively practicing in the field of psycho-mechanics from 1927 until the facility was closed down in March 1933. Jahoda conducted tests that Ichheiser utilized for his publications on success.<sup>9</sup> However, she could not be of any help to him in his efforts to establish himself within the US; she was too little known at the time and did not have enough contacts overseas.

Of those references Ichheiser had provided to the SPSL in 1937, only Karl Mannheim was able to promote him fervently and with success. Mannheim probably only knew Ichheiser from his publications, but these must have left a lasting positive impression on him. During this time, numerous inquiries from colleagues seeking help were piling up on Mannheim's desk at the London School of Economics, making it impossible to attend to all of them. In fact, Mannheim did not randomly write recommendation letters, and he did not make the effort to inquire about the progress of supporting measures for all of the petitioners. Ginsberg and Wittgenstein, who had both supported Ichheiser financially from private funds, also repeatedly made inquiries about the state of affairs, but could not be of much other support to Ichheiser. The same was true of Egon Brunswik, who mentioned Ichheiser next to his two teachers Karl and Charlotte Bühler as being particularly worthy of support in a letter to the committee for refugee psychologists of the American Psychological Association. A letter of recommendation, which Mannheim gave Ichheiser on his trip to the US, had the most formative effect. Mannheim wrote to Louis Wirth that Ichheiser was:

on the one hand experienced in occupational guidance and mental testing and on the other hand a sociological and psychological thinker with very stimulating ideas. His book on *Die Kritik des Erfolges* [*The Critique of Success*] is a very interesting contribution to our problems of ideologies. I am sure you will enjoy discussions with him and that you will be able to give him some advice and help about his further career.<sup>10</sup>

On November 7, 1940, Ichheiser sent this letter from New York to Wirth in Chicago, who responded immediately and announced he would make time for a personal meeting during his next stay in New York.

For the next few years, Wirth became Ichheiser's American mentor. The Austro-Polish psychologist, who claimed his specialty to be the psychology of human

<sup>9</sup>Marie Jahoda to Reinhard Müller, January 25, 1994, AGSÖ, Bestand Ichheiser.

<sup>10</sup>Mannheim to Wirth, September 20, 1940, Louis Wirth Papers, Box V, folder 5, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

misunderstanding, did not always make it easy for Wirth nor for any of those who were to follow in his footsteps. Another of his later mentors, Hans Morgenthau, wrote after Ichheiser’s death to Everett Hughes, who also occupied the same role for a while, that “The trouble with I[chheiser] was that he lived his social theories.”<sup>11</sup>

The foundation upon which Ichheiser was able to establish himself within the US, how fragile it may have been, unquestionably constituted his work still being published in Europe. The scientific capital gained out of these writings enabled him to mobilize enough social capital, which in turn enabled his admission into the scientific field of the social sciences in Chicago.

## On the Way Toward a Critique of Success

Ichheiser enclosed within all of his introductory letters and applications a list of 26 publications. He had, in fact, published much more than that between 1925—when his first article was published in the *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*—and 1938: three dozen essays and the book *Kritik des Erfolges. Eine soziologische Untersuchung* (1930) in German, as well as several Polish publications. The main thoughts and concepts, which remained central to Ichheiser’s work throughout the rest of his life, were already visible in his third publication published in 1927 in the *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*. Ichheiser presumably closely studied Niccoló Machiavelli during a study visit to Italy, which is reflected in his publication “*Die Antinomien zwischen Politik und Moral bei Machiavelli*” [*The antinomies between politics and moral in Machiavelli*] (1927). The subject that would later earn him fame among his contemporaries was already mentioned within the subtitle of this publication: “Ein Beitrag zu einer ‘Soziologie des Erfolgs’” [A contribution to the “sociology of success”]. What appears to Ichheiser as an “antinomy” is the fact that rules and norms, commonly referred to as morality, allow for a flexibility of actions that is then exploited by those who:

take advantage of the possibilities of movement arising from a lax realization of the law, and to diminish the success of all those who endanger their own position, partly from decency, partly from ignorance of the factual “perilous” (or almost perilous) violation of the provisions in question, and under otherwise equal circumstances must necessarily be inferior in the fight for social success. (1927, p. 306, emphasized in the original)<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup>Morgenthau to Hughes, December 19, 1969, Everett C. Hughes Papers, Box 6, Ichheiser-Material, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

<sup>12</sup>Translated from the German: “Die durch eine laxe Rechtsverwirklichung entstehenden Bewegungsmöglichkeiten rücksichtslos ausnützen und [das] vermindert die Erfolgchancen aller derjenigen, die teils aus Anständigkeit, teils aus Unkenntnis der faktischen ›gefahrlosen‹ (oder doch fast gefahrlosen) Übertretung der fraglichen Bestimmungen, die eigene Position gefährden und unter sonst gleichen Umständen im Kampf um den sozialen Erfolg notwendig unterliegen müssen.”

Ichheiser sees the “social mechanism of success,” referred to here, in the most “condensed form of appearance,” in the:

fact of hypocrisy. For this is the actual performance of hypocrisy, that it preserves the successfully hypocritical, all protection, which is guaranteed by normative behavior, and at the same time secures all the advantages resulting from the (advantageous) infringement of the social norms (and from the thereby resulting freedom of movement). (1927, p. 307)<sup>13</sup>

In his essay on Machiavelli (1927), Ichheiser fails to state why the hypocrites and all those who avoid following moral commands are successful. Despite his talk of “social mechanisms,” determined precisely by these actions (“The person takes action with the aim of a certain outcome, the ‘social mechanism’ however will steer the outcome into a direction which is foreseen by the sociologist [by the observer], but quite unintended by the individual himself,” p. 303),<sup>14</sup> a closer description of what nowadays would be termed a social mechanism is missing: the regular, common factors leading to specific results. But Ichheiser did, if you will, identify a worthy subject area that deserved further exploration. And he also already anticipated at this point that the investigator of these subject matters would encounter resistance:

For, as it is grounded in the essence of power to trim one’s own morals in such a way that they do not show what they are, morality has in the practical pursuit of the “sociology of success” at all times to bar the way to “success,” i.e., to effectiveness, to all those who have dared to expose them. (1927, p. 309)<sup>15</sup>

Besides investigating the subject matter of social success, Ichheiser’s early work reveals additional insight, which he was systematically trying to develop and which positioned him in the close proximity of the thinking of those authors who, as symbolic interactionists, later contributed to the prominence of the Chicago School of Sociology. Like the latter, Ichheiser sees “self-awareness” and “awareness of self-worth” as the result of a “reflection” or “mirroring.” Unlike Charles Cooley, however, Ichheiser is not content with the concept of a simple reflection or mirror image, but instead chooses the optical illusion of a picture puzzle:

The psychological situation of a man can best be illustrated, and perhaps the most vividly ... by the following analogy: If someone entered into a mirror cabinet, strange, contorted and distorted reflections of his own self reflection are grinning from all sides: and now suppose ... the person in question had experienced these contorted and distorted reflections *representing* the you to himself and the community, and that all these relations between him

<sup>13</sup>Translated from the German: “Tatsache der Heuchelei. Denn dies ist ja die eigentliche Leistung der Heuchelei, daß sie dem erfolgreich Heuchelnden, allen Schutz, den ein normgemäßes Verhalten gewährleistet, bewahrt und zugleich alle Vorteile sichert, die aus dem (zweckmäßigen) Verletzen der sozialen Normen (und aus der daraus resultierenden Bewegungsfreiheit) sich ergeben.”

<sup>14</sup>Translated from the German: “Der Handelnde will durch sein Verhalten etwas Bestimmtes, die ‘soziale Mechanik’ biegt aber die Folgen seines Verhaltens in einer zwar vom Soziologen (vom Betrachtenden) voraussehbaren, vom Individuum aber selbst durchaus ungewollten Richtung um.”

<sup>15</sup>Translated from the German: “Denn, da es im Wesen der Macht begründet liegt, sich moralisch zu verbrämen, um nicht als das was sie ist zu erscheinen, so hat sie, zu allen Zeiten, im praktischen Verfolge der ‘Soziologie des Erfolges’, alles darangesetzt, allen denjenigen, die es gewagt haben sie zu entlarven, den Weg zum “Erfolge”, d. h. zur Wirksamkeit zu versperren.”

and the environment, based on this distorted appearance, immerge, that respect and contempt, inclination and aversion, the “we and they” find their bearings in this mirror-spook: then one would have found, in this analogy, the image of the psychological situation that everyone experiences through being in conflict between “being” and “appearance.” (1928a, p. 35)<sup>16</sup>

In doing so, Ichheiser indeed does not understand the tension between the “core of the individual” and the “responsibilities taken on” as being one-sidedly determined. In the case of a “weak personality,” an “initially fictitious assumption of the social surrounding with respect to an individual ultimately produces a character that aligns with this fictitious assumption,” while a “strong personality . . . [will] always try from anew to run up against their own old appearances and the thereby resulting consequences.” Since society will always raise an objection to such “attempts, that threaten the very foundations of its existence,” “the best one can do” is acknowledgment that “a theoretically and practically unsolvable problem is to be recognized as *unsolvable*” (1928a, p. 42, emphasized in the original).

With all this, however, Ichheiser insists that reality and appearance can and must be kept apart. He demonstrates this point with the example of physical beauty in a rather original way. The beautiful woman—as a prototype of the beautiful human being—is confronted with the fact that wherever she goes, the physical aspects of her personality are at the forefront:

Her total personality is always “acknowledged” in regards to the typical aspect of the physical appearance, and the physical beauty is considered as “the actual essence of her.” . . . Her individuality “is” to her social surrounding only what her physical appearance means. (Ichheiser, 1928b, p. 259)

He continues to develop the idea in so far as he turns to the phenomenon of deception, which is only possible to conceive in terms of a given reality appearing as another but which, at least in principle, is transparent. He understands deceptions as “error’s of perception” (Ichheiser, 1928b, p. 259) and is mainly interested in their consequences for “researching the soul,” more than in the illusions and deceptions encountered by ordinary persons in everyday life. It is not always easy to see from which level his explanations depart, as his reasoning is phenomenological. It seems, however, that the critical delineation to other psychological perspectives was much more important to him in his German publications than in his later rather dominant preoccupation with the concept of human misunderstanding. In his German

---

<sup>16</sup>Translated from the German: “Am besten und vielleicht am eindringlichsten läßt sich die seelische Situation eines Menschen [...] durch folgendes Gleichnis illustrieren: Ist jemand in ein Vexierkabinett getreten, dann grinsen ihm aus allen Wänden seltsam verrenkte und verzernte Spiegelungen seines Selbst entgegen: und man nehme nun an [...], der Betreffende hätte die Erfahrung gemacht, dass diese verzerzten und verrenkten Spiegelungen ihn, dem Du und der Gemeinschaft gegenüber, *repräsentieren*, und dass alle Beziehungen zwischen ihm und der Umgebung sich, an diesem verzerzten Erscheinen orientiert, gestalten, dass Achtung und Verachtung, Neigung und Abneigung, ‘wir und ihr’ an diesem Spiegelspuk ihren Anhalt finden: dann hätte man, im Gleichnis, das Bild der seelischen Lage gewonnen, die der in Konflikten zwischen dem ‘Sein’ und ‘Erscheinen’ Befangene erleben muß.”

publications, this notion is only referred to in footnotes, but it becomes prominent in his American writings.

Ichheiser's *Critique of Success* thus represents something like a sum of his contributions sketched in previous years. A "sociology of success" should be concerned with the "success-relevant characteristics of the individuals and their behavior and the environmental constellations" understood as "two sides of in essence one and the same complex situation" (Ichheiser, 1930, p. 3). What belongs to the "essence of success" is that:

It [success] is subjected to self-disguise, [from which it follows that] every sociology of success will by its very nature signify an unmasking of success; That even in cases where there is no social-critical intention, whatever the nature of the intention may be, according to the outcome it must always necessarily be a critique of success. (p. 5)<sup>17</sup>

To this end, Ichheiser distinguishes between ability and success. The former represents, as it were, the totality of the abilities and character qualities of an individual, while the latter signifies all that contributes to success but does not increase actual performance. Ichheiser explicitly mentions commercials, the advertising drum, the masking—that is, all those elements that were later summarized as marketing and have been exposed in social criticism since Erich Fromm, David Riesman, and others. Now, the distribution of the success-promoting qualities differs from society to society, which is why the privileged can afford to show "standard behavior" in the "arena of social life." This, indeed, would add to the "bad aftertaste of Pharisaism," since it did not cost any of their decency, but it does not diminish their chances of asserting themselves in regard to success. Paraphrasing Max Weber Ichheiser (1930) states that he whose "behavior always and everywhere, exclusively and solely falls within the realm of functional rationality, will always and everywhere [...] be superior to those whose behavior is (sometimes, frequently, always) also oriented through value rational, traditional, emotional motives" (p. 31).<sup>18</sup> For the spectator, and therefore also for the researcher of success, all these "inevitable deceptions about the characteristics relevant to success" leads to a "peculiarly fascinating ... problem of deception" rendering "understanding the mechanisms of a sociology of success to be such a difficult task" (1930, p. 38).<sup>19</sup> An "illusionary empiricism," with the aim of collecting facts, is programmed to fail, for this approach only "generates illusionary insights."

---

<sup>17</sup>Translated from the German: Zum "Wesen des Erfolges" gehöre, "dass er ... einer Selbstverschleierung unterworfen ist," woraus folge, "dass jede Erfolgssoziologie ihrem Wesen nach eine Entlarvung des Erfolges bedeuten wird; dass sie, auch dort, wo keine wie immer auch geartete sozialkritische Absicht besteht, ihrem Ergebnis nach – eine Kritik des Erfolges bedeuten muß."

<sup>18</sup>Translated from the German: "Verhalten immer und überall, ausschließlich und allein sich in den Bahnen der Zweckrationalität bewegt [...] immer und überall [...] denjenigen überlegen sein (wird), deren Verhalten sich (manchmal, häufig, immer) auch an wertrationalen, traditionellen, emotionalen Motiven zu orientieren pflegt."

<sup>19</sup>Translated from the German: "Zwangsläufige Täuschungen über die erfolgsrelevanten Eigenschaften" zu einer "eigenartig faszinierenden [...] Täuschungsproblematik" und macht das "Durchschauen der erfolgssoziologischen Mechanismen zu einer derart schweren Aufgabe."



In further work, Ichheiser continued to elaborate his basic credo and contrasted his arguments with contributions from others on the same subject. By doing so, he also reflected that if his sociology of success were finally recognized as a successful theory, it would not have resulted from his theories being correct. Far more radical than Mannheim, who wanted to prevent the self-application of his sociology of knowledge by calling on the lack of interest as a mission of the free-spirited intelligentsia, Ichheiser did not hold back from viewing his theory of success “as a real child of our chaotic time,” as a “symptom of a mental (or spiritual) and social crisis; as a symptom that, in turn, accelerates the very process of which it is an expression, namely that of disintegration” (Ichheiser, 1932, p. 325).<sup>20</sup>

This brief summary of Ichheiser’s early work is intended to illustrate that he was able to develop his own research profile in the decade following his studies, which he completed in 1924 with a philosophical dissertation on the subject of aesthetics. As part of his responsibilities as a psychologist (psychotechnic) in the Vocational Counseling Bureau of the City of Vienna, Ichheiser administered vocational aptitude tests, which fit nicely with his interest in psychological and sociological conditions for success. In this aspect, he indeed followed his own path; he did not follow Karl Bühler’s direction in psychology, but instead developed a view oriented on the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and then extended it into a sociological direction.

For someone not employed by a university, he published an unusually high number of papers for his time. In the five years between the transfer of the management of the Psychotechnical Department and the closure of the vocational counseling department of the City of Vienna in the wake of the establishment of the authoritarian state (the so-called *Ständestaat*), Ichheiser published several essays each year, which appeared in leading psychological and sociological journals.<sup>21</sup> All of these papers are distinctly characterized by their explicit reference to current contributions by other authors with bibliographical details, which was rather unusual for the time. Ichheiser tried to put his own ideas into a discursive along with the contributions of others, paying particular attention to the more prominent authors of the time. His criticism of others was noticeably diminishing, and he was aiming at demonstrating the connectivity of his own thoughts to those of scholars already better established during that time. In short, Ichheiser’s early publications show an author who would have been capable of taking the next academic hurdle. Had it only depended on the “efficiency” (“Leistungstüchtigkeit”), the habilitation would have been the next step.

---

<sup>20</sup>Translated from the German: “Als ein echtes Kind unserer chaotischen Zeit verstanden” zu sehen, “als ein Symptom einer geistigen und gesellschaftlichen Krise; als ein Symptom, das seinerseits den Auflösungsprozeß, dessen Ausdruck es ist, [es] zu beschleunigen berufen ist.”

<sup>21</sup>Ichheiser’s essays appeared among others in *Archiv für angewandte Soziologie*, *Archiv für die gesamte Psychologie*, *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, *Archiv für systematische Philosophie und Soziologie*, *Erkenntnis*, *Kölner Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie*, *Zeitschrift für angewandte Psychologie*, *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie*, *Zeitschrift für Psychologie und Physiologie der Sinnesorgane*.

However, nothing suggests that Ichheiser had any hopes of actually attaining this step into the university world. What prevented him from doing so was not a lack of “success” (“Erfolgstüchtigkeit”), but rather characteristics that were not mentioned in his theory of success, in which the phenomenon of discrimination curiously does not appear at any point. As a Jew born in Polish Krakow and employed in the “Red Vienna,” he had no chance of setting foot in the academic world. He could not have hoped to qualify even if, for example, he had been part of Karl Bühler’s closer circle of students. During his two decades of professorship in Vienna, Bühler succeeded in habilitating, apart from his wife Charlotte, only one of his pupils, Egon Brunswik. All other attempts had already failed from the start.<sup>22</sup> Ichheiser only casually mentions<sup>23</sup> the irony of someone who knows of the hopelessness of his own striving and yet continues to do what drives him in his heart. From this brief mentioning, it does not become clear whether Ichheiser agrees with this assumption.

Within the three years following his escape from Vienna and before his first employment in the US, Ichheiser worked on his first English-language publications. It seems that he relatively easily managed the language problem. In the questionnaire he sent to the SPSL in 1937, he stated his English was “quite good” in reading and “weak” in speaking and writing, but he was already corresponding from Warsaw in acceptable English with his British helpers. He also seems to have written his English texts without anyone else’s help.

## Arduous First Steps

Upon his arrival in the US, he initially lived in New York, where he contacted German emigrants like Hans Speier<sup>24</sup> and also sought out American colleagues. Gordon W. Allport thanked him for sending him a special edition, and Allport’s secretary arranged a personal meeting for the two in Boston.<sup>25</sup> But since he was unable to find employment on the East Coast, Ichheiser moved to Chicago sometime in 1941.

Before that time, however, he had met his short-term wife. Edith Weisskopf was 13 years younger and had come to the US from Vienna a year before Ichheiser. She was the younger sister of two brothers; the oldest was the already famous physicist Victor Weisskopf, and the second brother, Walter, had already escaped to the US and later became an economics professor. Edith had studied psychology under the Böhlers at the University in Vienna and completed her doctorate in 1937. After the

---

<sup>22</sup> See Chapter 5 in Fleck, 2015, pp. 333–374.

<sup>23</sup> See Ichheiser, 1930, p. 35.

<sup>24</sup> Years later, Ichheiser mentions this meeting to Morgenthau. See September 30, 1965, Hans Morgenthau Papers, “General Correspondence Gustav Ichheiser,” Library of Congress.

<sup>25</sup> Ichheiser to Allport, November 23, 1940; Allport an Ichheiser, November 25, 1940; Allport’s secretary to Ichheiser, December 9, 1940, Gordon W. Allport Papers, Box 5, Misc. I 1938–1944, HUG 4118.10, Harvard University Archives.

“Anschluss,” she escaped to Norway, from where she arrived in the US in the spring of 1939. She became employed as an instructor at a small college in New York State. In 1941, she met Ichheiser through a common friend, which she reported in her autobiography without noting that she was married to him for 3 years. Ichheiser reportedly had a far more lasting influence on her than any of her Viennese teachers, of whom she, after all, found worthy to mention (Moritz Schlick, Charlotte Bühler, Egon Brunswik, and Else Frenkel-Brunswik). Through Ichheiser, she had first learned to read and conversations

were almost exclusively directed towards opening my eyes. Until I met him, I had viewed what social scientists wrote as true and myself as good if I understood it and believed it. But Gustav stressed that social scientists are a group of people with common backgrounds, and therefore with common views. . . . Gustav Ichheiser’s view of the entire world was drenched in doubt. He said, “Things are not as they seem to be,” and this sentence aroused my passion. (Weisskopf-Joelson, 1988, pp. 31–32)

Ichheiser was supposedly “often smug and arrogant,” which had reportedly prompted Edith to prove that many of his views were false. The few lines in Weisskopf-Joelson’s autobiography are almost everything that is known about the relationship and marriage of the two. The fact that they had more in common than is evident from this brief description will be further described. In contrast to Edith, Ichheiser found it more difficult to find employment, and the position he did find in 1941 was not part of the academic world but at a Chicago publishing house, which ended after a year—his subsequent explanation for why it was terminated was hardly convincing.

The impressions Ichheiser made on his social acquaintances were reported to be similar to those endeavors he made to impress this young Viennese woman. The Midwestern traveling assistant to the Chairman of the New York EC, Laurens H. Seelye, spent two hours conversing with Ichheiser in Chicago in April 1941:

Met him through Louis Wirth. Bachelor. Working on temporary job w[ith] Dr. Preston. Together we talked at Int[ernational] House, and I found him very interesting, with an original flair. Fluent English with mild accent. Very pleasant eyes and smile, sociable and responsive. Has published three or four articles in English. Prof. Dev. Service candidate.<sup>26</sup>

The “Professional Development and Visiting Scholar Plan” was the EC’s attempt to place refugees into smaller colleges and universities in the Midwest and the South. Accordingly, Seelye sent letters to two college presidents, warmly recommending Ichheiser. But nothing materialized.

In Chicago, besides Wirth, Everett C. Hughes—who surprised Ichheiser at their first meeting wondering whether he were the same Ichheiser who had written about success and the beauty of women—took on the task of promoting Ichheiser. Hughes had first come across these two publications during his stay in Germany in 1932 and since then had been using them in lectures. Moreover, he had even translated the essay on beauty into English—which had been previously published in a textbook.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>26</sup>EC, Box 75, File Ichheiser, Gustav, NYPL.

<sup>27</sup>Carl A. Dawson and Warner E. Gettys, *An introduction to sociology*, New York: Ronald Press

The two of them became friends, and Hughes later reported that they spent many hours in deep discussions. The friendly reception by the Chicago sociologists—including also Herbert Blumer and Morris Janowitz—never led to any satisfactory employment for Ichheiser, however. After spending some time in the publishing house, the funds of the department were cut and he was terminated. Later he was offered a position as a psychologist in a hospital, but all his jobs ended in resignations and applications for other posts remained unsuccessful.

In June 1943, the president of Clark University asked Gordon Allport for information on Ichheiser, as he had applied for a position:

[Ichheiser] says he is trained also in sociology and would want to work in the field of psychology. We may need to add someone in that field next year, and since he has given you as one of his references, I should be very much pleased if you would tell me whether you think he is a man I should seriously consider for a position on our staff here at Clark. I suppose he is a refugee scholar. I have been rather hesitant about placing such men on our permanent staff. ... Some of them certainly do not fit into an American institution very well. Kindly tell me whether he is Jewish. I am sure to be asked that question.

Allport replied the following day:

Although I have only met Dr. Ichheiser on one occasion I was favorable impressed by his alert, adaptable American manner. He is a refugee but I do not know whether or not he is Jewish. If so his appearance is not strikingly in that direction.

I know his written work and consider him to be alert in the field of personality and well grounded. His special interest seems to be in how we know other people, a psychological and epistemological problem.

He is animated and responsive and pleasant to deal with. I think he might be a good man to try out at Clark. Naturally you would not want to commit yourself to a permanency at this time.<sup>28</sup>

Clark University was considered as one of the elite American universities in the first half of the twentieth century. It particularly was at the forefront in psychology; its first president was the psychologist G. Stanley Hall, on whose initiative Sigmund Freud had been awarded an honorary doctorate in 1909, which was followed by a very well-attended lecture in which psychoanalysis was presented for the first time in the US. But Clark was also a typical white-Anglo-Saxon-Protestant stronghold, and both refugees and Jews were kept at a low count.<sup>29</sup>

Both Chicago University and Clark University knew about the possibility of receiving funds from the New York Committee for fugitives. Why neither institution ever asked for any subsidies remains unclear. Rich and research-intensive universities such as Chicago seem to have had such a rich external funding reserve, despite

---

1929, pp. 749–753, vgl. Richard C. Helmes-Hayes, “Canadian sociology’s first textbook: C. A. Dawson and W. E. Gettys’s ‘An introduction to sociology (1929)’”, *The Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie* 19. 1994 (4).

<sup>28</sup>Wallace W. Atwood, President of Clark University, and Gordon W. Allport, June 29, 1943; Allport an Atwood, June 30, 1943, Gordon W. Allport Papers, Box 5, Misc. I 1938–1944, HUG 4118.10, Harvard University Archives.

<sup>29</sup>That anti-Semitism was not without exception can be seen in the fact that the founder of American anthropology Franz Boas began his US career at Clark University.

all economic problems, and were so well anchored locally that a fund-providing institution like the EC might not have come to mind to people such as Wirth or Hughes. In the first years, Chicago received grants for some prominent and later also for less well-known exiles. Clark University was always very reserved toward the EC—friendly in tone but without ever receiving a protégé from the committee.

Whatever the reasons may have been for Ichheiser not to be able to gain a more permanent position or for Ichheiser to frivolously risk those less prestigious jobs he was offered, Ichheiser was at least not deterred: he wrote almost as diligently as in his early days in Vienna, and during the 1940s he succeeded in having his articles published in prominent journals.

In 1944, Ichheiser received a professorship at the Talladega College in the US state of Georgia, founded and funded by Protestant churches. Yet, being offered a position in the Deep South to teach young African-American students, who were then still called *Negroes*, must have seemed like a great injustice to him. In contrast to his ex-wife, who was able to attain a position at Indiana University after her entry-level job at a New York State college, and many other emigrants who had been admitted to American universities, he was unable to find satisfactory employment. In addition to his marginalization, further problems arose and he became caught more and more in his highly individual view of the world and of those around him. The divorce from Edith was on the grounds of “overt cruelty,” which was later held against him when he first asked to be naturalized in 1946, as foreigners were only able to become Americans if they could prove they were of “good moral character.” News from Europe informed him of the deaths of his closest relatives, but apparently no detailed information arrived. Ichheiser shared all this in letters to Louis Wirth and added further details and allegations that gave the impression that he was suffering from paranoia in the form of a persecution delusion or at least he was working on a severe form of conspiracy theory.<sup>30</sup>

Surprisingly, Ichheiser remained in Talladega for four years. We know very little about his activities, experiences, and impressions there. Everett Hughes reported much later that he had received “some brilliant letters on the disparity between the appearance and the deeper reality of the relations between the black and the white teachers” from Ichheiser; these letters seem not to have been preserved.<sup>31</sup> During his time in Talladega, Ichheiser wrote essays specifically dedicated to anti-Semitism; they appeared in the journal *Sociometry* founded by Jacob Moreno and as a separate

---

<sup>30</sup>The Wirth Papers contain a one-page document with the title “The Author and his Pseudo-Opponent. Observations and Reflections by Macchiavelli” with an explanatory footnote: “These strictly confidential observations and reflections are dedicated to Louis Wirth, sociologist and politician, by his Friend, Macchiavelli, who became sociologist because he failed as politician. The persons referred to are entirely imaginary and any resemblance to real persons and events is purely coincidental.” On the document itself, no date is stated, but it is archived with a letter sent by Ichheiser from Talladega on May 2, 1947, Wirth Papers, Box V, Folder 5.

<sup>31</sup>Hughes, Ichheiser, Gustav, January 1970, planned as prefix for a volume of Ichheiser’s collected essays, which was never published in this form. Hughes Papers, Bl. 167, Chicago. I was unable to find Ichheiser’s papers in both the Hughes Papers in Chicago and in those kept by Boston College.

print in brochures (Ichheiser, 1946a, 1946b). Finally, he also took part in at least one of the American Psychologists' annual conferences.

In March 1948—in the middle of the semester and academic year—Ichheiser returned to Chicago; why and under what circumstances he left Talladega College is unclear. His life in Chicago, however, did not bring any improvement over his life in the South. Scholarships and smaller grants secured his financial survival, but efforts to gain employment remained fruitless, and Ichheiser's efforts to place a book entitled *Why People Misunderstand Each Other* with a publisher were also fruitless. Black humor is evident in Ichheiser's request to Wirth, asking him to serve as a reference in his application for a job as a janitor in the Social Science Building of the Chicago University:

Working as janitor in the Social Science Building would not only provide me with the urgently needed income but, in addition, enable me to sign my publications as a member of the University of Chicago.<sup>32</sup>

The book, which was rejected by the University of Chicago Press, was then published in 1949 as a supplement to the *American Journal of Sociology* under the title *Misunderstandings in Human Relations: A Study in False Social Perception*. The two coeditors of the journal, Louis Wirth and Everett Ch. Hughes,<sup>33</sup> had made this unusual kind of publication possible and ensured that the supplementary booklet was distributed separately through the book trade and that Ichheiser was also paid royalties. Ichheiser, however, nevertheless felt he had been treated badly and suspected Hughes to conspire against him, which led to an end of their relationship.

The anthropologist Sol Tax and the political scientist Hans Morgenthau also supported Ichheiser at that time and tried to find employment for him. Morgenthau did not hesitate to warmly recommend Ichheiser in a letter to the current dean of the social sciences of the University of Chicago, without concealing the difficulties Ichheiser had caused his social environment:

While Mr. Ichheiser's work, in its actuality as well as in its promise, suggests to me a strong affinity with Veblen, so does his personality. Mr. Ichheiser's is a typical neurotic personality. He is essentially a goodhearted and kind man who is not endowed with much practical sense. In his personal relations he vacillates between exaggerate suspicion and exaggerated trust. I doubt whether at present he would fit well into a department. It must, however, be said that while part of his neurosis is the very reflection of his intellectual attitude toward society ... another element is certainly the result of the unusual and extremely precarious circumstances under which Mr. Ichheiser had to live for the last decade. While I would not want to say that I am confident, I would certainly not be surprised to find, that if Mr. Ichheiser could find at least a semblance of a normal occupation which would give him some personal and economic security, some of the neurotic traits of his personality might well be mitigated or disappear altogether.

I feel very strongly for myself the moral obligation not only to save a man of such unusual merit from destruction but also to use his unusual gifts to best advantage. I therefore

---

<sup>32</sup>Ichheiser to Wirth, March 28, 1949, Wirth Papers.

<sup>33</sup>Editors of the journal were Herbert Blumer and associate editors, besides Hughes and Wirth, Ernest W. Burgess, and Philip M. Hauser.

would strongly and whole-heartedly support any kind of employment that would meet the peculiar conditions of his intelligence and personality.<sup>34</sup>

Wirth's efforts to find a suitable job for Ichheiser all failed, so Wirth decided to employ him in a larger project under his own direct supervision, even though Ichheiser was unsuitable to undertake the necessary interviews and also unwilling to do so.<sup>35</sup> In May 1951, this temporary employment ended, and after a few weeks, Ichheiser's savings seemed to have been exhausted. In any event, having become an American citizen in the previous year, he now asked the Chicago welfare authority for support.

A few weeks later, in July 1951, Gustav Ichheiser was committed to a psychiatric institution through the request of the Chicago welfare authorities. The official diagnosis was “Schizophrenia, paranoid type. Feelings of persecution elaborated. Suspiciousness. Poor Judgment. Lack of Insight.” A few days later, a judge confirmed the legality of the institutionalization on the grounds that Ichheiser was “a mentally ill person incapable of managing his own estate” and that the “said person is in such condition of mind and body as to render him remaining at large dangerous to his self and others.”<sup>36</sup> The next 14 years Ichheiser spent most of his time in a psychiatric clinic in Peoria, Illinois, about 260 km outside of Chicago.

## Ichheiser's American Publications

During the ten years in which Ichheiser had tried to find a satisfactory position in the US, he published close to a dozen essays, which almost all appeared in prestigious journals. These publications are all characterized by a particularly noticeable feature in regard to form, which also set them apart from his earlier German-language essays. Most appear without footnotes or reference to other authors and their contributions, which differed markedly from the prevailing form of the standard social scientific essay. When he did mention the works of others, he usually pointed to a qualification that would demonstrate his own superiority: “Blumer does not emphasize sufficiently ...”;<sup>37</sup> “Myrdal, therefore, does not clarify, but rather confuses the real issue,” “It seems to us that, e.g., Margaret Mead, succumbs to this second fallacy ... she ignores certain really specific American national characteristics”; “In my opinion, this statement is, in a regrettable way, confused, misleading, and even socially harmful. It is confused because Dr. Wirth” (1949, p. 397). The few reviews he published are similarly condescending in tone. On the occasion of a

<sup>34</sup>Hans J. Morgenthau to Ralph W. Tyler, November 9, 1949, Morgenthau Papers, Library of Congress.

<sup>35</sup>RF, file “Chicago University Committee on Education, Training, and Research in Race Relations,” RG 1.2, Series 216S, Folder 45 and 46, RAC.

<sup>36</sup>Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to Reinhard Müller, February 9, 1993, AGSÖ, Ichheiser-Bestand.

<sup>37</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 2, the following references are from pp. 24 to 26.

publication, whose author was an employee of the EC, which Ichheiser may have not known, and of which it is not quite clear why it was discussed in a sociological journal, Ichheiser did not only demonstrate the expected criticisms but also the ability that distinguished him in the eyes of his sponsors—namely, bringing up surprising twists to a seemingly familiar phenomenon so that it appears in another light:

Finally, the author seems to overlook a certain moral ambiguity in the process which we call euphemistically ‘adjustment.’ He does not realize sufficiently that what from the one side appears as a successful adjustment may appear from the other side as lack of personal integrity, as distortion of the own personality, and sometimes even only as mimicry in order to survive. (Ichheiser, 1943a, p. 282)

Among those who had been wholeheartedly disposed toward Ichheiser—and we saw that these were not few in number—it was emphasized again and again that he was able to produce unusual and illuminating insights. And in fact, his writings repeatedly reveal keen observations and unusual perspectives:

In approaching scientifically such phenomena as persecution (or oppression, or aggression), we should always realize that what, from the point of view of the “victim,” looks like “being persecuted” may look, from the side of the “persecutor,” like “self-defense.” The medieval Crusaders would have been honestly surprised if a social psychologist had tried to explain to them that they were ‘persecuting’ Mohammedans. Unfortunately, the scientific analysis of this type of a phenomenon is frequently vitiated by the fact that the sociologist or psychologist so identifies himself, unconsciously, with one group or another, that, instead of achieving a perspectivistic understanding of both aspects of the relationships involved, he misinterprets the attitudes of the one group, or of both, in terms of his own frame of reference. (Ichheiser, 1943b, p. 775)

Later, not only did Ichheiser not hesitate to express his own heterodox view of the phenomenon of anti-Semitism, but he also regarded it as his duty as a scientist to do so, as one of the episodes that contributed to his failure. Similarly, we can demonstrate how the very specific approach Ichheiser used to analyze practically any conundrum. In “The Jews and Antisemitism [sic]” he begins his analysis of the subject by declaring the social psychologist, who is confronted with the task of explaining anti-Semitism scientifically, must admit that what he has been asked to explain is not worthy of any specialized explanation: “[M]any things in antisemitism [sic] which now appear to be baffling and mysterious, would be understood as being rather natural and quite *obvious*” (1946b, p. 92, original emphasis).

Prejudices, understood as collectively determined and collectively shared false images that members of a social group have about another, and the emotional responses that are partly the cause and partly the result of these false images, characterize not only the uneducated person, but all of us. The question therefore should not be why a group shows certain prejudices, but rather why, if all people have prejudices, we only become irritated by certain ones. The roots of the anti-Semitism of the non-Jews are based on the unusual (“abnormal”) social situation in which Jews have to live. Therefore, those explanations of anti-Semitism, which refer to the effect of propaganda or the scapegoat theory, are insufficient because oftentimes no evidence of propaganda or blame is evident, and, in any case, it is the *effect* of the anti-Semitic propaganda that needs explanation.



According to these preliminaries, which were not further elaborated or even empirically proven—references to other works by Ichheiser, in which he explains one or the other argument in more detail do not compensate for this gap—he adds a digression which can only be fully understood if one is more familiar with his writings in general. He distinguishes between conscious and unconscious nationalism, and while one may still be puzzled as to what precisely this differentiation means here, one then stumbles over Ichheiser’s next assertion:

The conscious nationalist, if he fights, fights for America, or France, or Germany. The unconscious nationalist, if he fights, fights always for “humanity,” or “justice,” or “freedom” and does not realize that the way he defines these ideas and ideals is determined by his unconscious nationalistic frame of reference. (1946b, p. 95)

The concept of ethnocentrism was well known to Ichheiser—he mentions it and its founder, William G. Sumner, in a footnote, but merely to point out that the analysis of ethnocentrism is often false as it does not account for the differentiation between conscious and unconscious nationalism. The concept of ethnocentrism would have fit well at this point. Indeed, if Ichheiser would have resorted to it, his digressions and further developments on this topic would have been much clearer. Instead, he uses another term, recently adopted into the social sciences—“frame of reference”<sup>38</sup>—and validates it by adding nationalism in a rather idiosyncratic manner, arriving at a surprising thesis his admirers considered insightful. This does not imply that Ichheiser’s writings were not in some way insightful and able to discuss a familiar phenomenon from a somewhat different perspective, but rather points out that his insights rolled around like loose pearls, never strung together on a string, as one of his readers once aptly expressed.

Ichheiser applies these insights to the relationship between Jews and non-Jews. Naturally, the Jews, regardless of how one defines them, also possess an unconscious nationalism that can show itself in three different forms: the Zionists, he argues, are conscious nationalists who are criticized by others just as any other nationalistic group would be; other Jews with an unconscious nationalism who identify with the general nationalistic assumptions of the majority but are rejected and criticized by the majority, just as any other minority might be; and, finally, because they did not have their own country, some Jews tend to regard themselves as internationalists who stand above the lowly nationalist quarrels; however, that position does not help them much, for Gentiles disagree.

As long as Jews do not have their own country and army but are still holding on to their cultural differences, they would have to be prepared to be under attack:

---

<sup>38</sup>This form of expression, which was originally only used in mathematics, was first taken up in 1933 by George Bernard Shaw (“If I may borrow an expression from my friend Professor Archibald Henderson, who is a mathematician, he had no frame of reference.”) and shortly after introduced into the social sciences by Muzafer Sherif in *The Psychology of Social Norms*, New York: Harper 1936, pp. 33–35: “We shall give concrete examples to illustrate the existence of norms or frames of reference which are different from those that are taken by western civilization to be as ‘natural’ as air or water.” See *Oxford English Dictionary*, [www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com). (accessed November 3, 2014).

Facts are stubborn things. They do not disappear if we deny that they exist. Mechanisms which control attraction and rejection in interpersonal and intergroup relations are very real facts. They function according to certain socio-psychological laws and can be only to a limited extent influenced by conscious effort. Repressed below the threshold of social awareness, those unconscious mechanisms continue to operate below the surface and tend to become even more troublesome than they would be if they were made accessible to a frank social discussion. (1946b p. 107)

Ichheiser's view of the social dynamics of anti-Semitism is largely in line with an ethnocentrism research position, understanding prejudices as being rooted in real social conflicts. It speaks for him as a researcher in that he did as much as hint at this kind of interpretation years before the theory of the realistic group conflict was formally postulated.<sup>39</sup> But, as with most scientists who merely pointed in certain directions, adumbrating at interpretations and mechanisms, the history of (theoretical) group conflict passed over Ichheiser without mentioning him.

## No One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest

Many former colleagues from the University of Chicago supported Ichheiser during the years he was under psychiatric care. Until his surprising death, Louis Wirth and Hans Morgenthau, as well as others, sent him money and remained in contact with him through written correspondence. Ichheiser always turned to one or the other and after a few years became increasingly more candid with his demands to be freed from his confinement. Morgenthau regularly inquired of the hospital management about Ichheiser's condition, needs and possible release. None of the people who supported him questioned the authority of the psychiatric diagnosis. Whether or not the offer that Ichheiser could be dismissed if someone presented him with a job (which Ichheiser conveyed to Morgenthau as a proposition made by treating physicians) corresponded to the factual situation cannot be ascertained. Hughes, who was informed of this, told Morgenthau that he could imagine that Ichheiser was able to "do work at about the level of efficiency he kept up before he went to the hospital. The problem would be to get him a job, and to nurse him along until he got well started, and to keep his relations with other people on an even keel."<sup>40</sup> Some of Ichheiser's articulations in his letters from the clinic did, after all, give the recipients much reason to suspect that his mental state in relation to reality was not the best.

---

<sup>39</sup>Robert A. Levine and Donald T. Campbell (1972) mention in their comprehensive literature review under the title "Realistic Group Conflict Theory" William G. Sumner and Maurice R. Davie (pp. 29–42), both of whom had represented this view before Ichheiser, but then go on to mention mostly publications from the 1950s, including M. Sherif, C. W. Sherif, Lewis Coser, J. Bernard, T. M. Newcomb, and Kenneth E. Boulding. Ichheiser is mentioned positively by the two authors elsewhere (p. 19).

<sup>40</sup>Hughes to Morgenthau, April 26, 1957, Morgenthau Papers.

Ichheiser not only regularly sent letters from the clinic but also manuscripts, which Morgenthau tried to publish but without success.<sup>41</sup> One of the more comprehensive manuscripts, entitled *The Contemporary Political Dictionary*, was a collection of definitions in the style of Ambrose Bierce’s *The Devil’s Dictionary* (2003). The forward of the manuscript included quotes from George Orwell, Aldous Huxley, and Hans J. Morgenthau as a motto for the entire work. These entries provide a good impression of Ichheiser’s thinking at that time. Here are some examples:

Conformism. A way of behaving in accordance with the expectations of others, of which behavior we approve if people conform to what we want them to conform, and of which we disapprove if they conform to what we do not want them to conform. Therefore, all conformists are at the same time also anti-conformists, and vice-versa. (See Misguided People.)

Enlightenment. An obscurantists philosophy developed in the 18th century in France which is responsible for some of the most detrimental illusions, fallacies and self-deception of modern man, particularly concerning such ideas as ‘reason,’ ‘progress,’ ‘goodness of man,’ ‘prejudice,’ ‘social harmony,’ and the like. (See Obscurantism.)

Objectivity. The way I (or We) see controversial facts and issues, as over against as You (or They) see them. (See Bias.)

Social Research. Diverting attention from all-important obvious facts by using symbols (‘concepts’) and rituals (‘techniques’), which look and sound scientific. Social Researchers are enjoying, therefore, a high prestige in the scientific community.<sup>42</sup>

After a 9-year break, an essay by Ichheiser was published in a scientific journal in May 1960 without any of Morgenthau’s doing. The *Journal of Individual Psychology* published a ten-page text of Ichheiser’s “On Freud’s blind spots concerning some obvious facts.” It is unclear who was a middle-person helping Ichheiser in succeeding in publishing this text. The address of the author is simply “Peoria, Illinois,” without providing too much information so that a reader might recognize that the author was an inmate of a psychiatric institution.

In February, 1963, almost 12 years after his being committed to psychiatric care, the clinic superintendent informed Morgenthau that Ichheiser was soon to be transferred into a halfway house: “Conditional Discharge in a Family Care.”<sup>43</sup> After the transfer, Ichheiser sent Morgenthau a new version of his dictionary and a short text entitled “Is nationalism really outmoded?” The latter Morgenthau immediately sent to the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, and it soon appeared in the June 1964 issue in the Letters section, with an even more misleading address of the author: Gustav Ichheiser, Chicago, Illinois.

Ichheiser, no longer locked up in an institution but still a psychiatric patient, was apparently able to produce a number of copies of his text and, as he had done in earlier times, generously sent these to others, but this time rectifying the misleading address, writing “Peoria, Illinois, 405 North Parry Ave” as a return address. One recipient was Kenneth W. Thompson, a former student of Morgenthau, who after

---

<sup>41</sup> Whether Morgenthau actually sent any of these manuscripts to magazines is unclear. In the comprehensive Ichheiser file in the Morgenthau Papers, there is in any case no carbon copy of a letter to an editorial office, only declarations of intent to Ichheiser.

<sup>42</sup> Morgenthau Papers, January 1961.

<sup>43</sup> Walter J. Garre, M. D. to Morgenthau, February 19, 1963, Morgenthau Papers.

teaching at Northwestern University and the University of Chicago had been employed at the Rockefeller Foundation since 1955, initially in the Department of Social Sciences, and from 1961 as Vice President, where he remained until 1974. It is unclear whether Ichheiser knew Thompson personally or how he had learned that he was now with the Rockefeller Foundation. In conveying his impressions to his colleague Gerald Freund, Associate Director of the Social Sciences Department of the Rockefeller Foundation, Thompson found the analysis “very thoughtful and thought provoking. Who is Ichheiser?”<sup>44</sup> Five days later, Freund sent the following letter to “Dear Mr. Ichheiser”:

You were good enough recently to send a copy of a letter you published in the BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS to my colleague the Vice-President of The Rockefeller Foundation, Dr. Kenneth W. Thompson. Dr. Thompson and I find your statement concerning nationalism of high interest. We are therefore prompted to send you the enclosed brief descriptive statement of the Foundation’s International Relations Program.

If by chance you have a research and writing project which could suitably be considered under this program, we would be happy to hear from you.<sup>45</sup>

Ichheiser took advantage of the opportunity and provided a prompt and clever reply. He mentioned that Morgenthau had helped with the placement of his “little article,” was pleased that the author of an admired book (Freund’s *Germany between Two Worlds* (1961) had been published in a New York academic publishing house, which Ichheiser probably read during his visits in a local library) had written to him, and outlined an analysis he had been “on and off” working on for several years:

I am at present interested more than in anything else in a study on *The Current Illusions concerning the Basic Issues of Peace and War* .... It will deal with such illusions, false assumptions, and misconceptions as: the ambiguity of our concept of “peace”; misinterpretations concerning the so-called “aggression”; problematical relation between “starting a war” and the “war guilt”; factual and moral illusions concerning the evils of using visible forms of power, i.e., military force, as over against using various invisible or disguised forms of power; misconceptions about “appeasement” and “preventive war.” Furthermore, I shall discuss the various types of pacifism and their contradictory motivations; the role of misunderstandings in international relations, and the peculiar role of the unconscious nationalism in producing these misunderstandings; and finally, I shall present a new re-interpretation of Machiavelli’s doctrine about the antinomy between politics and ethics.<sup>46</sup>

In conclusion, Ichheiser points out that, since he is “under rather restricted financial circumstances,” he will be able to realize this project only with financial support: “It would be, therefore, the utmost importance for me to obtain a grant from The Rockefeller Foundation in support of my work.” He did not forget to add a “PhD” to his name.

---

<sup>44</sup>Gerald Freund to Kenneth W. Thompson, Memo June 4, 1964. Thompson answered immediately: “No idea [probably in reference to the question who Ichheiser is]. Any point in sending him IRP [i.e., International Relations Program]?” RF, RG 1.2, Series 200S, Box 571, Folder 4893, RAC (the following quotes are found within the same papers).

<sup>45</sup>Freund to Ichheiser, June 9, 1964, RAC.

<sup>46</sup>Ichheiser to Freund, June 14, 1964, RAC.

In the archived letter, two passages are marked by hand: the reference to Morgenthau and the reference to the materially precarious position of the author. In the traditional Rockefeller Foundation manner, Freund contacted Morgenthau and inquired whether he should suggest to Ichheiser that he apply for a grant. In particular, it is self-evident of course that this information could, if it were easier for Morgenthau, also be provided “per collect telephone,” whether Morgenthau read parts of the study quoted by Ichheiser and whether he thought that their completion was a worthy contribution to knowledge and thinking about present questions.

Of course I can ask him [Ichheiser] directly, but if you happen to know, could you tell us whether Ichheiser has an academic position or what the nature of his employment is, and whether he could conceivably take a leave of absence from it to work full time on his study?<sup>47</sup>

Freund documented the information received via telephone from Morgenthau and passed the document to Thompson:

Morgenthau considers Mr. Gustav Ichheiser a brilliant man with an original and fertile mind. Basically a sociologist, he is very much like Veblen with the one difference that, while Veblen remained just one step on the side of sanity, Mr. Ichheiser went beyond it and spent most of the past 10 years in a state asylum. He has been released on a probationary basis, apparently in the care of a family in Peoria. He was once married to a sister of the physicist Victor Weisskopf. ...

If the Foundation can do it, Professor Morgenthau would be much in favor of granting assistance to Mr. Ichheiser. ... A grant could conceivably be made via the University of Chicago. Professor Morgenthau could appoint him a research associate.<sup>48</sup>

Freund assured Morgenthau he would discuss this matter with Thompson and noted his recommendation: “Probably we should try to get a full reading of the man’s present competence without becoming involved in his personal affairs or taking responsibility for them.”

It is more than surprising the Rockefeller Foundation, an organization boasting to only support the very best, to even consider to give a grant to someone who had been confined for years in a psychiatric institution. To understand this, it is necessary to take a closer look at those involved and their relationships. The central person was undoubtedly Morgenthau, then 60 years old. He had been born in Coburg, Bavaria, the son of a doctor and a mother from a rich merchant family. He had attended the Gymnasium (high school) in Coburg, where he experienced anti-Semitic animosities. After finishing his studies of philosophy and law, he worked as a judge at the Labor Court in Frankfurt. In 1932, he began teaching in Geneva and was dismissed from his duties of a judge in Frankfurt after the Nazis gained power. After stops in Spain, Italy, and France, Morgenthau emigrated to the US in 1937, where he spent the first two years in New York before moving to Kansas in 1939. In 1944 he began teaching at the University of Chicago, where he soon became a leading figure in the new field of international relations research. Morgenthau was one of the founders of the so-called political realism. He was not only an exceptionally

---

<sup>47</sup> Freund to Morgenthau, June 18, 1964, RAC.

<sup>48</sup> Interviews: GF (telephone) Professor Hans J. Morgenthau, June 22, 1964, RAC.

productive author of scientific publications—his *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948) was reissued and translated numerous times—but he also acted as a public intellectual. When he met Ichheiser, seven years his senior, is unknown. But he took almost self-sacrificingly good care of him during the entire time Ichheiser spent in the psychiatric hospital. In his unpainted yet emphatic information about Ichheiser, which he conveyed to the Rockefeller Foundation, the absence of two aspects is apparent: Morgenthau did not mention that Ichheiser was a Jew and a Nazi refugee—or Freund did not consider it necessary to document these two facts.

When Kenneth W. Thompson, Morgenthau's former student, received the special print of Ichheiser, he almost certainly did not know anything about the close relationship between his former teacher and the unknown author, who had sent him a short text on a research topic in which he was personally interested. His request to his younger colleague, Gerald Freund, to make inquiries about Ichheiser was, in all likelihood, only due to the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation being in the habit of keeping an eye out for talents. In an obituary for Freund, Freund's conception of the task of foundations is characterized as "finding, sustaining and promoting the development of gifted individuals in the fields of the humanities, sciences and arts."<sup>49</sup> One may add that this quote perfectly describes the mindset of the Rockefeller Foundation. Freund, who had been born in Berlin in 1930, like Morgenthau and Ichheiser, had fled from Nazi Germany. He completed his academic education in the US and Oxford, where he earned a doctorate in Modern European History in 1955.

The Rockefeller Foundation adapted Morgenthau's unconditional advocacy of Ichheiser's funding. On July 9, 1964, Ichheiser was invited to outline his project on 4–5 pages and to submit it to the Rockefeller Foundation's International Relations Program. The final decision was to be taken by an advisory committee at the end of the year. In August, Ichheiser sent this more detailed exposé and received the application forms. Only in the cover letter, with which Ichheiser returned with the forms, did he mention that both sides were aware of the peculiarities of the case: "Professor Morgenthau wrote me some time ago that you are acquainted with my personal history. This, I assume, will explain to you certain gaps in my application."<sup>50</sup>

The names of two persons, who were obviously added by Ichheiser, and three others handwritten most certainly by someone other than Ichheiser, can be found in the references section of the application form. Apart from Morgenthau, Ichheiser had also named Herbert Blumer as a reference; the three others were "Herman Kahn, Hudson Institute; Larry Finkelstein, Carnegie Endowment; and Sidney Bailey, London." Rules of conflict of interest or bias were apparently not yet in force at that time, since Morgenthau could scarcely be regarded as an impartial assessor. His report is then also formulated as professional assessment of a research project, as if someone not personally known to Morgenthau had conducted it. Bailey expressed a more reserved but positive attitude: "My general conclusion is that the applicant gives evidence of general research ability and is likely to carry the study

<sup>49</sup> *New York Times*, May 5, 1997. Comp. Gerald Freund (1996).

<sup>50</sup> Ichheiser to Freund, September 10, 1964, RAC.

to successful completion; only parts of it, however, seem to break new ground.”<sup>51</sup> Herbert Blumer emphasized in his letter that during his Chicago period, he had “a considerable amount of association” with Ichheiser:

[I] ... have always had high regard for Dr. Ichheiser’s abilities as a scholar. He is intelligent and imaginative and has a gift of seeing complicated areas of sociological interest in a new light. ... I believe that if he were given a grant he would produce a scholarly product which would be found to be novel, revealing, and a worthwhile contribution. I would say that his proposal, accordingly, is one which warrants aid.

In conclusion, Blumer made sure not to take any too dramatic risks:

I wish to state that I have not seen Dr. Ichheiser for the past decade and have not been in touch with him. Consequently, the positive endorsement which I have given above is based upon my earlier knowledge of him and upon my impressions of his statement accompanying your letter.<sup>52</sup>

Only Lawrence S. Finkelstein, from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, declined to comment on Ichheiser and his research project:

I regret to say that, not only do I not know Mr. Ichheiser, but I have never encountered his work or his name in any connection that I can recall. In the circumstances, I think it would be irresponsible for me to comment on his request. As you know, I believe that a written outline alone can be a poor expression of a project proposal, when it cannot be considered in the light of knowledge of the proposer.<sup>53</sup>

The four expert opinions illustrate the formalities of project evaluations, which were, in the mid-1960s, little formalized. Exclusion on the grounds of personal bias was unknown, and the reviewers clearly demonstrate different approaches. The British Quaker, author, and peace activist Sydney D. Bailey pointed out that Ichheiser did not have any academic qualifications or experience and therefore was cautious with his expert opinion, while the two Americans emphasized the personal proximity to the applicant as a necessary prerequisite for an accurate assessment. The impersonal peer-review process was at that time still not the gold standard of scientific project review.

At the end of 1964, Freund informed Ichheiser that he had been awarded a \$5000 grant for the coming year. For internal use, Thompson noted, “This is a calculated risk but in view of the Advisory Committees favorable response I think—on balance—we should take a chance.”<sup>54</sup> After overcoming several more bureaucratic hurdles, Ichheiser was finally released from psychiatric care at the end of April 1965, after nearly 14 years, and became the “research associate” of the Morgenthau-led Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at the University of Chicago, which he had sought out in vain before being committed. He immediately went to work on his manuscript.<sup>55</sup> In October, he informed Freund that eight

<sup>51</sup> Sydney D. Bailey, London, to Freund, October 28, 1964, RAC.

<sup>52</sup> Blumer to Freund, October 29, 1964, RAC.

<sup>53</sup> Finkelstein to Freund, October 29, 1964, RAC.

<sup>54</sup> February 25, 1965 Thompson to KW [unknown], RAC.

<sup>55</sup> This work was not preserved. Betty M. Bayer and Lloyd H. Strickland (1990) offer a friendly interpretation of Ichheiser’s views on misunderstandings in international relations.

chapters had been completed and added that he would be happy if he could be financially supported for another 6 months to finish the book. Morgenthau was also summed to the RF. Finally, it was agreed that Morgenthau was to finance Ichheiser from other funds the RF had provided him with.

Ichheiser's mentors Morgenthau and Hughes turned to the University of Chicago Press, supported by Morris Janowitz, who published the series *The Heritage of Sociology* starting in 1964, with the proposal to consider Ichheiser's manuscript for publication. External experts argued against this. One reviewer seems to have been Gordon W. Allport, who admitted the author "to be brilliant, well informed, and opinionated," but he also said, "he tends to a verbosity which indicates, either that he is not being understood, so he has to shout, or that his primary audience is himself."<sup>56</sup> A second reviewer, J. David Singer of the Mental Health Research Institute of the University of Michigan, came to a very similar conclusion:

In sum, the book is tedious in many places, generates no new evidence, ignores most prior evidence, generates only one or two interesting ideas, violates a number of logical norms, and perhaps already rendered its most useful service: some sort of catharsis for the author.<sup>57</sup>

In the years that Ichheiser had to spend far from academic life, the demands on scientific publications and the possibilities for including contributions from outsiders had radically changed. In 1949, Hughes had been able to publish Ichheiser's *Misunderstanding in Human Relations* in the *American Journal of Sociology*, which he had co-edited as a supplement. The publication did not reference much current literature, which was considered as a weak point of the text, but nevertheless Hughes was even able to pay the author for his contribution; in the mid-1960s, neither publishing a text with so few current references nor paying the author royalties was possible. The standards of a peer-review process and the changing formal requirements for scientific publications could not be met by a text written in an essayistic style. Morgenthau nevertheless submitted Ichheiser's book to another publisher, and he did not conceal the book's weakness in his letter to the publisher: "The main weakness ... lies in a tendency towards eccentricity [but] the book ought to be published because it makes a really original contribution to knowledge and is likely to create a sensation."<sup>58</sup> Ultimately, it remained unpublished; even the manuscript ended up lost.

After the RF funding sources ended, Ichheiser found another sponsor in the person of Sol Tax, the anthropologist. As editor of *Current Anthropology*, Tax had a little money and provided Ichheiser a pro forma job. Together with Hughes, Tax then also tried to publish selected essays by Ichheiser. The negotiations with various publishers dragged on, but eventually Jossey-Bass accepted the proposal. In Spring

---

<sup>56</sup>"Comments on Ichheiser manuscript," signed GWA, Morgenthau Papers.

<sup>57</sup>J. David Singer to Howard Goldfinger, University of Chicago Press, April 25, 1967, copy in Morgenthau Papers.

<sup>58</sup>Morgenthau to Miriam S. Farley, Indiana University Press, April 28, 1967, Morgenthau Papers.



1969, negotiations on which of his works were to be published in the volume began, and a first list was compiled.

Meanwhile, Ichheiser had written an autobiographical text, the various versions of which he distributed generously.<sup>59</sup> In “Was I Insane – or was I ‘Railroaded’ to a State Hospital? My Own Retrospective Interpretation,” Ichheiser analyzes the reasons for his internment in a psychiatric institution and announces that in two further texts he will attend to the “social blindness and moral apathy” of his “friends and pseudo-friends” and his social psychological observations within the asylum; these two texts seem to not have been written; in any case, they have not been discovered to this day.

At the center of Ichheiser’s argument is the assumption that one of the two psychiatric diagnoses must be wrong, either the one leading to his institutionalization in 1951 or the one communicated to him at his release. The first diagnosis stated that as a mentally ill person, suffering from schizophrenia of the paranoid type, he was incapable of taking care of himself and therefore posed a threat to himself or to others, and after 11 years, the diagnosis attested he was “competent and without psychosis.” Ichheiser does not say anything even close to the most obvious conclusion that over the past 11 years a cure may have been possible.<sup>60</sup> Instead, he sees the true reason for his institutionalization in his shocking scientific views (of which he briefly mentions five) in his refusal to position himself politically and in other numerous misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

Ichheiser explains the absence of an initial counterposition to the diagnosis on his part to having been succumbed to a situational misinterpretation. From a conversation with Louis Wirth, mentioned in the text as “the late professor L. W.,” he had falsely interpreted a statement as reference to the secret service being interested in him as an employee. He then sought out informed about the recruitment practices of this office in the library and had read that potential employees would be subjected to an in-depth investigation without their knowledge, which could also lead to the potential intelligence worker being coerced into a false marriage or committed into

---

<sup>59</sup>On December 7, 1966, Ichheiser sent a copy to Sol Tax, on June 5, 1968, to Gerald Freund (RAC, RG 2, GC 1968, Series 200, Box 606), and the Morgenthau Papers contain a copy, which had most likely been already sent to Morgenthau in late 1966. Everett Hughes only received a copy after Ichheiser’s death (Hughes to Suzanne Cole, Secretary to Hans Morgenthau, January 27, 1970, Hughes Papers, Box 6, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library; Kopie in Morgenthau Papers). In the following, I use the copy that includes a motto as prefix and contains a postscript, which must have been written after April 1969. It is archived in the Sol Tax Papers, Box 6, Folders 6 and 7, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library. Tax suggested publication after Ichheiser’s death, as “the only reason for not publishing the article now is that we continue to ‘protect him against himself,’ and I have a feeling that his friends have been too guilty of that already. It seems to me we have an obligation now to take him at his word, and publish this defense, even though – as he would be the first to recognize – most people might accept it as further proof rather than as denial,” letter to Harold Zepelin, January 5, 1970, Sol Tax Papers, copy archived in the Morgenthau Papers. In a letter dated February 3, 1970, to Hughes, he then agrees to not publish this text after all, copy archived in Morgenthau Papers.

<sup>60</sup>Ichheiser is here obviously only counting the years he had spent within in the closed psychiatric institution.

a psychiatric institution or the likes to test his reaction. In regard to being coerced into a false marriage, a coquettish nurse had in fact approached Ichheiser during his stay in the hospital.

Most of this autobiographical text focuses on the psychiatric attributions. To each one, Ichheiser cites a fitting interpretation taken from his writings. From early on, he had warned against overestimating the unity of the person, from which it might be concluded that we are all schizophrenic in one way or another. Paranoia, too, is, as it were, a normal state, which only attains its discrediting quality through the reaction of others: "If you do not see things as I (We) see them, and do not feel about them as I (We) do, then this proves that it is you who are 'prejudiced,' 'biased,' 'undemocratic,' or even 'mentally ill'!" In the medical diagnoses, which he had only been able to see after his release, persecution complex and mistrust were also stated. He contends that he was probably too careless and trusting toward his surroundings. Women who had forced themselves onto him, with little, he inserts, resistance from his side, had denounced him as a consequence, and his scientific adversaries had not only deceived him with the proceeds of sales but also prevented him from gaining a position.

In his endeavor to set things straight, Ichheiser felt verified by the then very recent publications of Erving Goffman and Thomas Szasz, whose writings explain why, after being once labeled with having a mental disorder, he had no chance to defend himself against it. Goffman's (1961) *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* and Szasz' (1963) *Law, Liberty, and Psychiatry: An Inquiry into the Social Uses of Mental Health Practices* were at the beginning of the widespread criticism of psychiatry and its practices. Problematic therapies and the hospitalization of socially conspicuous people were later taken into account in films such as "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest"<sup>61</sup> and the movement of anti-psychiatry. Thanks to these movements, inmates were released from the psychiatric units but then found themselves among the homeless. Goffman, who had studied with Hughes in Chicago, among others, knew Ichheiser's publications and referred to them.<sup>62</sup> It is not known whether Goffman personally had met Ichheiser during his years in Chicago.<sup>63</sup> The same is true of Szasz, a Hungarian-born psychiatrist who had come to the US in 1938 and from 1944 onward received psychoanalyst training in Chicago before teaching psychiatry at Syracuse University in New York from 1956 onward. Szasz does not refer to Ichheiser in his publications. Ichheiser's writings justifying his standpoint in relation to wrongfully being institutionalization would, however, fit well there.

On the basis of Ichheiser's autobiographical text, academic physicians would probably have diagnosed a lack of insight into the author's illness, and, as a non-physician, one might be inclined to give this point a bit more attention. It remains,

---

<sup>61</sup> *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest*, Director: Milos Forman, US 1975; starring Jack Nicholson.

<sup>62</sup> Goffman references Ichheiser only once (1959/1973, p. 2), but Smith (2006) argues that Ichheiser had made lasting impressions which has greatly influenced his own work.

<sup>63</sup> In an interview conducted by Marianne Egger de Campo, Howard S. Becker remembered Ichheiser.

however, that only after the Rockefeller Foundation’s interest was a sudden (declaration of) recovery of the longtime barred was pronounced. Ichheiser viewed himself as one and the same person in 1951 and 1965, and, in this case, he probably succumbed to an overestimation of personal unity and, consequently, related his “miraculous cure” back to his having received professional recognition from a third party. The treating psychiatrists would have only agreed to this interpretation if they had switched to the then already existing camp of labeling theorists, as this direction nevertheless proclaimed that all forms of deviant behavior were merely the result of attribution by the powerful. Given that nothing points to this, one must keep in mind that Ichheiser remained imprisoned longer than was psychiatrically justified.

In the postscript of his autobiographical text, Ichheiser justifies the relentless tone of his remarks by saying that he was too old to maintain an occupation, and, in view of the long years that he spent in psychiatry, he saw no other possibility other than in all openness and under renouncing a “gentlemanlike” style to provoke a scandal. At the end of his text, he lists his English-language publications, which he had extensively referred to. The last two entries in this list are “Selected Essays, in publication, 1970,” and “On our current illusions concerning the basic issues of peace and war, under a grant of the Rockefeller Foundation; Ready for publication.”

On the night of November 8, 1969, Ichheiser took his own life.

After long debate, Ichheiser’s mentors, who were not warmly treated in his autobiographical pamphlet, agreed to publish the book with selected articles without this justification text. After reading Ichheiser’s autobiographical text, Everett Hughes refused the imprint of a preface written by him under his name and published only a brief note in the *American Sociologist* (1970).

## Summary

During his three decades living in the US, Ichheiser had numerous mentors, but for him, no place was satisfactory. Although the American social scientists Louis Wirth, Everett C. Hughes, Hans J. Morgenthau, Sol Tax, Herbert Blumer, Morris Janowitz, and Gerald Freund were all not exactly under employed when the refugee and outsider Ichheiser crossed their paths, they nevertheless—and remarkably—took time for him and promoted him, despite his arrogance and troublemaking character. Ichheiser’s entire scientific career was extremely marginal and precarious. As Hughes wrote in the then unpublished preface, “the full, free, and bitter observer of the life about him and the life he himself lived.” Hughes compares Ichheiser to Ulrich from Robert Musil’s *The Man Without Qualities*: “Gustav Ichheiser was another Viennese for whom things, anything, could just as well—or perhaps, better—have been otherwise.”<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Everett C. Hughes, Gustav Ichheiser, Sol Tax Papers.

What remained—and still remains—of Ichheiser are his publications, which would have been less numerous without the help of his American mentors. If this psychiatric patient had not been cured as a result of the miraculous activity of the Rockefeller Foundation, the leading US philanthropic foundation, a collection of his writings previously published as monograph in a supplement to a periodical, could not have been republished (along with additional writings) as a book. Thanks, however, to the journal database, established long after Ichheiser's death, his publications from 1949 are now more easily accessible than the 1970 book, which is currently out of print.<sup>65</sup>

From an empirical scientific and sociological perspective, Ichheiser's failed attempt to gain a foothold in the US exposes some insights. First, one can say that his decision to be in close proximity to Chicago sociologists was probably the best thing he could have done. There he found a large number of colleagues able to gain some insight from his essayistic and opinionated writings. That he ultimately provoked too many influential people, whose names are only mentioned collectively and anonymously in the papers I have consulted, would have elsewhere led much sooner to his social isolation. The only collective of thought that might have more welcomingly acknowledged his texts had only just begun to form in the 1940s. The phenomenological sociologists, with whom Ichheiser had come into contact only in his last years of life, would—due to their own marginality—probably not have had the means to support him to the same extent that the sociologists Wirth and Hughes, the political scientist Morgenthau, and the anthropologist Tax had, who, at the time, were well established in the research apparatus of the social sciences. The fact that these “big shots” of the American social sciences of the postwar period took such long and intensive interest in Ichheiser can not only be explained simply on the grounds of personality alone but also on their institutional peculiarities. In the world of third-party research, in which each of them moved, it was viewed as good manners and essential for their research to always be on the lookout for wise and imaginative colleagues. Anyone who had to manage large research budgets had to regularly look for potential “clerks.” The RF employees' offer to an unknown—who also turned out to be a psychiatric institution inmate, is an example of this. To create a structure of opportunity, such as receiving grants for research projects, is one thing, but to then also be able to use these structures and apply and receive a grant is not always under all circumstances possible.

In American psychology, Ichheiser found far fewer cooperative partners. Only Gordon W. Allport offered a supportive hand for an extended period of time. It is not unlikely that other psychologists could have related to Ichheiser's views. The only psychology perspective that might have been compatible with his own would have been what today is known as the attribution theory. The attribution theory was inspired by another Austrian émigré, Fritz Heider, whose *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations* (1958) itself only slowly found acceptance (Gasser-Steiner, 2009; Rudmin et al., 1987).

---

<sup>65</sup> Google Scholar counts 290 references for “Misunderstandings in human relations” and only 39 for *Appearances and realities*, <http://www.scholar.google.at>, accessed November 3, 2014.

All in all, one must come to the conclusion that someone like Gustav Ichheiser would not have been any more successful in any other scientific world.

## References

- Bayer, M. B., & Strickland, L. H. (1990). Gustav Ichheiser on sociopsychological misperception in international relations. *Polit Psychol*, 11(4), 966–719.
- Bierce, A. (2003). *The devil's dictionary*. London: Folio Society. (Original work published in 1911).
- Fleck, C. (2015). *Etablierung in der Femde. Vertriebene Wissenschaftler in den USA nach 1933 [Establishing oneself abroad: Displaced Scholars in the USA after 1933]*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Freund, G. (1961). *Germany between two worlds*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Freund, G. (1996). *Narcissism & philanthropy: Ideas and talent denied*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Gasser-Steiner, P. (2009). Fritz Heider (1896–1988) – Der philosophische Analytiker und ‘naive’ Erforscher sozialer Beziehungen [Fritz Heider (1896–1988): The philosophical analytic and the ‘naive’ researcher of social relations]. In K. Acham (Ed.), *Rechts-, Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften aus Graz. Zwischen empirischer Analyse und normativer Handlungsanweisung. Wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Befunde aus drei Jahrhunderten* (pp. 479–498). Wien: Böhlau.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1973). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press. (Original work published 1959).
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hughes, E. C. (1970). Gustav Ichheiser 1897–1969. *Am Sociol*, 5(3), 289.
- Ichheiser, G. (1925). Die ästhetische Geltung. Eine kritische Untersuchung [Aesthetic meaning: A critical investigation]. *Z Ästhet Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 18, 365–373.
- Ichheiser, G. (1927). Die Antinomie zwischen Politik und Moral nach Machiavelli. Ein Beitrag zu einer ‘Soziologie des Erfolges’ [The anatomy between politics and moral of Machiavelli: A contribution to the ‘sociology of success’]. *Z Völkerpsychol Soziol*, 3, 294–309.
- Ichheiser, G. (1928a). ‘Sein’ und ‘Erscheinen’: Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Selbstbewusstseins [‘Being’ and ‘appearing’: A contribution to the psychology of self-consciousness]. *Jahrbuch Charakterol*, 5, 21–59.
- Ichheiser, G. (1928b). Die Bedeutung der leiblichen Schönheit des Individuums in sozialpsychologischer und soziologischer Beleuchtung [The meaning of an individual’s physical beauty in socio-psychological and sociological terms]. *Z Völkerpsychol Soziol*, 4, 257–265.
- Ichheiser, G. (1930). Kritik des Erfolges. Eine soziologische Untersuchung [Critique of success: A sociological investigation]. Leipzig: Verlag von C.L. Hirschfeld.
- Ichheiser, G. (1932). Ausdruck und Eindruck [Expression and impression]. *Kölner Vierteljahresheft Soziol*, 11, 59–64.
- Ichheiser, G. (1943a). Review of: American words and ways: Especially for German Americans (J. Whyte). *Am J Sociol*, 49, 282.
- Ichheiser, G. (1943b). Review of: Essays on Anti-Semitism, (Koppel S. Pinson, Eds.) *Am J Sociol*, 49, 775.
- Ichheiser, G. (1946a). *Diagnosis of anti-semitism: Two essays*. New York, NY: Beacon House.
- Ichheiser, G. (1946b). Jews and antisemitism. *Sociometry*, 9, 92–110.
- Ichheiser, G. (1949). Sociopsychological and cultural factors in race relations. *Am J Sociol*, 54(5), 395–401.

- Ichheiser, G. (1960). On Freud's blind spots concerning some obvious facts. *J Individ Psychol*, 16, 45–55. [Reprinted in *Appearances and realities: Misunderstandings in human relations*, pp. 140–151. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1970].
- Ichheiser, G. (1964). Is nationalism really outmoded? *Bull Atom Sci*, 20(June), 35.
- Ichheiser, G. (1966). *Was I insane - or was I 'railroaded' to a state hospital: My own retrospective introspection*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago.
- Ichheiser, G. (1970). Misunderstandings in human relations: A study of false social perception. In *Appearances and realities: Misunderstandings in human relations* (pp. 7–120). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. (Reprint from supplement to *American Journal of Sociology*, 55(2), Part 2).
- Kendall, P., & Wolf, K. M. (1955). The two purposes of deviant case analysis. In P. F. Lazarsfeld & M. Rosenberg (Eds.), *Language of social research: A reader in the methodology of social research* (pp. 167–170). Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F. (1962). The sociology of empirical social research. *Am Sociol Rev*, 27, 766.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Rosenberg, M. (1949–1950). The contribution of the regional poll to political understanding. *Public Opin Q*, 13, 579–580.
- LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Rudmin, F., Trimpop, R. M., Kryl, I., & Boski, P. (1987). Gustav Ichheiser in the history of social psychology: An early phenomenology of social attribution. *Br J Soc Psychol*, 26, 165–180.
- Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. New York: Harper.
- Smith, G. W. H. (2006). Enacted others: Specifying Goffman's phenomenological omissions and sociological accomplishments. *Hum Stud*, 28, 397–415.
- Szasz, T. S. (1963). *Law, liberty, and psychiatry: An inquiry into the social uses of mental health practices*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Weisskopf-Joelson, E. (1988). *Father, have I kept my promise? Madness as seen from within*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.