History of Psychology

Gestalt Psychology—Hereditary Psychology—Twin Research: Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) and the German-Japanese Knowledge Transfer During National Socialism and the Postwar Period

Lukas Frank, Dominik Gross, and Nadezhda Durdova

Online First Publication, October 8, 2026. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000307

CITATION

Frank, L., Gross, D., & Durdova, N. (2026). Gestalt psychology—Hereditary psychology—Twin research: Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) and the German-Japanese knowledge transfer during national socialism and the postwar period. *History of Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/hop0000307

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

History of Psychology

© 2026 The Author(s)
ISSN: 1093-4510

https://doi.org/10.1037/hop0000307

Gestalt Psychology—Hereditary Psychology—Twin Research: Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) and the German-Japanese Knowledge Transfer During National Socialism and the Postwar Period

Lukas Frank, Dominik Gross, and Nadezhda Durdova

Institute for History, Theory and Ethics of Medicine, RWTH Aachen University

The present article reconstructs the scientific career of the psychologist Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) in the context of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics (Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik [KWI-A]) in Berlin, Germany. Against this background, it aims to analyze the scope and characteristics of the German-Japanese knowledge transfer during National Socialism and the postwar period. Drawing on Gottschaldt's profile as a Gestalt psychologist, the article establishes that his work at the KWI-A marked a programmatic reorientation toward hereditary psychology and twin research. The twin method functioned as an empirical instrument for quantifying the relationship between "heredity" and "environment" and was embedded within the institute's racial-scientific research program. The transnational dimension of this research is reconstructed for the first time through the cases of the Japanese visiting scholars Takagi Masataka (1913–1962?) and Kamitake Masaji (1909–1983). Their work documents both their institutional integration into the KWI-A as well as the lasting influence of the theoretical and methodological concepts developed there on Japanese psychology after 1945. The article demonstrates that key personnel networks, methodological approaches, and epistemological principles persisted despite the political rupture. In doing so, the study contributes to a nuanced examination of the entanglement of science, politics, and international exchange in the 20th century.

Keywords: science–politics entanglement, transnational scientific exchange, personality theory (layer model), postwar scientific continuities, Kaiser Wilhelm Institute

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Christopher D. Green served as action editor.

Lukas Frank https://orcid.org/0009-0006-8484-2011

We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0). This license permits copying and redistributing the work in any medium or format for noncommercial use provided the original authors and source are credited and a link to the license is included in attribution. No derivative works are permitted under this license.

Lukas Frank served as lead for conceptualization, investigation, methodology, project administration, and writing–original draft and contributed equally to writing–review and editing. Dominik Gross contributed equally to supervision and writing–review and editing and served in a supporting role for writing–original draft. Nadezhda Durdova contributed equally to writing–review and editing and verification of academic accuracy (psychology) and served in a supporting role for methodology and writing–original draft.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lukas Frank, Institute for History, Theory and Ethics of Medicine, RWTH Aachen University, Wendlingweg 2, 52074 Aachen, Germany. Email: lfrank@ukaachen.de

The claim of a politics- and culture-free science that is subject to universal standards of objectivity can most readily be understood as an idealized self-image or a rhetorical device in political debates (Roelcke, 2012). A particularly striking example is provided by the life sciences—including biology, genetics, medicine, psychiatry, and psychology—which served to scientifically legitimize National Socialist hereditary and racial policy, up to and including the extermination of "life unworthy of living" (*lebensunwertes Leben*). These disciplines, in turn, profited enormously as politically favored sciences from the goodwill of those in power: Research projects were generously funded, chairs were established or repurposed, research institutions were founded or expanded, scientists were given unhindered access to sensitive data and were able to exploit human subjects—frequently against their will—for research purposes (Schmuhl, 2003). The programs and practices of the actors operating within this web of relationships can only be understood adequately in the context of the specific challenges and opportunities created by the political system (Roelcke, 2012).

In Germany, three Kaiser Wilhelm Institutes (KWIs) played central roles in this interplay between science and politics: the KWI for Anthropology, Human Heredity, and Eugenics (Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik [KWI-A]) in Berlin-Dahlem, the German Research Institute for Psychiatry (Deutsche Forschungsanstalt für Psychiatrie [DFA]) in Munich, and the KWI for Brain Research (Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Hirnforschung) in Berlin-Buch (Schmuhl, 2003).

The Department of Hereditary Psychology, headed by the Gestalt psychologist Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991) at the KWI-A in Berlin-Dahlem from 1935 onward (Stadler, 1985), was also intertwined with the political system—and embedded within the overarching framework of racial research and human genetics at the KWI-A (Massin, 2003). The fact that this interpretation of Kurt Gottschaldt represents a more recent position in historical scholarship is connected to the circumstance that, well into the 1970s, the thesis of the incompatibility of Gestalt psychological approaches with National Socialist ideology had been emphasized, partly in order to relativize the intellectual proximity of certain representatives of the discipline to National Socialism (Prinz, 1985). The eminent Gestalt psychologist Wolfgang Metzger (1899–1979) even claimed that the conceptual frameworks of Gestalt psychology and National Socialism were fundamentally irreconcilable (Geuter, 1989).

By contrast, one of the central theses of the present study is that Kurt Gottschaldt's outstanding reputation as a Gestalt psychologist—which he had established at the Psychological Institute of the University of Berlin from 1922 onward (Stadler, 1985)—contributed to maintaining the KWI-A's standing as an internationally renowned center of excellence[1] (Ash, 1985a)—at least in Japanese perception—even during the Third Reich. The fact that the two Japanese psychologists Takagi Masataka (高木正孝; 1913–1962?) and Kamitake Masaji (上武正二; 1909–1983) worked specifically in the Department of Hereditary Psychology (Abteilung für Erbpsychologie)[2,3] under Kurt Gottschaldt's leadership is directly connected to his biographical and professional background, as the first part of this article demonstrates.

[1] Scientists came from Norway, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Italy, Hungary, India, Japan, China, Brazil, and many other countries, right up until the war years (Weingart et al., 1988).

[2] As referred to in the annual report of the KWI-A from April 1941 until March 1942 (Archives of the Max Planck Society, I-003-0019) also referred to as *Erbpsychologische Abteilung*, for example, in Gottschaldt (1942).

[3] Archives of the Max Planck Society, I-003-0019, Jahresbericht 1941/42 [Annual Report 1941–42].

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

The KWIs as "nodes of a closely interwoven network" (Schmuhl, 2003, p. 20) of research projects, research programs, conferences, universities, nonuniversity research institutions, and numerous other institutions have not yet been studied in all their dimensions. Many works neglect the scientific contexts of criminal research, focusing only on complicity (Schmuhl, 2003). Accordingly, Benoît Massin notes that scholarly research on the KWI-A constitutes terra incognita, and that it is of interest to embed research in social and political contexts in order to understand its popularity in the 1920s and 1930s—explicitly naming twin research as a desideratum (Massin, 2003).[4] Despite these findings, the role of the two Japanese psychologists remains underexamined in the existing scholarship on the KWI-A. Equally absent is any connection between their scientific activities and Gottschaldt's twin research. In Hans-Walter Schmuhl's seminal study on the history of the KWI-A from 1927 to 1945, there is merely a note that during the war, *Untersuchungen über den Rassenruf mongolider Völker im Rassenbewußtsein von Japanern* (Studies on the Race Reputation of Mongoloid Peoples in the Racial Consciousness of Japanese) were conducted in the Hereditary Psychology Department in collaboration with the Department of Culture of the Japanese Embassy. Schmuhl suspects these were carried out by the two Japanese scholars (Schmuhl, 2008). For the period from 1942/1943 to the end of 1943, Hans-Joachim Bieber notes in his extensive monograph on German-Japanese cultural relations from 1933 to 1945 that it is scarcely known what the Japanese scholars, who were still present in Germany at this time, were engaged with (Bieber, 2014). This is where the second part of the study intervenes, elucidating what the visiting scholars were scientifically engaged with during their time at the KWI-A.

International reputation and extensive professional networking contributed in the postwar period to the reintegration of racial geneticists such as Otmar von Verschuer (1896–1969)—director of the KWI-A from 1942 onward—into academic life (Tschacher, 2010; Weiss, 2006). In Verschuer's case—as in Kurt Gottschaldt's—his background as a twin researcher allowed him to resume an aspect of his research activity that continued to find acceptance in postwar Germany. Likewise, the two Japanese psychologists were able to make use of their scientific experience in the field of twin research—conducted under Gottschaldt at the KWI-A during the 1930s and 1940s—for their postwar academic careers. An elaboration of this forms the final part of our article.

The article is accordingly structured in three parts, each of which examines one facet of Kurt Gottschaldt's scientific orientation and its direct or indirect connections to Japan. Although Gottschaldt provides the institutional link between German and Japanese researchers, the study primarily focuses on the Japanese actors who participated in, adapted, and transmitted this research tradition before and after 1945. The first part of the article situates Gottschaldt as a Gestalt psychologist, and sketches the transfer of Gestalt and holistic psychological concepts to Japan. It also illuminates the influence of this transfer on the two later visiting scholars Takagi Masataka and Kamitake Masaji. The second part of the article focuses on Gottschaldt as a hereditary psychologist at the KWI-A—including his institutional integration into the racial-scientific research program—and the work of the Japanese visiting scholars. The third part is devoted to twin research as a line of continuity beyond 1945, and demonstrates—through the cases of Gottschaldt, Takagi, and Kamitake—how careers, methodological approaches, and personal networks were continued in the German-Japanese context in the postwar period.

[4] With regard to the history of psychology, Lück et al. (1984) criticized the fact that publications were largely limited to nostalgic reflections and that the interplay between the discipline's development and societal conditions was scarcely addressed.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

For the purposes of this study, both German and Japanese sources have been evaluated, including works that have previously been overlooked in the research literature. Records from the Archives of the Max Planck Society pertaining to Takagi and Kamitake are analyzed here for the first time in light of the Japanese history of psychology—among others, Takagi's account of his first encounters with Kurt Gottschaldt and Eugen Fischer (1874–1967), the geneticist courted by the National Socialists and a former director of the KWI-A (Stadler, 1985).[5] Japanese-language works by Takagi and Kamitake from the postwar period close gaps with regard to their activities at the KWI-A. Of particular note are Takagi's 1956 research overview on hereditary psychology (Takagi, 1956a) and Kamitake's (1971) monograph on hereditary and environmental influences on psychological function, which builds on his unpublished dissertation from 1962. It has also been possible to clarify the fate of Takagi (missing since a 1962 expedition on the island of Fatu Hiva in the Pacific Ocean; Ishikawa, 1964).

Gestalt Psychology in Germany and Japan: Intellectual Backgrounds of German-Japanese Knowledge Transfer

In the 1920s, the two most significant psychological movements in Germany were the Gestalt psychology, represented in Berlin by Wolfgang Köhler (1887–1967), and the holistic psychology (*Ganzheitspsychologie*), shaped in Leipzig by Felix Krueger (1874–1948; Ash, 1985b). Both movements understood themselves as critiques of the subjectivism of consciousness-based psychology (Scheerer, 1985). Although Gestalt psychology holds that psychological processes are organized primarily as structured wholes (*Gestalten*), the formal laws of which are amenable to experimental analysis, Krueger's holistic psychology takes as its epistemological starting point the immediate reality of lived experience (Geuter, 1994).

Berlin Gestalt psychology made its core assumptions clear through vivid perceptual examples. One classic example is the law of proximity. When identical points are arranged at regular intervals on a surface, they appear to us not as isolated individual elements but as groups—for instance, spontaneous appearances of groups of two or three. Crucially, these groupings are neither arbitrarily chosen, nor the result of conscious interpretation. Rather the perceptual field tends to organize itself according to structural tendencies (Ash, 1998b). This research was based on the assumption that perception is not built up from the summation of individual sensations, but rather that the whole—the organized structure of the field—determines the character of its parts.

Kurt Gottschaldt was a Gestalt psychologist. From 1922 onward he studied philosophy with a focus on psychology at the Psychological Institute of the University of Berlin, initially under Carl Stumpf (1848–1936), then primarily under Max Wertheimer (1880–1943) and Wolfgang Köhler (Stadler, 1985).[6] His dissertation, *Über den Einfluß der Erfahrung auf die Wahrnehmung von Figuren* (On the Influence of Experience on the Perception of Figures; Gottschaldt, 1926), appeared in the journal *Psychologische Forschung* (Psychological Research; Ash, 1985a). The study investigates whether certain figures are more easily recognized after prolonged exposure when they are embedded in a new context, and brought

[5] Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-094-063, Begegnungen mit Eugen Fischer. Zu seinem 85. Geburtstag am 5. Juni 1959 (maschinenschriftlich, gebunden) [Encounters with Eugen Fischer. On the occasion of his 85th birthday on June 5, 1959 (typescript, bound)].

[6] He also studied physics and chemistry, although Ash does not specify to what extent (Ash, 1998b).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Gottschaldt international recognition. The second part of the work appeared in 1929 following a 3-year assistantship under Köhler. In 1932, Gottschaldt completed his *Habilitation* under Erich Rothacker (1888–1965) at the University of Bonn (Stadler, 1985). The thesis published in 1933 under the title *Der Aufbau des kindlichen Handelns* (The Structure of Children's Actions; Stadler, 1985), distinguished by its use of an observational model based on age-appropriate tasks, enabling the analysis of patterns and styles of action in children (Ash, 2003). One task, for instance, consisted of building towers with wooden blocks (Ash, 1998b). On the basis of this scholarly background, Gottschaldt's significance for German-Japanese scientific exchange becomes reconstructable.

Psychology played a special role in this exchange. It was one of the disciplines that were imported to Japan following the Meiji Restoration of 1868. Before the outbreak of the Second World War (1939–1945), more than one hundred students and associate professors traveled to Europe and the United States to study psychology. In the first half of the 20th century, more than 50 Japanese psychologists visited Germany (Takasuna & Sato, 2017).[7] Following the cultural agreement concluded between Germany and Japan at the end of 1938—which promoted bilateral relations in science, art, music, literature, film, radio, youth movements, and sports—increasing numbers of scholars came to Germany, though primarily from the fields of medicine and law (Bieber, 2014).

Due to the German-Japanese alliance, Gestalt and holistic psychology held a prominent place in Japanese educational psychology, as German "totalitarianism"—understood also in nonpolitical sense as "wholeness" (*Ganzheit*; Takasuna & Sato, 2017, p. 53)—was met with admiration by the Japanese ally and consequently received favorably. Japanese scholars did not draw the sharp distinction between holistic and Gestalt psychology that was present in German psychology. Since both concepts spread to Japan in close temporal proximity,[8] many Japanese scholars assumed that Gestalt psychology was merely a derivative of holistic psychology. This derivative experienced a veritable boom in popularity in Japanese academic circles during the 1930s (Takasuna & Sato, 2017). Takasuna and Sato (2017) remarked, "Both Gestalt psychology and Ganzheitspsychologie were misused to fortify totalitarianism" (p. 56).

Against this history-of-science context, it becomes understandable why a stay with a prominent Berlin Gestalt psychologist such as Gottschaldt held particular appeal for Japanese scholars. Both Gottschaldt's career trajectory and the Japanese enthusiasm for Gestalt and holistic psychology are elementally important for comprehending the presence of Takagi and Kamitake at the KWI-A during the National Socialist era.

Takagi Masataka's Academic Background

Takagi Masataka received a bachelor's degree in literature from the Imperial University in Tokyo in 1936 and enrolled at the University of Berlin in the same year to study psychology, anthropology, and ethnology. He also worked as a translator for the Japanese Embassy and from 1944 onward as an animal psychologist at the Berlin Zoological Garden (Schmuhl, 2008). In addition, he was a member of a German-Japanese working group on the topic *Deutscher und japanischer Staatsaufbau* (German and Japanese Political Systems), founded

[7] This was also due to the fact that studying abroad was a requirement for obtaining a professorship at a national Japanese university (Takasuna & Sato, 2017).

[8] The scholar Takagi Sadaji (1893–1975) first presented the concept of Gestalt psychology in 1921 at a psychology conference at the Imperial University of Tokyo. Takasuna and Sato also note that Felix Krüger's (1874–1948) holistic psychology was already being received in Japan as early as 1927 (Takasuna & Sato, 2017).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

in Berlin in the fall of 1940 (Haasch, 1996), as well as of the academic section of the Alpine Club Munich.[9]

His path to the KWI-A was directed toward Gottschaldt. In a letter to Kurt Gottschaldt dated September 28, 1939, Takagi requested through the Humboldt Foundation to conduct research at the KWI-A for a period of time. At that point, no research topic had yet been determined.[10] It can be shown that Takagi was one of those scholars who came to Germany out of enthusiasm for Gestalt psychology. He was determined to learn from Kurt Gottschaldt, studying the German language intensively to that end. A contribution by Takagi to a commemorative volume for Eugen Fischer's 85th birthday provides the evidence for this:

> It was one day in September 1939. I finally resolved to work with Professor Gottschaldt at the KWI for Anthropology. I then visited Professor Gottschaldt once again at the Institute in Dahlem during office hours and expressed my resolve to him and requested to be admitted to the Institute.
>
> I had already completed my studies as a psychologist at the University of Tokyo in Japan and had been fortunate enough to receive a stipend from the Humboldt Foundation. I arrived in Germany for the first time in the summer of 1938. As early as the winter semester of 1938, I attended the lectures of Professor Gottschaldt and visited him once at the institute in Dahlem to see the institute. But at that time I could not master the language. Therefore, despite Prof. Gottschaldt's recommendation that I work with him,[11] I could not make up my mind. I wanted to devote a year to language practice.
>
> And I thought to myself that Japanese scholars were usually admitted and worked as academic guests at the Institute. But I wanted to learn the methods of research in Germany thoroughly. Therefore I concealed my position as a lecturer in Japan and I wished to be admitted as a doctoral candidate. Professor Gottschaldt was kind enough to fulfill my wish and consented to allow me to work with him. (see Footnote 5)

Takagi's recollections, however, offer no indication that he had known Eugen Fischer before his time in Germany. It was Gottschaldt who introduced them (see Footnote 5). The sources suggest that Takagi's decision was motivated primarily by a scholarly orientation toward German Gestalt psychology, rather than by the established institutional networks at the KWI-A.

Kamitake Masaji's Academic Background

Kamitake Masaji already possessed a well-founded scholarly qualification and a clearly defined research profile before his stay at the KWI-A. He obtained a bachelor's degree in psychology from the Tokyo University of Literature and Science in 1935 and initially became a teacher at the Pedagogical College of Mie Prefecture. From 1936 onward he was an assistant professor at the Tokyo Higher Normal School and from 1939 additionally an assistant at his alma mater (Ōizumi, 2003).

In terms of content, there was already a proximity to Kurt Gottschaldt before Kamitake's work at the KWI-A. Kamitake's studies on the emergence of leadership processes in groups of children—published in 1941 and 1942 (Kamitake, 1941, 1942a, 1942b)—reveal a pronounced interest in developmental-dynamic questions among young people. With this focus,

[9] Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-094-069-09, Korrespondenz mit Otmar von Verschuer (auch mit Erika von Verschuer), Bd. 9 [Correspondence with Otmar von Verschuer (and Erika von Verschuer), Vol. 9].

[10] Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-127-12, Briefwechsel mit Mitarbeitern—1935-1945 [Correspondence with Employees—1935–1945].

[11] It was merely an offer from Gottschaldt to allow him to sit in on his classes (Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-127-12; see Footnote 10).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

he encountered Gottschaldt, an expert in child and adolescent psychology and at that time one of the most competent psychologists for questions of childhood and adolescence in Germany (Schmuhl, 2008). Beyond this thematic proximity, a theoretical affinity with the Gestalt tradition is also recognizable. In his first study, published in 1942, Kamitake refers to Ferdinand Hoppe's (1904–1960) concept of the *Anspruchsniveau* (level of aspiration) from Hoppe's investigation *Erfolg und Misserfolg* (Success and Failure; Hoppe, 1931; Kamitake, 1942a). Hoppe was a student of the Gestalt psychologist Kurt Lewin (1890–1947; Stadler, 1985; Sternek, 2013). Lewin, in turn, had supported Gottschaldt with his dissertation (Gottschaldt, 1926), but subsequently found himself compelled to leave Germany on account of his Jewish heritage (Stadler, 1985). Notably, the starting point of Hoppe's study was "questions that had arisen in the investigation of psychological satiation" (Hoppe, 1931, p. 3). These were the same questions to which Takagi would equally devote himself in his doctoral work with Gottschaldt at the KWI-A. The publications drawn upon suggest that, before his stay in Dahlem, Kamitake was already embedded in discursive contexts closely linked to the Berlin Gestalt milieu and to Kurt Gottschaldt.

In summary, it may be argued that Takagi Masataka's and Kamitake Masaji's career trajectories were already decisively prefigured, before their time at the KWI-A, by the Japanese reception of holistic and Gestalt psychological approaches as well as by Kurt Gottschaldt's position within German Gestalt psychology.

From Gestalt Psychology to Hereditary Psychology: Intellectual Contexts of German-Japanese Exchange

As early as 1929, Kurt Gottschaldt had assumed the directorship of the Psychology Department of the Rheinische Provinzial-Kinderanstalt für seelisch Abnorme (Rhine Province Children's Institution for the Mentally Abnormal) in Bonn. After the National Socialist seizure of power, he lost this position due to political suspicions related to alleged connections with the Communist Party of Germany (Stadler, 1985). Although he was not a member of the NSDAP (National Socialist German Workers' Party, Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei), he later became affiliated with the National Socialist Lecturers' League.[12]

Despite these difficulties, Gottschaldt was one of the few Gestalt psychologists who remained in Germany after 1933 (Stadler, 1985). After a brief assistantship under Rothacker (Schmuhl, 2008), he assumed from 1935 onward the directorship of the Department of Hereditary Psychology at the KWI-A in Berlin-Dahlem (Stadler, 1985).[13] As Massin emphasizes, it initially appears paradoxical that Gottschaldt was hired by Eugen Fischer (Massin, 2003)[14]. Yet precisely this apparent improbability marks the beginning of a disciplinary transformation. The research program of the newly established department was explicitly aimed at the

[12] German Federal Archives, NS 12/5497, Gottschaldt, Kurt.

[13] In addition, Gottschaldt became director of the Poliklinik für nervöse und schwer erziehbare Kinder und Jugendliche (Polyclinic for Nervous and Difficult Children and Adolescents) at the Berlin Children's Hospital that same year, and in 1938 he was appointed associate professor at the University of Berlin (Stadler, 1985). At the Psychological Institute, he taught courses on developmental psychology and twin research (Ash, 1985a).

[14] For Eugen Fischer, the decision to hire Gottschaldt was by no means paradoxical, and this was not solely due to professional considerations. As Schmuhl points out, Gottschaldt posed no threat to Fischer's own position or to the succession plans favoring Verschuer. His dependence on the institute bound him closely to it and reduced the risk of institutional competition. In Gottschaldt, he appointed someone who possessed both relevant professional expertise and the ability to integrate institutionally. His position allowed him to expand psychological research within the KWI-A's eugenics-oriented research program without fundamentally altering existing hierarchical structures (Schmuhl, 2003).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

psychological foundations of a "positive racial hygiene" (Ash, 2003, p. 407). The research agenda of the Department of Hereditary Psychology under Fischer was to investigate the heritability of psychological characteristics (Ash, 2003). Within this framework, Gottschaldt's Gestalt psychological approaches were incorporated into a research program focused on hereditary psychology and human genetics.[15] From being a Gestalt psychologist, Gottschaldt became, in a sense, a hereditary psychologist, whose research was henceforth institutionally, conceptually, and scientifically embedded in the human genetics of the KWI-A.

The cognitive interest of Gottschaldt's twin research lay in demonstrating the hereditary basis of mental capacities. Drawing on Fischer's phenogenetics, which aimed to compile all known hereditary phenomena in humans, and his distinction between heredity and environment when studying identical and fraternal twins (Fischer, 1930), both heuristic categories were treated as effectively closed units. At the same time, the paradigm assumed an additive interaction between both factors and aimed to quantitatively determine their respective contributions to the formation of psychological characteristics. In this way, psychological properties appeared as dependent variables ultimately reducible to two independent factors (Schmuhl, 2003).[16] This distinction, with its emphasis on the importance of psychological development, distinguished Fischer's and Gottschaldt's approach from concepts like Hans F. K. Günther's (1891–1968) "race psychology" (Ash, 1998b, p. 340) based on anthropometric measurement.

Favorable conditions for empirical work in natural life settings were provided by the twin camps on the island of Norderney, organized by Gottschaldt in 1936/1937 with the support of the *Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt* (National Socialist People's Welfare Organization; see Figure 1). During these several-week-long camps, extensive data were gathered through participant observation (Stadler, 1985).[17] Kurt Gottschaldt based his analysis of the "overall structure of the psyche" on a stratified conception of personality. This orientation toward layer models was prevalent in Germany at the time.[18] He differentiated between a "noetic superstructure," constituting "the domain of the intellectual functions of thinking and willing," and an "endothymic ground," encompassing "the feelings, moods, and vital states" (Weinert et al., 1994, pp. 274–275).[19]

In programmatic texts, Fischer and Gottschaldt articulated without ambiguity the aim of depicting and genetically explaining, "in the hereditary image of the human being, the mental-psychological dimension both in the individual and in the race" (Fischer & Gottschaldt, 1942, p. V). Gottschaldt's research laid to provide the methodological foundation for this undertaking. As Massin elaborates, his department was an integral component of Fischer's long-term racial-scientific program. Initially, the heritability of mental and psychological

[15] Quotations from Gestalt theorists had already been steadily declining in Gottschaldt's writings since 1926 and remained at a comparatively low level after 1935—the first year of his tenure at the KWI-A (Stadler, 1985).

[16] Although the methods employed by Gottschaldt conformed to the then-prevailing international standard, he downplayed methodological objections from American colleagues (such as the problem of distinguishing twins raised apart versus together; Ash, 1998b).

[17] The twin pairs included in the study were revisited after the war and examined further between 1949 and 1951. In a third phase of the study, conducted between 1965 and 1970, the twins who could still be located—now in middle adulthood—were contacted and interviewed once again. This resulted in an exceptionally extensive longitudinal data set on monozygotic and dizygotic twins (Stadler, 1985). However, as Weinert et al. emphasized in retrospect in 1994, the data required an urgent "methodological reconstruction and reanalysis." Gottschaldt himself had published "only a few fragmentary descriptive findings based on highly aggregated scales" regarding his studies (Weinert et al., 1994, p. 273).

[18] The layer theory of personality was developed by Philipp Lersch (1898–1972; Ash, 2002). Gottschaldt adopts this model but cautions against taking the geological analogy too literally (Hany, 2001).

[19] See also Gottschaldt (1939).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

properties[20] was to be established against environmentalist positions, above all by means of twin research as the "most brilliant instrument of human genetic research" (*glänzendste[s] Instrument der menschlichen Erbforschung*; Massin, 2003, p. 234). In a second phase, their unequal distribution across races was to be demonstrated (Massin, 2003). More recent assessments—such as Mastroianni's—therefore conclude that Gottschaldt's methodological critique of contemporary racial psychology is to be read not as distancing himself from the broader eugenic project, but rather as qualifying stabilization of it (Mastroianni, 2006). His work, despite its scholarly care and ideological reserve, supported the overarching aims of NS eugenics.[21] In 1942, Gottschaldt claimed to have found substantially higher heritability estimates for endothymic qualities (mood, activity level, and drive) than for intellectual functions (Gottschaldt, 1942).[22]

The ideological embedding of Gottschaldt's scholarly activity is further supported by statements from the two Japanese scholars Takagi and Kamitake. In his 1956 retrospective overview of hereditary psychology, Takagi noted, "The layer-theoretical structure of the personality has already been established from various problem areas. Gottschaldt has provided the hereditary-biological foundation for this through twin research" (Takagi, 1956a, p. 1).[23] And in a 1948 research overview, Kamitake states that, with respect to the hereditary psychology at the KWI-A, Gottschaldt had sought to develop a "system of hereditary psychology" on the basis of the twin study material (Kamitake, 1948, p. 156).

Research Activities of Takagi Masataka at the KWI

Correspondence between Kurt Gottschaldt and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation (since 1931 incorporated into the German Academic Exchange Service, *Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst* [DAAD]; since 1941 part of the German

[20] This heritability was regarded as a given, as Weingart et al. (1988) noted.

[21] These assessments stand in contrast to those in which Gottschaldt was viewed as a methodologically sober, politically reserved scholar. Stadler points out that Gottschaldt's works on hereditary psychology from the Nazi era are notably free of overtly Nazi-programmatic formulations (Stadler, 1985), a point also emphasized by Ash: "Both the scholarly and the popular publications of Gottschaldt and his coworkers in this period were remarkably free from proclamations of loyalty to Nazism, or even explicit statements in favor of particular eugenic practices" (Ash, 1998a, p. 347). In terms of content, Gottschaldt advocated an interactionist or dialectical nature-environment model (Stadler, 1985), while consistently emphasizing the need for further research to clarify the interaction of heredity and environment in psychological development (Ash, 1998a). At the same time, however, Ash points out that skepticism regarding the practical feasibility of eugenic programs does not imply a principled rejection of them (Ash, 1998a). Sprung and Sprung note rather uncritically:

> In basic research, fields that were based upon the worldview of National Socialist ideology, such as hereditary-environmental psychology (*Erbe-Umwelt-Psychologie*) or race psychology (*Rassenpsychologie*), also played a role. These nevertheless also served a covering function to some extent for serious psychogenetic research projects. One example of this was Kurt Gottschaldt (1902–1991), who in 1935 was appointed the director of the division of genetic psychology at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Human Genetics and eugenics (*Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik*) in Berlin. There he conducted ontogenetic longitudinal studies on identical and fraternal twins to determine the degree to which psychological characteristics depended on genetic or environmental factors. These empirical studies are still considered some of the classic studies of their kind in the German language. Sprung & Sprung (2001, p. 371)

[22] Given this background, it is unsurprising that, in his 1998 comprehensive monograph on the history of Gestalt psychology in Germany, Mitchell G. Ash noted with respect to Gottschaldt's twin studies, that "Gottschaldt and his associates still came out more decisively in favor of a hereditarian position than was demanded by their own results" (Ash, 1998b, p. 359).

[23] A similar statement can already be found in Japanese in Takagi (1950).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Figure 1
Kurt Gottschaldt With Twins



Note. Reprinted from "Zwillingsforschung" [Twin Studies], by K. Gottschaldt, 1937, *Neues Volk*, *5*(2), p. 12.

Study Foundation for Foreign Students, *Deutsches Studienwerk für Ausländer*; Impekoven, 2013) reveals that Takagi worked on a dissertation in the field of hereditary psychology concerning the hereditary conditionedness of psychological satiation phenomena from fall 1939[24] until the Christmas holidays of 1943, and planned to return to Japan in January 1944 (see Footnote 10). According to Gottschaldt, this work was "methodologically exemplary for experimental hereditary-psychological investigations" (see Footnote 10). For his project, Takagi received the scholarship of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. He was supported in the statistical evaluation of his results by the secretary Annemarie Bischoff (see Footnote 10).

It may be assumed that the proposal to undertake the doctoral project came from Gottschaldt. As early as 1933, he reported "Über Sättigung der sozialen Beziehungen jugendlicher Psychopathen" (On the Satiation of Social Relationships Among Adolescent Psychopaths; Gottschaldt, 1934) at the 13th Congress of the German Society for Psychology. The findings presented were obtained by Gottschaldt through the examination of young people at the

[24] Sometimes 1938 is incorrectly cited as the starting year (Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-094-069-09; Schmuhl, 2008). However, since the correspondence is dated 1939, Takagi cannot have been working at the KWI-A a year earlier.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Rhine Province Children's Institution for the Mentally Abnormal (Gottschaldt, 1934). In the *Handbuch der Erbbiologie des Menschen* (Handbook of Human Genetics) of 1939, Gottschaldt then identifies the following research lacuna:

> There appear to be people who show a relatively low disposition toward hypersatiation alongside others who become very quickly hypersatiated in an action or a life situation. It may be supposed that such differences are to a large extent hereditarily conditioned. Secure results are not yet available. (Gottschaldt, 1939, p. 507)

Takagi's work fills precisely this research gap.

Further information on Takagi's activity at the KWI-A can be gathered from his 1956 overview of current problems in hereditary psychology (Takagi, 1956a). The bibliography contains a reference to a planned but unpublished publication coauthored with Gottschaldt, titled *Die erbliche Grundlage der psychischen Sättigung* (The Hereditary Basis of Psychic Satiation; Takagi, 1956a). This reference is insightful in several respects. On the one hand, it documents that the investigations into psychological satiation conducted during the Berlin years were not conceived as an individual achievement, but rather as part of a jointly designed research project intended to extend beyond the dissertation. This may be precisely what Kurt Gottschaldt was alluding to when he informed the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation on April 8 1943, that Takagi "at [his] suggestion had resolved to extend the work into a broader context than had originally been planned" (see Footnote 10).

On the other hand, Takagi's 1956 overview allows a substantive reconstruction of this project. Takagi outlines a research approach based on a stratified personality structure, whose deeper, endothymic layers underlie directly observable behavior. These layers, however, are not directly accessible but rather can only be approached through their functional manifestations in concrete psychological processes. Accordingly, he emphasizes the methodological difficulties arising from the experimental capture of such deep dimensions, particularly with respect to statistical analysis and the complexity of experimental conditions. In this context, he refers to investigations in which psychological processes were analyzed comparatively within the framework of the twin method, to draw inferences regarding structural and hereditary connections. Among the works he cites here are his joint studies with Gottschaldt on psychological satiation (Takagi, 1956a).

The planned joint publication with Gottschaldt is therefore to be interpreted as a programmatic work. It was intended to demonstrate exemplarily how, by analyzing satiation effects, access could be gained to that foundational psychological stratum which is constitutive for personality development yet eludes classical test procedures. It is thus to be situated within the research agenda of the KWI-A during the National Socialist era. Although Gottschaldt's work was characterized by methodological restraint and an avoidance of overt NS rhetoric, the project was functionally embedded in a research program aimed at the hereditary-biological grounding of mental and psychological properties. The analysis of psychological satiation phenomena was intended not only to contribute to general personality psychology but also to explicitly demonstrate that even dynamic, affectively grounded functional domains of the psyche are amenable to genetic explanation. The work thus corresponded to that first phase of the KWI-A program in which—contrary to environmentalist positions—the heritability of mental and psychological properties was to be empirically established, to ultimately legitimize racial-psychological differentiations from a scientific perspective. The planned publication with Gottschaldt would therefore be understood less as a politically neutral basic research project and more as an epistemic and empirical building block of eugenics-

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

affine research. Through methodological rigor, this research created the appearance of ideological distance while implicitly supplying its political compatibility.

The aforementioned research project on the racial reputation of "Mongoloid" (Schmuhl, 2008, p. 308) peoples can be reconstructed, against the background of institutional, science-policy, and personnel-strategic considerations at the KWI-A in the years 1941/1942. It can be seen as a follow-up project that was hypothetically initiated but ultimately never realized. The annual report of the KWI-A for the period from April 1941 to March 1942 reveals that, during this time, Gottschaldt was actively expanding international cooperative relationships. It is explicitly noted that he had established joint projects "with the Department of Culture of the Japanese Embassy for the purpose of investigations into the racial consciousness of the East Asian person" (see Footnote 3). In parallel, the initiation of "racial-psychological investigations" (see Footnote 3) in collaboration with this same institution is reported. These formulations suggest that a concrete project in the field of racial-psychological investigation of East Asian self- and other-images existed at least in the planning or preparatory phase.

At the same time, internal correspondence from Gottschaldt shows that the conclusion of Takagi's dissertation was already foreseeable toward the end of 1941. In a letter of November 3, 1941, Gottschaldt expresses the hope that Takagi would complete his work by fall 1942. The empirical part of the investigation had already been concluded for some time. The remaining work consisted principally of the theoretical extension and embedding of the results in a broader context. Gottschaldt expressly encouraged Takagi to pursue this, after an extension of his stay in Germany had proved possible (see Footnote 10).

Against this background, the following hypothesis can be formulated: Because Takagi had already received the Humboldt scholarship for approximately 3 years by the end of 1941, while the regular maximum duration of scholarships was 2 to 2.5 years (see Footnote 10), there was a necessity to secure his further funding institutionally. Gottschaldt's approach to the Department of Culture of the Japanese embassy and the planning of a new racial-psychological project could therefore be interpreted as a strategic attempt to legitimize Takagi's continued stay at the KWI-A through a new research project and to underpin it in terms of funding policy. This strategy, however, proved unnecessary. Contrary to expectations, the Humboldt scholarship was approved for the academic year 1941/1942, as documented in a report by Gottschaldt regarding a further extension application dated April 8, 1943, documents (see Footnote 10). This eliminated the necessity of actually implementing a separate project. The project thus remains in the status of a conceptual option that, while visible in the official reports of the KWI-A, was rendered obsolete by the secured continuation of Takagi's doctoral funding.

Research Activities of Kamitake Masaji at the KWI

In 1941, Kamitake came to the University of Berlin as an exchange scholar (Ōizumi, 2003) and assumed extensive teaching responsibilities at the Auslandswissenschaftliche Fakultät (Faculty for Foreign Area Studies), which had commenced teaching on January 8, 1940. In the summer semester of 1943 and in the years 1944 and 1945, he directed a large number of courses in the Japanese language (Brochlos, 2002), thereby contributing to the institutional integration of Japan-related studies within the National Socialist university system. Beyond the strictly academic framework, Kamitake also assumed central organizational functions. In November 1941, he served as a chairman of the Japanischer Akademikerverein (Japanese Academic Association; Haasch, 1996), which underscores his prominent standing within the Japanese scholarly community in Germany. At the German-Japanese academic conference in

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

January 1942, he presented a lecture on questions of Japanese youth education.[25] From 1942 to 1945 he additionally served as a Japanese editor (Schmuhl, 2008).

Kamitake's activity at the KWI-A can be delimited to the period from February 1940 to November 1944 (Kamitake, 1948).[26] References to Kamitake's work at the institute are found in his later monograph *Seishin kinō ni okeru iden to kankyō: Sōseiji hō ni yoru jisshōteki kenkyū* (Heredity and Environment in Psychological Functions: An Empirical Study Using the Twin Method) from 1971 (Kamitake, 1971). There, Kamitake retrospectively reflects on the beginning of his intensive engagement with the nature-nurture problem from a psychological perspective and locates this explicitly in his wartime stay in Germany. He explains that he began to engage seriously with questions of heredity and environment from 1941 onward, while working as an overseas researcher of the German Ministry of Education. Under the supervision of Kurt Gottschaldt, he conducted experimental twin research at both the University of Berlin and at the KWI-A. This self-description documents his active participation in Gottschaldt's hereditary-psychological research.

Postwar Continuities: Japanese Researchers and the Transmission of KWI-A Twin Research

In the postwar period, Gottschaldt achieved a remarkable institutional and scientific continuity, while simultaneously adapting to the altered sociopolitical context. In the second half of 1945, a research post in psychology was established under his direction, intended to support "the combating and management of the currently threatening delinquency among youth" (Hachtmann, 2007, p. 1065). Studies conducted there were facilitated by the fact that from 1945 to 1950 all "polyclinics for psychopathic and difficult-to-educate youth" (Hachtmann, 2007, p. 1064) in the city of Berlin were placed under his supervision. As early as 1946, he was appointed as associate professor of psychology in the Mathematics and Natural Science Faculty at the Humboldt University in Berlin and was soon proposed for a full professorship (Ash, 1999; Stadler, 1985). Gottschaldt became professor in 1947 and was chosen dean of the faculty in 1955 and 1957. He had been a full member of the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften (German Academy of Sciences) since 1953 and an editor of the *Zeitschrift für Psychologie* (Journal for Psychology) since 1954. A year later, he became the founding director of a Research Center for Experimental and Applied Psychology (Ash, 1999). He continued his twin studies, begun before 1945, in the immediate postwar period (Ash, 1998a). In August 1961, Gottschaldt received an appointment offer from the University of Göttingen. In February 1962, he therefore left the German Democratic Republic illegally and relocated to the Federal Republic (Ash, 1998a). In Göttingen, he continued his twin research, conducting a third follow-up study in 1967 (Ash, 1998a).

[25] Archives of the Max Planck Society, I-051-0018-07, "Mitteilungsblätter der Vereinigung zwischenstaatlicher Verbände und Vereinigungen," "Zwischenstaatliche Wochenschau. Deutsch-Ausländischer Veranstaltungskalender," (Film 2 – Nrn. 000-372) ["Newsletters of the Association of Intergovernmental Federations and Associations," "Intergovernmental Weekly Review. German-Foreign Calendar of Events," (Film 2—Nos. 000-372)].

[26] Discrepancies in the research, such as those found in Bieber (2014), who dates the start of his stay to 1941 or 1942 and extends it through 1945, contradict Kamitake's own account.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Figure 2
Takagi Masataka With His Wife Madeleine in Switzerland



Note. Reprinted from "Chaka-san no oshu junen": Takagi Masataka sensei no seitan hyakunen ni yosete ["Mr. Chaka's Ten Years in Europe": Marking the 100th Birthday of Professor Takagi Masataka], by H. Toyota, 2013, *ACKU-news*, *38*, p. 26.

Takagi Masataka's Postwar Activities

At the time of the end of the war in Japan, Takagi was on a mountain tour in Switzerland (Schmuhl, 2008). In early 1947, he and his wife Madeleine (see Figure 2) were at the Salem Clinic in Bern, where they both received medical treatment.[27,28]

It was not until February 1948 that Takagi returned to Japan via the United States (Inui, 1983). In the immediate postwar period, he accepted a professorship in the Department of Natural Sciences at Tōhō University in Tokyo (Schmuhl, 2008). As is apparent from correspondence between Eugen Fischer and Otmar von Verschuer dated September 21, 1951, he

[27] Takagi was there for treatment of a liver condition and to investigate a kidney disease, whereas his wife had been diagnosed with pyelonephritis and cystitis (Japan Center for Asian Historical Records, B18090025200).

[28] Japan Center for Asian Historical Records, B18090025200, 2. Japanese P.O.W. and internees by detention country from September, 1945/(10) Switzerland.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

directed there a Department of Human Genetics (see Footnote 9). From early 1953, Takagi was a professor at Kōbe University. In the same year, he undertook a scientific expedition to the Himalayas.[29] Takagi's life came to an end under unexplained circumstances: Following an expedition to the island of Fatu Hiva in 1962, he has been considered missing (Ishikawa, 1964).

The influence of Gottschaldt on Takagi as a scholar is evident in both his lectures and his publications. As early as 1950, a contribution appeared in the journal *Seibutsu Kagaku* (Biology) under the title "Jinkaku kōzō no seibutsugakuteki kiso: Sōisetsu to shinteki idensei" (The Biological Foundations of Personality Structure: The Layer Theory and Psychic Heredity; Takagi, 1950), which contains extensive references to Gottschaldt, to his twin camps, and to the study on psychological satiation planned with Takagi. In this contribution, Takagi engages with the critique of Gottschaldt's twin research voiced by, among others, Fritz Lenz (1887–1976). This critique is directed against the quantitative indices employed by Gottschaldt to determine relative hereditary shares: It objects to possible measurement inaccuracies and the limited validity of comparisons between identical and fraternal twins. Takagi summarizes these objections, however, rejects the conclusion drawn from them—that Gottschaldt's layer theory and the relative heritability of the lower layers are fundamentally questionable (Takagi, 1950).[30]

At the 15th Congress of the Japanese Psychological Association, Takagi presented a lecture titled *Iden to kankyō no kenkyū (3): Chikaku no mondai toshite no Müller-Lyer sakushi ni tsuite* (Research on Heredity and Environment (3): The Müller-Lyer Illusion as a Problem of Perception). The study was conducted with twins and examined the influence of heredity and environment on the degree of the illusion (Nihon Shinrigakkai, 1951). In 1957, he published, together with Inui Takashi (1911–1994), a monograph on psychology (Inui & Takagi, 1957), and in 1959, with several coauthors, a volume on educational social psychology (Takagi et al., 1959).[31]

Takagi received numerous impulses for some of these works between August 1951 and February 1952 during his extensive European journey (Inui, 1983), which also served to renew and cultivate scholarly contacts. He visited numerous colleagues and former companions from his Berlin period, among them Eugen Fischer, Otmar von Verschuer, Kurt Gottschaldt, and further former associates of the KWI-A (Schmuhl, 2008). The journey reveals that Takagi maintained and actively renewed transnational scholarly networks that facilitated the continued circulation of psychological and twin-research concepts between Germany and Japan after 1945. In particular, he maintained contact with those actors who had played central roles in hereditary and racial-scientific research during the NS era. The continuation of these personal networks was not based solely on institutional or scholarly contacts. Friedhart Klix (1927–2004), who collaborated with Gottschaldt in the postwar period, later described Gottschaldt as a difficult personality in interpersonal relations. According to Klix, Gottschaldt's second wife Yuki (née de Lalande,1909–1963) repeatedly acted as a mediating and balancing figure in such situations (Busse,

[29] Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-086A-052, Fischertreffen—Zum 80. Geburtstag von Professor Eugen Fischer [Fischer Symposium—In Honor of Professor Eugen Fischer's 80th Birthday].

[30] For the critical exchange between Lenz and Gottschaldt, see in particular Gottschaldt (1942), p. 32; Lenz (1942), pp. 362–368.

[31] Takagi was also an avid mountaineer, which took him to exotic places. This was reflected in publications such as "Nepāru fūbutsushi" (Seasonal Poem from Nepal; Takagi, 1954) or lectures such as the one on the psychology of Nepal's ethnic groups at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Japanese Psychological Association (Nihon Shinrigakkai, 1954). The Alpine Club of Kobe University possesses numerous articles on Takagi, a few of which were kindly made available to us (Masuda, 2015; Toyota, 2013, 2014).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

1996).[32,33] Although the available sources do not allow a direct reconstruction of her specific role in the contacts with Takagi and Kamitake, her position within Gottschaldt's personal and academic environment suggests that she may have contributed to the maintenance of interpersonal networks underlying these scholarly relations.

This continuity is also documented by Takagi's correspondence with Otmar von Verschuer. In a letter of March 30, 1954, he not only expresses his joy at the forthcoming 80th birthday of Eugen Fischer but also articulates his strong emotional attachment to Germany and German science. Takagi speaks of a strong "longing for Germany and German science" ("*Sehnsucht nach Deutschland und nach der deutschen Wissenschaft*"; see Footnote 29), which points to a sustained ideational identification with the German research environment. This attitude is most clearly apparent in a contribution Takagi made to a commemorative volume for Eugen Fischer's 85th birthday on June 5, 1959. In it, he describes his time in Germany as the "*schönste Zeit in meinem Leben*" ("most wonderful time of my life") and expresses his deep personal esteem for Fischer (see Footnote 5). Even though Takagi's scholarly collaboration in Berlin was conducted primarily with Gottschaldt, this contribution documents a remarkable admiration for the long-serving director of the KWI-A. It makes clear how profoundly the German research environment shaped Takagi's scholarly orientation, providing a framework that he subsequently transmitted to postwar Japanese psychology.

Existing German-Japanese networks generated new channels for transmitting twin-research methods and concepts to a younger generation of Japanese psychologists. The Japanese psychologist Takuma Taketoshi (1927–2018) noted in a 2016 interview that he had visited Gottschaldt either in 1957 or 1958 and spoken about twin research. He had also been a guest at Gottschaldt's home in Göttingen numerous times after the latter's flight to West Germany (Watanabe et al., 2016). From Takagi's correspondence with Otmar von Verschuer it emerges not only that Takuma was a friend of Takagi's but also that Takuma had examined German twin pairs under von Verschuer in Münster in 1959.[34] By that time, Otmar von Verschuer was a professor of human genetics and anthropology in Münster (Tschacher, 2010). In the 1960s, Takuma then published several times on twin research: "Shussei zengo no shintaiteki shojōken ga chinō no hattatsu ni oyobosu eikyō—ichiransei sōseiji no bunseki o chūshin ni shite" (The Influence of Physical Conditions Before and After Birth on the Development of Intelligence—With a Focus on the Analysis of Monozygotic Twins; Takuma, 1966) and "Sōseiji-hō ni yoru chinō no idensei ni kansuru kenkyū" (A Study on the Heritability of Intelligence Using the Twin Method; Takuma, 1968).

German-Japanese contacts were also cultivated within Japan, as illustrated exemplarily by Takagi's report on the "Symposia on Twin Research and Population Genetics in Man," which took place on September 4, 1956, in Tokyo (Takagi, 1956b). Noteworthy is the composition of the actors involved: The section on twin research was chaired by

[32] Gottschaldt married his first wife, Charlotte Kube, in 1922 (Ebisch, 2012). Kube was the daughter of Herrmann Kube and worked at a bookstore owned by Malik Publishing, which published left-wing and Soviet literature (Ebisch, 2011). She lost their first child and died in 1934. In 1938, Gottschaldt married his second wife, the social worker Yuki de Lalande (Ebisch, 2012). Eugen Fischer served as a marriage witness (State Archives of Berlin, Heiratsregister Berlin-Wilmersdorf Nr. 196/1938). They had a son (born in 1939; Ebisch, 2012).

[33] State Archives of Berlin, Heiratsregister Berlin-Wilmersdorf Nr. 196/1938 [Register of marriages Berlin-Wilmersdorf No. 196/1938].

[34] Archives of the Max Planck Society, III-086A-053, Fischertreffen—Zum 85. Geburtstag von Professor Eugen Fischer [Fischer Symposium—In Honor of Professor Eugen Fischer's 85th Birthday].

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Otmar von Verschuer (Takagi, 1956b), who had already been regarded as one of the world's leading experts on twin research during the war (Weiss, 2006). Hans Nachtsheim (1890–1979), former director of the Abteilung für experimentelle Erbpathologie (Department of Experimental Hereditary Pathology) at the KWI-A (Weingart et al., 1988), was also represented with a contribution (Takagi, 1956b). In 1943, Nachtsheim had participated in low-pressure experiments on epileptic children. He had apparently destroyed records concerning the Verschuer-Mengele project in Auschwitz at the end of the war (Tschacher, 2010). Otmar von Verschuer presented at the symposium results from follow-up studies on twins whom he had examined at the KWI-A during the war. Following Verschuer's lecture, a discussion developed with the Swedish professor Arne Müntzing (1903–1984) and Takagi on the concept of freedom (Takagi, 1956b). Central figures of German hereditary and human-genetic research who had played a decisive role during the NS period, once again appeared as scholarly authorities on the international stage.[35] The symposium illustrates the continued integration of Japanese psychologists into international twin-research networks that had emerged from prewar and wartime German-Japanese scientific exchange.

Kamitake Masaji's Postwar Activities

Kamitake Masaji returned to Japan in 1946 and worked as an assistant professor at the Tokyo University of Education as well as a professor at the Tokyo Higher Normal School. In 1952, he was appointed full professor at the former institution, from which he retired in 1972. In the same year, he took up a position as professor at Shirayuri Women's University, and, in 1977, at Meisei University. He died of pneumonia in 1983 (Ōizumi, 2003).

Similar to Takagi in his contribution to Eugen Fischer's 85th birthday, Kamitake also idealizes his time at the KWI-A. Looking back, he remarks respectfully of Eugen Fischer: "Fischer was an extremely serious scholar, and even when his research results contradicted NS policy, he held firm to his views" (Kamitake, 1948, p. 154). He formulates this as a demarcation from Hans F. K. Günther, whom he labels a "government scholar" (Kamitake, 1948, p. 154). The term refers to that close intertwining of political power and academic career as elaborated in detail by Uwe Hoßfeld in his analysis of Günther's Jena years. Hoßfeld shows that Günther's appointment in 1930 to Jena was not the result of a regular, discipline-internal selection procedure, but was rather decisively driven by the Thuringian Minister of Education, Wilhelm Frick (1877–1946). The establishment of the chair for social anthropology appears there as a deliberate political act in the context of National Socialist power consolidation in Thuringia—as the "first breach" (Hoßfeld, 1999, p. 51) against the established university culture.

Against this background, Kamitake's juxtaposition serves a double function. On the one hand, it serves as a retrospective distancing from too obvious party scholarship of the kind, as embodied by Günther: His appointment, made against the resistance of the faculty and the rectorate, and through the direct intervention of NS politics, is considered by Hoßfeld as a paradigmatic example of ideologically motivated appointment policies (Hoßfeld, 1999). On

[35] The significance of this symposium is further underscored by the fact that the presentations were published in print. The corresponding proceedings include Verschuer's contribution *Erbgebundenheit und Freiheit des Menschen in seiner Entwicklung* (Human Beings' Dependence on Heredity and Freedom in Their Development) and Nachtsheim with *Vergleichende und experimentelle Erbpathologie in ihren Beziehungen zur Humangenetik* (Comparative and Experimental Hereditary Pathology in its Relationship to Human Genetics; Japan Society of Human Genetics, 1957).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

the other hand, Kamitake stylizes Fischer as the archetype of the scholar of integrity, who, according to his account, had maintained methodological independence even in the tension between research and politics. Historiographically, however, this juxtaposition is problematic. Hoßfeld makes clear how closely science and NS politics were institutionally interwoven, especially in Jena. The founding of racial-science chairs was part of a comprehensive restructuring of the university in the spirit of a "National Socialist university" (Hoßfeld, 1999, p. 48). In such a context, the sharp dichotomy between "serious scholar" and "government scholar" appears less as an analytical description and more as a memory-political construction of the postwar period. Kamitake's formulations are a source for the self-exculpatory strategies of former KWI-A associates. They mark a symbolic boundary-drawing within the spectrum of racial-anthropological actors, without questioning the structural complicity of science and the NS state.

Kamitake's later work demonstrates how research methods acquired at the KWI-A were adapted and applied in the postwar Japanese psychological context.[36] Already in the early 1950s, Kamitake repeatedly presented lectures at meetings of the Japanese Psychological Association in which he referred to Gottschaldt's twin method and its significance in investigating psychological functions, such as electrical skin reflexes, learning functions (Nihon Shinrigakkai, 1952) and the dominant hand and leg in twins (Nihon Shinrigakkai, 1954). Together with other scholars, Kamitake conducted educational-psychological twin studies in 1956 (Yōda & Hidano, 1959), which marked the transfer of research methods learned in Berlin to the Japanese scholarly context. Kamitake's 1962 doctoral dissertation at the Tokyo University of Education on psychological heredity using the twin method (Ōizumi, 2003) further underscores the long-term continuity of research traditions transmitted from the KWI-A to postwar Japanese psychology.

The article "Sōseiji-hō ni yoru shinteki iden no kenkyū: Nōha ni okeru iden yōin ni tsuite" (A Study of Mental Heredity Using the Twin Method: On Genetic Factors in Brain Waves; Kamitake, 1963), published in the *Japanese Journal of Psychology* in 1963, reads in places as an implicit defense of Kamitake's former teacher. Drawing on the methodological approaches acquired during his Berlin years, Kamitake employs a quantitative determination of heritability based on the calculation of intrapair differences in identical and fraternal twins (Kamitake, 1963). The mean absolute differences between the two twin groups are set in relation to one another and then interpreted as a measure of the ratio of genetic to environmental influences (Hany, 2001). Although this method has been repeatedly subjected to critical discussion in the literature, Kamitake adopts it deliberately. Notably, he explicitly acknowledges the theoretical weaknesses of the so-called Gottschaldt method, yet does not distance himself from it. Instead, he repeatedly emphasizes its practical utility, in particular the ease of computing the indices. At several points in the 13-page, richly illustrated article, he stresses that, despite theoretical objections, the method remains suitable as a pragmatic instrument for initial orientation. However, he recommends combining several indices (Kamitake, 1963). This repeated justification demonstrates Kamitake's continued commitment to the methodological approaches developed within the KWI-A research environment, and his willingness to defend a procedure established at the KWI-A against sustained criticism—a striking parallel to Takagi.

The long-term significance of the Berlin years finally becomes apparent in the monograph *Seishin kinō ni okeru iden to kankyō: Sōseiji hō ni yoru jisshōteki kenkyū* (Heredity and Environment in Psychological Functions: An Empirical Study Using the Twin Method) from

[36] For a comprehensive list of Kamitake's publications, see Ōizumi (2003).

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

1971 (Kamitake, 1971), which builds on Kamitake's doctoral dissertation. Kamitake remarks on the now-delayed publication:

> In 1962, I was awarded the doctorate of philosophy on the basis of the research results produced up to that point. Until now, however, there has been no possibility of publication, and the manuscript slumbered unused on a bookshelf until now, but thanks to the support of *Seibundō shinkōsha* [the publisher, author's note] it has finally been made accessible to the public. (Kamitake, 1971, p. 1)

The study explicitly understands itself as a continuation of the twin investigations that Kamitake had begun at the KWI-A during the war. Gottschaldt is explicitly named as the one who first motivated Kamitake to conduct twin studies. The twin method appears as the central instrument for determining the relative influence of genetic and environmental factors on psychological functions, with the overarching aim of empirically testing a hypothesis concerning the stratified structure of mental functions. Methodologically, Kamitake unmistakably follows the principles learned in Berlin. Differences between identical twins raised under identical environmental conditions are interpreted as the expression of environmental influences, whereas differences between fraternal twins contain both genetic and environmental components. By comparing the respective difference ratios, inferences are to be drawn concerning the relative strength of hereditary and environmental influences on different functions. Also notable is that in this monograph Kamitake draws on data from German twins investigated by Eugen Fischer and Otmar von Verschuer at the KWI-A, at least insofar as these data are used to determine physical characteristics and zygosity (Kamitake, 1971). This demonstrates that Kamitake had access to empirical material from the KWI-A's orbit in the postwar period and continued to make scientific use of it. In terms of content, the monograph culminates in a result that is almost identical to Gottschaldt's earlier findings. The further one moves from intellectual functions toward mental and physical functions, the stronger genetic determination becomes, and the weaker environmental influence becomes (Kamitake, 1971). This conclusion corresponds to the findings of Gottschaldt's wartime twin studies at the KWI-A as formulated by Kamitake in a research overview on German psychology (Kamitake, 1948). It demonstrates the lasting impact of the theoretical and methodological concepts developed at the KWI-A on Kamitake's scientific thinking.

Conclusion

The present study has reconstructed a German-Japanese transfer of psychological knowledge centered on hereditary psychology and twin research, using the Department of Hereditary Psychology at the KWI-A, led by Kurt Gottschaldt, as the institutional setting in which German-Japanese research networks were established and maintained. By analyzing the Japanese researchers who participated in and transmitted this research program, the study shows how psychological knowledge circulated between Germany and Japan under National Socialism and after 1945. The cases of Takagi and Kamitake demonstrate that Japanese psychologists were active participants in the transmission, reinterpretation, and institutionalization of German psychological knowledge in postwar Japan, not merely recipients.

Furthermore, the case of Gottschaldt and the KWI-A demonstrates that disciplinary identities such as Gestalt psychology did not necessarily prevent participation in National Socialist scientific institutions. On the contrary, it has become clear that Gottschaldt's reputation as a Gestalt psychologist contributed to stabilizing the international reputation of the KWI-A. His appointment to the Department of Hereditary Psychology

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

signified a programmatic reorientation in which questions and methods shaped by Gestalt theory were integrated into a research program oriented toward human genetics and racial hygiene. The twin method functioned therein as an empirical instrument that defined psychological properties within the framework of a quantifying heredity-environment dichotomy. Psychological phenomena were increasingly interpreted through quantitative models that emphasized the relative contributions of hereditary and environmental factors, thereby paradigmatically consolidating the hereditary-psychological orientation of the institute.

The KWI-A was revealed as a nodal point with a dense network of institutional, science-political, and transnational relationships. The work of the Japanese visiting scholars Takagi Masataka and Kamitake Masaji exemplifies how scholarly mobility was embedded in this structure. Their work at the KWI-A bore the imprint of the methodological standards and theoretical premises established there. This formative influence remained recognizable in their later publications in Japan. Therefore, a central finding of this study is the remarkable continuity of German-Japanese research networks in hereditary psychology and twin research across the political rupture of 1945. Japanese psychologists who had trained in the KWI-A environment continued to adapt, disseminate, and institutionalize methodological and theoretical approaches acquired in Berlin for decades after the war. Particularly in the field of twin research, clear continuities can be identified—for instance, in the assumption of differentially strong genetic determination of psychological functions.

The analysis thus relativizes simple narratives of rupture or caesura. The political transformation of 1945 did not automatically produce an epistemic discontinuity. Rather, twin research proved adaptable to new scientific and institutional contexts without its fundamental theoretical assumptions being substantially revised. Personnel networks, methodological routines, and guiding conceptual distinctions survived the system change and enabled the continuation of German-Japanese scholarly relations in the postwar period.

The study contributes to a differentiated historical assessment of psychology in the 20th century. It demonstrates that scholarly authority, methodological innovation, and political integration do not represent contradictions, but can mutually stabilize one another. The case of Gottschaldt, Takagi, and Kamitake illustrates how researchers situated within politically charged scientific systems could nevertheless become central reference points in international and postwar research networks. The entanglement of Gestalt psychology, hereditary psychology, and twin research within the institutional framework of the KWI-A highlights the necessity of always considering epistemological structures and political contexts together.

References

Ash, M. G. (1985a). Ein Institut und eine Zeitschrift: Zur Geschichte des Berliner Psychologischen Instituts und der Zeitschrift “Psychologische Forschung” vor und nach 1933 [An institute and a journal: On the history of the Berlin psychological institute and the journal psychological research before and after 1933]. In C. F. Graumann (Ed.), *Psychologie im Nationalsozialismus* (pp. 113–137). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70064-4_5

Ash, M. G. (1985b). Psychologie in Deutschland bis 1933 [Psychology in Germany until 1933]. In H. E. Lück, R. Miller, & W. Rechtien (Eds.), *Geschichte der Psychologie: Ein Handbuch in Schlüsselbegriffen* (pp. 17–22). Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Ash, M. G. (1998a). From “positive eugenics” to behavioral genetics: Psychological twin research under Nazism and since. *Paedagogica Historica*, *34*(Suppl. 1), 335–358. https://doi.org/10.1080/00309230.1998.11434892

Ash, M. G. (1998b). *Gestalt psychology in German culture 1890–1967: Holism and the quest for objectivity*. Cambridge University Press.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Ash, M. G. (1999). Kurt Gottschaldt and psychological research in Nazi and socialist Germany. In K. Macrakis & D. Hoffmann (Eds.), *Science under socialism: East Germany in comparative perspective* (pp. 286–304). Harvard University Press.

Ash, M. G. (2002). Psychologie [Psychology]. In F.-R. Hausmann (Ed.), *Die Rolle der Geisteswissenschaften im Dritten Reich 1933–1945* (pp. 229–264). Oldenbourg. https://doi.org/10.1524/9783486594492.229

Ash, M. G. (2003). Die erbpsychologische Abteilung am Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik (1935–1945) [Department of hereditary psychology at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for anthropology, human heredity, and eugenics (1935–1945)]. In L. Sprung & W. Schönpflug (Eds.), *Zur Geschichte der Psychologie in Berlin* (2nd ed., pp. 401–428). Peter Lang.

Bieber, H.-J. (2014). *SS und Samurai: Deutsch-japanische Kulturbeziehungen 1933–1945* [The German SS and the samurai: German-Japanese cultural relations 1933–1945]. Iudicium.

Brochlos, A. (2002). Das Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen an der Berliner Universität und die japanbezogene Lehre [The seminar for Oriental languages at the university of Berlin and Japan-related teaching]. In G. Krebs (Ed.), *Japan und Preußen* (pp. 145–162). Iudicium.

Busse, S. (1996). *Psychologie im Real-Sozialismus: DDR-Psychologen im Interview* [Psychology under real socialism: Interviews with GDR Psychologists]. Centaurus.

Ebisch, S. (2011). *Was kam nach der Gestaltpsychologie? Zur Forschungsgeschichte des Berliner Psychologischen Instituts 1935–1962* [What came after Gestalt psychology? A history of research at the Berlin Psychological Institute, 1935–1962]. [Doctoral dissertation, Berlin University].

Ebisch, S. (2012). Kurt Gottschaldt—Eine Biographie mit ungewöhnlichen Verwerfungen [Kurt Gottschaldt—A biography with unusual twists]. In T. Herrmann & W. Zeidler (Eds.), *Psychologen in autoritären Systemen* (pp. 106–127). Peter Lang.

Fischer, E. (1930). Versuch einer Genanalyse des Menschen: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der anthropologischen Systemrassen [An attempt at genetic analysis of humans: With special reference to anthropological racial groups]. *Zeitschrift Für Induktive Abstammungs- Und Vererbungslehre*, *54*(1), 127–234. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01848933

Fischer, E., & Gottschaldt, K. (1942). Der Schriftenreihe "Erbpsychologie" zum Geleit [A foreword to the "hereditary psychology" series]. In K. Gottschaldt (Ed.), *Die Methodik der Persönlichkeitsforschung in der Erbpsychologie* (pp. V–VI). Johann Ambrosius Barth.

Geuter, U. (1989). Psychologie im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland [Psychology in nazi Germany]. In K. Fallend, B. Handlbauer, & W. Kienreich (Eds.), *Der Einmarsch in die Psyche: Psychoanalyse, Psychologie und Psychiatrie im Nationalsozialismus und die Folgen* (pp. 125–145). Junius.

Geuter, U. (1994). The whole and the community: Scientific and political reasoning in the holistic psychology of felix krueger. In M. Renneberg & M. Walker (Eds.), *Science, technology, and national socialism* (pp. 197–223). Cambridge University Press.

Gottschaldt, K. (1926). Über den Einfluß der Erfahrung auf die Wahrnehmung von Figuren [On the influence of experience on the perception of figures]. *Psychologische Forschung*, *8*(1), 261–317. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02411523

Gottschaldt, K. (1934). Über Sättigung der sozialen Beziehungen jugendlicher Psychopathen [On the satiation of social relationships among adolescent psychopaths]. In O. Klemm (Ed.), *Bericht über den XIII. Kongreß der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Psychologie in Leipzig vom 16.–19. Oktober 1933* (pp. 135–137). Gustav Fischer.

Gottschaldt, K. (1937). Zwillingsforschung [Twin studies]. *Neues Volk*, *5*(2), 9–13.

Gottschaldt, K. (1939). Erbpsychologie der Elementarfunktionen der Begabung [Hereditary psychology of the basic functions of talent]. In G. Just (Ed.), *Handbuch der Erbbiologie des Menschen: Fünfter Band; Erbbiologie und Erbpathologie nervöser und psychischer Zustände und Funktionen* (pp. 445–537). Julius Springer.

Gottschaldt, K. (1942). Zur Problematik der Psychologischen Erbforschung: Eine Erwiderung auf den gleichnamigen Beitrag von Fritz Lenz [On the problems of psychological heredity research:

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

A reply to the article of the same name by Fritz Lenz]. *Archiv Für Rassen- Und Gesellschaftsbiologie Einschließlich Rassen- Und Gesellschaftshygiene*, *36*(1), 27–56.

Haasch, G. (1996). *Die Deutsch-Japanischen Gesellschaften von 1888 bis 1996* [The German-Japanese Societies from 1888 to 1996]. Edition Colloquium.

Hachtmann, R. (2007). *Wissenschaftsmanagement im "Dritten Reich": Geschichte der Generalverwaltung der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft (Bd. 2)* [Science management in the "Third Reich": History of the general administration of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society (Vol. 2)]. Wallstein.

Hany, E. A. (2001). Kurt Gottschaldts Zwillingsstudie (1937–1967): Ein 30-jähriger Längsschnitt wird fortgesetzt [Kurt Gottschaldt's twin study (1937–1967): A 30-year longitudinal study continues]. *Psychologie Und Geschichte*, *9*(1–2), 54–90. https://doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.637

Hoppe, F. (1931). Untersuchungen zur Handlungs- und Affektpsychologie: Erfolg und Misserfolg [Studies on action and affect psychology: Success and failure]. *Psychologische Forschung*, *14*, 1–62. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00403870

Hoßfeld, U. (1999). Die Jenaer Jahre des "Rasse-Günther" von 1930 bis 1935: Zur Gründung des Lehrstuhls für Sozialanthropologie an der Universität Jena [The Jena years of the "Race-Günther" from 1930 to 1935: On the establishment of the chair of social anthropology at the university of Jena]. *Medizinhistorisches Journal*, *34*(1), 47–103.

Impekoven, H. (2013). *Die Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung und das Ausländerstudium in Deutschland 1925–1945: Von der "geräuschlosen Propaganda" zur Ausbildung der "geistigen Wehr" des "Neuen Europa"* [The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and foreign student studies in Germany, 1925–1945: From "silent propaganda" to the cultivation of the "intellectual defence" of "New Europe"]. V & R Unipress.

Inui, T. (1983). Minka "shinri bukai" no ayumi [The development of the "Psychology section" of the Minka]. *Shinri Kagaku*, *7*(1), 23–38.

Inui, T., & Takagi, M. (1957). *Shinrigaku* [Psychology]. Aoki Shoten.

Ishikawa, E. (1964). Fatuhiva shima (furansu ryō porineshia marukesasu guntō) no jinkō to shūraku: Fatsuhiba shima shakai no haikei [Population and settlements of Fatu Hiva island (French Polynesia, Marquesas Archipelago): The social background of Fatu Hiva island]. *Minzokugaku Kenkyū*, *29*(1), 32–57.

Japan Society of Human Genetics. (1957). *Symposia on twin research and population genetics in man* (Supplement to Japanese Journal of Human Genetics, Vol. 2).

Kamitake, M. (1941). Jidō shūdan ni okeru tōsotsu katei no jōken hasseiteki kenkyū (I): Tōsotsu shinri ni kansuru kenkyū (Dai ni bu) [Conditional genetic study of leadership processes in children's groups (I): Studies on the psychology of leadership (Part II)]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *16*(5–6), 352–380.

Kamitake, M. (1942a). Jidō shūdan ni okeru tōsotsu katei no jōken hasseiteki kenkyū (II): Tōsotsu shinri ni kansuru kenkyū (Dai ni bu) [Conditional genetic study of leadership processes in children's groups (II): Studies on the psychology of leadership (Part II)]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *17*(1), 93–132.

Kamitake, M. (1942b). Jidō shūdan ni okeru tōsotsu katei no jōken hasseiteki kenkyū (III): Tōsotsu shinri ni kansuru kenkyū (Dai ni bu) [Conditional genetic study of leadership processes in children's groups (III): Studies on the psychology of leadership (Part II)]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *17*(2), 295–320.

Kamitake, M. (1948). Saikin doitsu shinri gakkai no jōkyō [The current state of German psychology]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *19*(2), 153–157.

Kamitake, M. (1963). Sōseiji-hō ni yoru shinteki iden no kenkyū: Nōha ni okeru iden yōin ni tsuite [A study of mental heredity using the twin method: On genetic factors in brain waves]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *33*(6), 305–317.

Kamitake, M. (1971). *Seishin kinō ni okeru iden to kankyō: Sōseiji hō ni yoru jisshōteki kenkyū* [Heredity and environment in psychological functions: An empirical study using the twin method]. Seibundō Shinkōsha.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Lenz, F. (1942). Zur Problematik der psychologischen Erbforschung [On the problematic aspects of psychological heredity research]. *Archiv Für Rassen- Und Gesellschaftsbiologie Einschließlich Rassen- Und Gesellschaftshygiene*, *35*(5), 347–368.

Lück, H. E., Miller, R., & Rechtien, W. (Eds.). (1984). Einleitung [Introduction]. In *Geschichte der Psychologie: Ein Handbuch in Schlüsselbegriffen* (pp. 10–16). Urban & Schwarzenberg.

Massin, B. (2003). Rasse und Vererbung als Beruf: Die Hauptforschungsrichtungen am Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Anthropologie, menschliche Erblehre und Eugenik im Nationalsozialismus [Race and heredity as a profession: The main research directions at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for anthropology, human heredity, and eugenics under national socialism]. In H.-W. Schmuhl (Ed.), *Rassenforschung an Kaiser-Wilhelm-Instituten vor und nach 1933* (pp. 190–244). Wallstein.

Mastroianni, G. R. (2006). Kurt Gottschaldt's ambiguous relationship with national socialism. *History of Psychology*, *9*(1), 38–54. https://doi.org/10.1037/1093-4510.9.1.38

Masuda, M. (2015). Takagi Masataka: Ichi shinrigakusha no kiseki [Takagi Masataka: The life path of a psychologist]. *Yama to Hito*, *19*.

Nihon Shinrigakkai. (1951). Nihon shinrigakkai dai-jūgo-kai taikai kōen shōroku [Abstracts of the presentations of the 15th annual meeting of the Japanese Psychological Association]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *21*(3–4), 88–122.

Nihon Shinrigakkai. (1952). Nihon shinrigakkai dai-jūroku-kai taikai kōen shōroku [Abstracts of the presentations of the 16th annual meeting of the Japanese Psychological Association]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *22*(4), 245–281.

Nihon Shinrigakkai. (1954). Nihon shinrigakkai dai-jūhachi-kai taikai kōen shōroku [Abstracts of the presentations of the 18th annual meeting of the Japanese Psychological Association]. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*, *25*(1), 1–78.

Ōizumi, H. (2003). *Nihon shinrigakusha jiten* [Dictionary of Japanese psychologists]. Kuresu.

Prinz, W. (1985). Ganzheits- und Gestaltpsychologie und Nationalsozialismus [Holistic and gestalt psychology and national socialism]. In C. F. Graumann (Ed.), *Psychologie im Nationalsozialismus* (pp. 89–111). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70064-4_4

Roelcke, V. (2012). Medizin im Nationalsozialismus—Radikale Manifestation latenter Potentiale moderner Gesellschaften? Historische Kenntnisse, aktuelle Implikationen [Medicine under national socialism—radical manifestation of latent potentials of modern societies? Historical knowledge, current implications]. In H. Fangerau & I. Polianski (Eds.), *Medizin im Spiegel ihrer Geschichte, Theorie und Ethik: Schlüsselthemen* (pp. 35–50). Franz Steiner. https://doi.org/10.25162/9783515105613

Scheerer, E. (1985). Organische Weltanschauung und Ganzheitspsychologie [Organic worldview and holistic psychology]. In C. F. Graumann (Ed.), *Psychologie im Nationalsozialismus* (pp. 15–53). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70064-4_2

Schmuhl, H.-W. (2003). Rasse, Rassenforschung, Rassenpolitik: Annäherungen an das Thema [Race, racial research, racial policy: Approaches to the subject]. In H.-W. Schmuhl (Ed.), *Rassenforschung an Kaiser-Wilhelm-Instituten vor und nach 1933* (pp. 7–37). Wallstein.

Schmuhl, H.-W. (2008). *The Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for anthropology, human heredity, and eugenics, 1927–1945: Crossing boundaries*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6600-9

Sprung, L., & Sprung, H. (2001). History of modern psychology in Germany in 19th- and 20th-century thought and society. *International Journal of Psychology*, *36*(6), 364–376. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590143000199

Stadler, M. (1985). Das Schicksal der nichtemigrierten Gestaltpsychologen im Nationalsozialismus [The fate of non-emigrated gestalt psychologists under national socialism]. In C. F. Graumann (Ed.), *Psychologie im Nationalsozialismus* (pp. 139–164). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-70064-4_6

Sternek, K. (2013). Erfolg und Misserfolg: Zur Aktualität und psychotherapeutischen Bedeutung der Untersuchungen von Ferdinand Hoppe [Success and failure: On the relevance and psychotherapeutic significance of Ferdinand Hoppe's studies]. *Phänomenal*, *5*(1–2), 53–60.

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.

Takagi, M. (1950). Jinkaku kōzō no seibutsugakuteki kiso: Sōisetsu to shinteki idensei [The biological foundations of personality structure: The layer theory and psychic heredity]. *Seibutsu Kagaku*, *2*(4), 157–165.

Takagi, M. (1954). Nepāru fūbutsushi [Seasonal poem from Nepal]. *Iden*, *8*(1), 15–24.

Takagi, M. (1956a). Iden shinrigaku no shomondai [Fundamental problems of psychological heredity research]. *Japanese Journal of Human Genetics*, *1*(1), 1–10.

Takagi, M. (1956b). Kokusai jinrui idengaku shinpojūmu [International symposium on human genetics]. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, *4*(2), Article 48.

Takagi, M., Tsuru, H., Tanaka, K., & Matsuyama, Y. (1959). *Kyōiku shakai shinrigaku: Nihonjin no keisei wo meguru mondai* [Educational social psychology: Questions on the formation of the Japanese people]. Asakura shoten.

Takasuna, M., & Sato, T. (2017). Felix Krueger and Ganzheitspsychologie: History of psychology in Japan before and during World War II. In R. Diriwächter & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Striving for the whole: Creating theoretical syntheses* (pp. 47–58). Transaction. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315130354-4

Takuma, T. (1966). Shussei zengo no shintaiteki shojōken ga chinō no hattatsu ni oyobosu eikyō—ichiransei sōseiji no bunseki o chūshin ni shite [The influence of physical conditions before and after birth on the development of intelligence—With a focus on the analysis of monozygotic twins]. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, *37*(5), 257–267.

Takuma, T. (1968). Sōseiji-hō ni yoru chinō no idensei ni kansuru kenkyū [A study on the heritability of intelligence using the twin method]. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, *16*(4), 237–254.

Toyota, H. (2013). "Chaka-san no ōshū jūnen": Takagi Masataka sensei no seitan hyakunen ni yosete ["Mr. Chaka's ten years in Europe": Marking the 100th birthday of Professor Takagi Masataka]. *ACKU-news*, *38*, 18–30.

Toyota, H. (2014). Chaka-san no arupusu tōhan: S. wettāhorun hokuseiheki [Mr Chaka's Alps climb: The north-west face of the Wetterhorn]. *ACKU-news*, *39*, 26–41.

Tschacher, W. (2010). Täterschaft, Reintegration und Vergangenheitspolitik in Deutschland (1920–1969): Der Rassengenetiker Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer [Perpetrators, reintegration and the politics of the past in Germany (1920–1969): The racial geneticist otmar freiherr von verschuer]. In R. Kühl, T. Ohnhäuser, & G. Schäfer (Eds.), *Verfolger und Verfolgte: "Bilder" ärztlichen Handelns im Nationalsozialismus* (pp. 39–66). Lit.

Watanabe, Y., Oshio, S., Kitamura, H., & Takuma, T. (2016). Pāsonariti no somosomo-ron o shiyō [Let us discuss the fundamental question of personality]. *Sainabi Bukkuretto*, *9*, 1–17.

Weinert, F. E., Geppert, U., Dörfert, J., & Viek, P. (1994). Aufgaben, Ergebnisse und Probleme der Zwillingsforschung: Dargestellt am Beispiel der Gottschaldtschen Längsschnittstudie [The objectives, findings and challenges of twin studies: Illustrated using the example of Gottschaldt's longitudinal study]. *Zeitschrift Für Pädagogik*, *40*(2), 265–288.

Weingart, P., Kroll, J., & Bayertz, K. (1988). *Rasse, Blut und Gene: Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland* [Race, blood and genes: A history of eugenics and racial hygiene in Germany]. Suhrkamp.

Weiss, S. F. (2006). Human genetics and politics as mutually beneficial resources: The case of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for anthropology, human heredity and eugenics during the third reich. *Journal of the History of Biology*, *39*(1), 41–88. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10739-005-6532-7

Yōda, A., & Hidano, T. (1959). Development of educational psychology in Japan. *Psychologia*, *2*(3), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.1959.137

Received April 28, 2026
Revision received June 24, 2026
Accepted July 2, 2026 ■

All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved.