



Hans J. Eysenck: Introduction to centennial special issue

Philip J. Corr

City University London, Department of Psychology, London EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 13 July 2016

Accepted 16 July 2016

Keywords:

Hans Eysenck

History

Academic and professional psychology

The year 2016 marks the centenary of the birth of Hans Juergen Eysenck (4 March 1916–4 September 1997). This special issue devoted to his work and life is very timely and its publication in *Personality and Individual Differences* (PAID) most appropriate as this was the influential journal he founded in 1983 – the year of his *de jure*, but certainly not *de facto*, retirement from the Institute of Psychiatry, London. The collection of papers attests to the great, some might say bewildering, diversity of Hans's contributions to scientific and professional psychology, as well as the reactions they provoked.

In addition to discussion of academic and professional matters, readers should find of interest, and sometimes amusement, personal reflections on Hans. They provide a truly fascinating insight into his work, life and *him*. Especially, they show the important and positive influences he had on so many people and the very favourable impressions he left – but, as also documented, some reflections and impressions are not so favourable. The diversity of views are appropriate to include in this special issue: anything less, and certainly one that regressed to hagiography, simply would not do justice to Hans's varied life and work. But the special issue cannot be the place to chronicle all of the facts and opinions, which in any case have recently been surveyed in a new biography, *Hans Eysenck: A Contradictory Psychology* (Corr, 2016a), summarised elsewhere (Corr, 2016b,c,d) and detailed in Roderick Buchanan's (2010) aptly titled biography, *Playing with Fire*.

Contributors to the special issue gave generously of their time, and all are owed a debt of gratitude. I am especially grateful to Hans's wife, Sybil, and his eldest son, Michael, both of whom are notable psychologists in their own right, for graciously sharing their own perspectives. It is appropriate that Sybil's paper opens the special issue, and Michael's closes it. Hans would no doubt have been amused, but perhaps not terribly surprised, to learn that the greatest reluctance to contribute, and then to honour commitment once made, came only from psychoanalytically-leaning psychologists and those who would be the

first to criticise his views on the efficacy of psychotherapy (Eysenck, 1952, 1965) – perhaps there is something to Freudian projection after all! Lastly, it would be shamefully remiss not to acknowledge the production staff at Elsevier for their support and constant hard work, and Tony Vernon, Editor-in-Chief of PAID, for guiding the special issue to fruition. Such vital behind-the-scenes work is rarely seen and all too often under-appreciated.

There are 34 papers in the special issue, and although they span a wide range of topics and opinions, they fall into thematic groups that allow the convenient structuring of this Introduction.

1. Papers in special issue

Sybil Eysenck opens the special issue with reflections on her husband as a scientist, psychologist and family man. She shows the breadth of Hans's interests and the ways in which he was often misunderstood. Their family routine and holiday times on the Isle of Wight provide an intimate portrait – it was on these 'holidays' that Hans had the opportunity to compose his many papers and books, and even here the very positive influence of Hans, and also Sybil, were felt. To illustrate this point, it is worth repeating a memory from a student, Wendy Thomson (cited in Corr, 2016a, p. 296/7), who meet them there:

"Well I had just finished a dissertation for Southampton University, where I had taken statistical methods as part of the curriculum, so I had a lot of data and was playing around with it, which led me to finding a significant correlation between stress and the personality dimension psychoticism. As it happened the very next day Hans & Sybil had been invited to give a talk on psychoticism at the local asylum, Whitecroft hospital on the Isle of Wight, to be held in the chapel. I was very shy and had to write my question down so that I could read it. I didn't know where to sit and decided to sit at the front – that way I wouldn't see faces turning to look at me which might make me tongue tied. Hans and Sybil took questions following the talk and I couldn't pluck up courage to put my hand up. Hans then said "one more question!" I shot up my hand and he pointed at me. "Is there a correlation between psychoticism and stress", I asked? "Why?" he said. Because I've found one I replied. "See me after", Hans replied. The party of consultants left the chapel and were going to have sherry before lunch. They made their way along the long corridor in procession and I followed a safe distance behind. As they turned to mount the stairs Hans turned and said "where's that girl?" Someone pointed me out and he beckoned me forward "what's this" he said. I told him and he said "write it up". I wrote it

up in a practical no nonsense way interpreting what conclusions I'd drawn from the results. And sent it to him – 3 weeks later I was asked to correct the proofs! It was published internationally. That was the beginning of my relationship with Sybil and Hans. They are the most wonderful people oozing integrity, wisdom, kindness, extremely generous, and modest. I can't thank them enough."

The next paper, by the Polish psychologist Jan Strelau, discusses Hans's positive influence on international psychology, especially in the old Soviet Bloc countries where intellectual life was subordinated to the greater good of "The People". To illustrate these times, Strelau discusses his own scientific and professional development, focussed on his temperament theory and the translation of Pavlovian concepts to Western personality psychology which were pioneered by Hans and advanced by others, notably Jeffrey Gray. Strelau's paper provides a valuable historical perspective of scientific progress and the obstacles that are sometimes placed in its way by politics – something to which Hans was sensitised from his days in Nazi Germany as a youth. Strelau also discusses the inception of ISSID, and in the next paper this theme is taken-up by Robert ('Bob') Stelmack who, in addition, recounts his first encounter with Hans in the 1976 as well as the establishment of PAID. It seems that Robert Stelmack, Marvin Zuckerman and Jan Strelau suggested the idea for the ISSID organization a short time after Hans established the journal in the early 1980s – clearly, there was something in the air that indicated the time was ripe for such a scientific Society.

Next, Patrick Rabbitt takes us on a journey of the early days of the Experimental Psychology Society (EPS) in the UK, Hans's involvement in it, and his decision to resign. The 'tipping point' came with the rejection of his nominee and colleague, Monte Shapiro, to Society membership. As Rabbitt says: "Shapiro was warmly liked and respected, but as a clinician and administrator rather than a researcher. His interests were markedly different from those of members of the tiny proto-EPS. On strict interpretation of EPS rules, he would still be unelectable for this reason." This paper is important historically because it showcases the distinction between experimental and correlational psychology, and how Hans chose to pursue this own distinctive line of research which failed to respect the arbitrary demarcation between different fields of psychological enquiry. Although, it might be claimed that Hans could have remained in the EPS and fought his correlational corner, he seemed to sense that this would never work and it would be for the best if he went his own way. Rabbitt's paper is important too for illustrating the tensions of scientific, professional and personal natures that came – or, at least, were seen – to characterise Hans's style of engagement with the rest of the scientific community.

Hans's agenda was much broader than, what he perceived to be, the narrow remit of the EPS, which today remains firmly in the experimental-cognitive psychology camp. Hans wanted to combine experimental and applied (especially clinical) psychology, all within an individual differences framework, and he felt that this simply was not possible (or permitted) within the EPS – differential psychologists still do not see the EPS as a natural place for their scientific interests and for this reason parallel scientific societies have been established, for example the British Society for the Psychology of Individual Differences (BSPID).

Hans could have continued his EPS membership and involvement, and it would be an interesting *Gedankenexperiment* to speculate on the possible outcome of his acquiescence. Whatever this might have been, we can be fairly sure that his differential, correlational, psychology, and those of his colleagues and students, would have been heavily criticised, especially for their relevance on factor analysis, and this may have served only to stifle the entire field. In any event, Hans was never one to play other people's games; he wanted to create his own and go his own way in his own style.

In the next paper, one of Hans's biographers (Buchanan, 2010), Roderick Buchanan, takes us on an historical journey of Hans's life and

places his achievements in an appropriate social and historical context. This is nothing sort of a grand tour of twentieth century psychology and Hans's unique place in it. Although highly talented and ambitious, Buchanan argues that his achievements and eminence were, to a large extent, down to fate, and the circumstances and opportunities that marked his early career are unlikely to be seen again in British or international psychology – something of a rather grand trait x situation/environment interaction.

As so much of Hans's scientific interests revolved around personality – this was the hub of the spokes of almost all of his research – it is pleasing that a number of distinguished psychologists have written on his remarkable accomplishments in this area. As noted by Jeffrey Gray in his 1997 *Nature* obituary: "Undoubtedly, the construction of a scientific theory of personality was Eysenck's most important and enduring achievement." If for nothing else, Hans has a place assured in the history books.

The first personality themed paper is by William ('Bill') Revelle who provides a masterful survey of Hans's work – whom he compares favourably with Gordon Allport and Raymond B. Cattell – starting with his 1944 factor analysis of a medical checklist which laid the foundations for the gigantic dimensions of Extraversion and Neuroticism. Revelle's chapter leaves us in little doubt of Hans's lasting contribution in this important area of psychology. Next, Greg Boyle and colleagues develop this theme by comparing Hans's personality work with that of Cattell's. They provide an insightful comparison of these two giants of personality and intelligence research, illuminating their similarities and differences. Next, Marvin Zuckerman and Joseph Glicksohn discuss Hans's descriptive model with the narrower construct of sensation seeking which has been shown to have important life-long consequences. Their paper demonstrates how scientific developments take place by reasoned argument and evidence, and good-natured disagreement borne of mutual respect. It also shows the subtle differences between various notions of arousal and arousability in the biological basis of personality, and how narrow trait models (e.g., sensation-seeking) can be accommodated with broad-band dimensional ones of the type favoured by Hans.

Attesting to the lasting scientific value of Hans's descriptive PEN (Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism) model of personality, in an impressively large and comprehensive study based on data from 33 countries, Stephen Bowden and colleagues examine empirically its factor structure and gender invariance. Their results confirm a remarkably robust dimensional model of personality which is largely invariant to language, culture and economic development. It is, thus, little wonder why the international community views Hans's descriptive model as the best of its kind.

In the spirit of constructive and, in this case very well informed criticism, and moving on to the details of causal processes, Gerald Matthews provides a critique of Hans's general approach to personality traits, arguing that it is burdened by its failure to take proper account of important individual differences in performance and cognitive processes. In particular, Matthews points to concerns regarding the handling of the complexity of processing, its attribution of performance effects to variation in cortical arousal, and its neglect of the adaptive significance of traits. It is true that Hans had little time for, or interest in, the types of processes of interest to cognitive psychologists, and as we can see in Patrick Rabbitt's paper this was a major point of departure from the 'experimental psychology', increasingly cognitive, orientation that was the focus of Oxford and Cambridge, and now many of the leading psychology departments in the world.

Despite these concerns, which need to be seen in the context of the ongoing scientific development of any general approach, an international perspective on Hans's continuing influence is provided by Carmen Flores-Mendoza and colleagues who discuss the late arrival of a scientific personality psychology in Latin American. Hans's work led the charge, and as in his earlier days the 'enemy' to be defeated was psychoanalysis. The impetus for this Latin American work came from Hans's various visits to the region, which are still remembered for the

clarity and influence of his lectures, and his support of international colleagues. Perhaps well fitting for Latin America, Carmen Flores-Mendoza and colleagues label Hans a “revolutionary” — in his own words, a ‘rebel with a cause’.

Turning to biological aspects of Hans’s personality model, Rachel Mitchell and Veena Kumari provide a systematic review of functional and structural magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) studies conducted over the last 15 years. From their impressive synthesis of the literature, they conclude that the traits Hans hypothesized 70 years ago relate meaningfully to the structure and functioning of various cortical and limbic brain regions. To be revolutionary, one must also be a “visionary”, and this is how Mitchell and Kumari characterise Hans. But, as history reminds us, few revolutionary and visionary leaders are correct in all respects, and few enter the history books with their work and character entirely unblemished — this is only to be expected of those who attempt, and achieve, so much.

The devil-in-the-detail of any causal theory of personality is the stock-in-trade of the experimentalist. As readers of this journal will know, and as discussed below, Hans was always interested in the applications of his basic personality theory. But, he needed bridging constructs and the most important of these came in the form of conditioning principles and procedures. The intricate details of the link between general conditioning and personality, on the one hand, and social/clinical behaviour, on the other, are described in detail by Ian Evans and Nick Wilson. They properly note that the concept of conditionability was one of the cornerstones of Hans’s grand theory and that this concept allowed Hans to move seamlessly from biology, to basic learning, to personality, and to clinical syndromes, including psychopathy and criminal conduct — and, indeed, to much else (e.g., reactions to media depictions of violence and sex; see David Nias’s paper in this special issue). Although this conditioning literature is far from moribund, it has been largely superseded by EEG and MRI techniques. However, as Evans and Wilson point out, theoretical models, especially ones of social/clinical application, lag some distance behind the sophistication of brain imaging technology. In Hans’s science, theory was all important. He (e.g., Eysenck, 1997, p. 161) was fond of reminding people of Kurt Lewin’s famous phrase: “There is nothing as practical as a good theory.”

The two applied areas of special interest to Hans were clinical psychology and criminality, and the next set of papers cover these topics.

In an authoritative, first-hand, account, Stanley (‘Jack’) Rachman surveys Hans’s contribution to the professional establishment of clinical psychology and his development of specific theories regarding behaviour therapy. Although some people have challenged Hans’s role in the professional genesis of clinical psychology in Britain, few are better placed than Rachman to provide an accurate account (see also Corr, 2016a). Rachman’s paper leaves us in little doubt that Hans’s legacy is assured in this specific respect.

Next, Gordon Claridge provides a comprehensive account of Hans’s contribution to our understanding of personality and psychological disorders. He shows how notions and classifications of mental illness have changed over the years, increasingly towards a dimensional perspective — something which Hans was influential in advocating from the very beginning. The field of personality and psychopathology surely owes a debt of gratitude to him for his life-long adherence and development of this crucial approach. This individual differences perspective (IDP) theme is taken-up by Kieron O’Connor who provides a truly insightful account of the bases and implications of assuming a fully dimensional model of mental illness. As O’Connor notes, adopting such a dimensional perspective allows the specification of process and context. Importantly, the IDP is person-centred and, thus, can chart intra-personal and inter-personal processes, perhaps even revealing idiosyncratic triggers and trajectories to a problem through person × situation interactions. O’Connor’s paper attests to the truly fundamental nature of Eysenck’s dimensional thinking and its continuing potential for shaping the personality-psychopathology field way into the future.

The other specific application of Hans’s general approach was aimed at understanding, as he saw it, the causes and cures of criminal behaviour. One of his close colleagues and co-author of *The Causes and Cures of Criminality* (1989), Gisli Gudjonsson, provides a forensic account of Hans’s conception of the personality disposition to criminality concluding that, whilst in general form it is on the right lines, it falls down on specific predictions. Perhaps given the complexity of the nature of crime this is only to be expected; however, this is surely a sombre reminder to those of us who favour general theories because they may be insufficient to account for the causal specificity, and often context-dependent, nature of social behaviour.

Continuing the theme of criminal behaviour, the next paper by Lee Ellis offers a sociologist’s tribute to Hans, showing how his general approach was inspirational and shed new light on the psychological nature of criminality — if the specificities of the theory did not always stand-up well to empirical test, the general framework inspired and informed. Ellis outlines how he applied evolutionary-based ideas to understanding the nature of criminality, namely life-course history and *r/K selection* which found publication space, and resulting intellectual oxygen, in Hans’s PAID journal. Once more attesting to his capacity for positive influence, Ellis says: “As that Kansas farm kid, I will be forever grateful to Hans for being a friend and a mentor.”

Another major intellectual column supporting Hans’s grand scientific edifice was the concept of intelligence. His first paper (Eysenck, 1939) and last book (Eysenck, 1998) were on this topic and throughout his life he continued to believe that this was the most established and one of the most important concepts in the whole of the social sciences — perhaps *the* most important. With recent impressive work revealing the genetic basis of intelligence and how it relates to so many life outcomes, there is now good reason for accepting the validity of his position (Hagenaars et al., 2016; see also Corr, 2016c). But before we run away with the idea that the scientific importance Hans’s attached to intelligence has obvious implications, consider his final words in his final (1998) book:

“...*moral* behaviour is most important; only slightly less important is the quality of being cultured, courteous and chivalrous; intelligence only comes in third. In other words, what is needed is intelligence in the service of morality and decency. Would anyone disagree? (Eysenck’s italics).

Linda Gottfredson opens this section on intelligence with *tour de force* that charts Hans’s research interests and shows how recent genetic, especially molecular, and neuroimaging research continues to add empirical weight to his views on the widespread importance of general intelligence. As a sociologist, Gottfredson summaries the standard model which dominated the social sciences around the middle and later parts of the twentieth century. This model viewed intelligence as a cultural artefact, invented by the socially advantaged elite to justify their wealth and status. Careful sociological work, including the association between intelligence and career status/success, led Gottfredson to move increasingly towards Hans’s biological perspective.

Paul Barrett, who was a close research associate of Hans, gives an insightful, first-hand, account of the Biosignals laboratory at the Institute of Psychiatry — this was tasked with trying to uncover the biological basis of intelligence. Barrett provides a splendid overview of Hans’s general biological approach, entailing: brain evoked potential and sensory nerve conduction correlates of psychometric IQ; timed/speeded performance (chronometrics); and Inspection Time. Despite initial promise, Barrett notes that there were too many cases showing the opposite of expected effects (e.g., some low IQ individuals possessed much shorter Inspection Times than high IQ individuals) which undermined the claim to substantive consistency of data. Barrett concludes that, although not much of lasting value issued from this specific programme of work, it made a major contribution by highlighting the challenges confronting this research field. Others to follow can better build on these foundations.

Many of Hans's writings, especially those with a more popular flavour, were on social issues, and one of particular interest was the psychology of politics and the statistical structure of social attitudes – 'socio-political genetics', as Gary Lewis calls it in his paper. Lewis outlines Hans's early work (Eysenck, 1944, 1947, 1950, 1954/1999) on the structure of political attitudes and he details the use of the classical twin design to examine whether genetic factors contribute to individual differences in social and political attitudes (e.g., Eaves & Eysenck, 1974). Lewis shows that not only did Hans's ideas stand the test of empirical time, but they continue to stimulate younger researchers, who are now witnessing the fruits of a fully-fledged genetics approach. Hans envisioned this outcome as early as the 1940s – a true visionary!

Over his many years, Hans had his scientific fingers in many pies, some of a distinctly exotic nature. As someone who wrote several books with him, David Nias summarises Hans's adventures in paranormal, graphology and astrology, as well as his ground breaking work on the effects of sex and violence on television (Eysenck & Nias, 1978). Nias argues that in the case of pornographic films, and violence as shown on television (and in the media generally), Hans's interpretation of the early evidence as indicating harmful and anti-social effects, especially for predisposed and vulnerable individuals, has been confirmed. This is an important psychological finding in today's media-intensive world where depictions of extreme forms of violence and sex are little more than a mouse click away.

However, as Nias points out, in the case of paranormal psychology and astrology, things have been much less positive. In the case of parapsychology, replicability is absent and robust effects difficult to find and confirm. With astrology, only the Mars effect required explanation, but subsequent research has shown this to be a probable artefact. Whilst still on fringe areas, the one topic absent in this special issue is hypnosis, something which interested Hans from a very young age – he was recognised as an expert in the 1940s. Hans even went as far to say in his (1997) autobiography that if he had his time again he would focus on this very topic.

In the next paper, Adrian Furnham discusses Hans's long-time interest in occupational/organisational, and well as consumer, psychology, much of which revolved around the work/consumer associations with his gigantic three personality dimensions: Extraversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism. Much of this research went unpublished due to its commercially sensitive nature, although it did afford Hans the opportunity to learn some amusing consumer psychology folklore (e.g., the symbolic significance of mints with a hole!).

As discussed at some length by Corr (2016a), Hans's interest in consumer psychology sparked his research into the personality bases of smoking, which led to another controversial era. This aspect of Hans's scientific life is taken-up by Shulamith Kreitler who makes the case that his contribution to health psychology is major and underrated, noting that he was involved in this literature long before it became a mainstream topic of psychological investigation. Kreitler summarises the developmental course of Hans's interest in medicine and health from "early groping attempts" focused on studying, on the one hand, psychological correlates of physical disorders and, on the other hand, the personality correlates of psychological ones.

Hans increasingly focused on the personality associations with the occurrence and course of disease, mainly cancer and coronary heart disease (see Eysenck, 1994a; film of a lecture he gave in Edinburgh). Despite repeated and severe criticism of this work (e.g., Amelang, 1991, 1997; Amelang, Schmidt-Rathjens, & Matthews, 1996; Fox, 1991; Kiecolt-Glaser & Chee, 1991; Lee, 1991; Pelosi & Appleby, 1992, 1993; Schuler & Fox, 1991; Van der Ploeg, 1991; van der Ploeg & Vetter, 1993; also see Michael Eysenck's contribution to this special issue), Kreitler is correct to make the general point that Hans should be acknowledged for highlighting the role of psychology and especially personality in physical disorders; and he should be recognised for suggesting several major conceptual and methodological paradigms

for the study of the impact of psychological, genetic, and life-style factors on physical health. In spite of the perceived inadequacies of this work, Hans's positive and potentially long-lasting contribution to health psychology were similarly noted in the most recent biography (Corr, 2016a).

As discussed in a stimulating paper by Nils Myszowski and colleagues, something not so well known about Hans was his interest in art and aesthetics. Indeed, his PhD was on the topic of experimental aesthetics, which was also the topic of his first wife's, Margaret Davies, Masters thesis – according to Hans, as another coincidence, his step-father (Max Glass) had been Professor of aesthetics at the Sorbonne. Hans maintained this interest throughout his life and, in fact, he had a large impact on the field. As I argue in my 2016 biography, there was something of the artist about how Hans went about his scientific life – he was a *performer* and he loved it. This aspect of his professional life is under-appreciated – it partly explains his fame and especially the reactions he readily elicited.

Yet another major theme for Hans was education. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, he was dismayed at the social experiment to dismantle the selective Grammar School system in Britain in preference for a "fairer" Comprehensive School one. He co-authored several 'Black papers' to highlight the issues at hand, and even asked the Iron Lady herself, Margaret Thatcher, who was Education Secretary at the time, why no research was being conducted into the effects of this radical change in government policy. She informed him that the Civil Service had been asked to look into this matter but had done nothing. In contrast, Hans always had faith that appropriate empirical, preferably experimental, methods could be brought to bear on educational issues. In the spirit of this attitude, Rock Braithwaite and Philip Corr present a meta-analysis of (largely) quasi and pure experimental interventions in university students designed to enhance self-efficacy/confidence. Despite Hans's labelling of this statistical technique as "meta-silliness" (Eysenck, 1994b), Braithwaite and Corr's results attest to the dismal state of the higher education experimental psychological research literature (e.g., poorly designed and executed studies seem to have the largest effect size!). These authors agree with Hans that empirically-derived instructional techniques to raise attainment and to provide appropriate education according to student's abilities, personality and preference are much needed, but largely absent. As Hans noted, dogma over data seems often to be the lesson of the day in the world of lower and higher education.

2. Contention and controversy

Hans was so often a magnet for attention, much of it critical, largely because he was willing to crash the ring-fences protecting certain social fields from 'insensitive' scientific intrusion. Education was one field, social class differences another. Admirers of Hans's general scientific approach have taken heart from his example and braved the storm of protest from their own intrusions into, what others decree to be, specially protected social issues.

2.1. Personality and social issues

In the next paper, which demonstrates the current-day application of personality psychology – as well as further proof of its capacity to ruffle feathers – Adam Perkins summarises the thesis of his 2015 book, *The Welfare Trait: How State Benefits Affect Personality*, which has evoked a storm of protest in the cybersphere and print media, and which led to the postponement of a scheduled lecture (February 2016) at the London School of Economics (LSE) because of "negative social media activity" and the threat of protest. To their credit, LSE rescheduled the lecture, which took place in June 2016. As can be seen in the video of the lecture (LSE, 2016), the event went off without incident, but not invective.

Perkins's thesis is that a too generous welfare state encourages those with pre-existing personality (i.e., low conscientiousness and low

agreeableness) to develop, what he calls, an ‘employment-resistant personality’, which they then pass on to their children by similarly low conscientious and disagreeable behaviour towards them (e.g., not engaging in sufficiently varied and rich verbal behaviour). Perkins also argues that more children are born to employment-resistant parents which makes the problem of ‘personality mis-development’ all the worse. The evidential bases of these conclusions have been challenged, and it would be fair to say that much better data are needed to confirm this theory (for a review of the book, see Corr, 2016e). In the spirit of scientific enquiry, the debate initiated by Perkins’s thesis should point the way to the collection of data sufficient to answer the critical points in a less contentious manner. Such data are coming in fast; for example, since the publication of the book and his contribution to this special issue, data are now available to show that higher levels of conscientiousness, as measured at age 16–17, predict levels of later-life employment (Egan, Daly, Delaney, Boyce, & Wood, 2016). The authors report that controlling for intelligence, gender and socioeconomic status, the less (– 1 SD) conscientious had a 75% higher predicted unemployment rate than the highly (+ 1 SD) conscientious.

In a similar way to Hans, Perkins has taken the path less travelled and by so doing has invoked the wrath of critics. As I have pointed elsewhere (Corr, 2016d), sometimes we *really* must engage in such debate, albeit sometimes through gritted teeth.

In the next paper in this special issue, by another young psychologist, Ben Walker, controversial psychological research is discussed in terms of the implications for the careers of newly-fledged academics. Using as evidence the case of Adam Perkins, and with the wisdom of someone much older, Walker makes the point that, rather than perceiving Hans’s career as having successes and failures, a better way to view things is to acknowledge his willingness to push boundaries and explore new frontiers – inevitably some outcomes will be more positive than others. We would all probably endorse this sentiment, but things are not straightforward for young academics who are routinely encouraged, often berated, to ‘play it safe’ rather than taking aim at a much bigger, and much more risky, target. This is the dilemma facing academics, and it is one raised by consideration of Hans’s contrarian attitude which was instrumental in enabling him to make such significant contributions, especially during his younger days (Corr, 2016d).

2.2. Intelligence and societal issues

Consideration of the relevance of personality to social issues of the kind explored by Perkins is relatively tame compared to the IQ and race debate, which is discussed in the next two papers.

Andrew Colman has been a long-time opponent of Hans’s view on race and IQ, although he is in no way inimical to him – indeed, he sees much to admire in Hans as shown by the impression left by their first meeting which he discusses in his paper. Colman argues that the evidence is now clear that there are no genetics-based IQ differences between ‘the races’. As he states, although research has supported the claim that IQ is heritable, it is now evident that race differences in IQ could be determined entirely by environmental factors. Colman supports his conclusion by drawing on findings from different approaches, including racial admixture studies, racial crossing studies involving interracial parenting or adoption, and the study of molecular genetics.

The fact that at this time it does not seem possible to prove conclusively that such differences are not, partly, genetic in nature allows Richard Lynn in the next paper to make a strong case for the hereditarian position. Lynn notes that not only are there IQ differences between national and racial groups, but these can be linked to differences in socio-economic outcomes which he argues are probably genetic in nature. As he states: “We gave measured and estimated IQs for all nations in the world and reported a correlation of .73 for the association between national IQs and per capita income and proposed that the principal causal path was from genetically based IQs to economic development.” As Colman’s and Lynn’s papers show, this

debate rumbles on, with little evidence of a meeting of minds – no one doubts though that this is not an important psychological issue of considerable societal importance.

3. Integrity and interpretation of family background

The next two papers address an issue of a contentious nature which any adequate coverage of Hans’s work and life, and especially reactions to them, would be negligent not to include in a special issue. This matter is presented to clarify the historical record.

Some people accuse Hans of deliberately and purposefully concealing his Jewish ancestry and, then, only later revealing it when it served the purpose of justifying his views on race and IQ. This aspect of Hans’s life has come to be used as a device to question the integrity of the reasons he gave for leaving Germany in 1934, at the age of 18 years, and of *him*. Discussion of this matter is included in this special issue, not only because Andrew Colman and Caren Frosch report important new historical information, but because the reader deserves to be properly informed in order to make-up their own mind.

Colman and Frosch make a major contribution to the historical record by reporting a remarkable piece of detective work: they reveal the true identity of Hans’s maternal grandmother, who was to die in a concentration camp. Previous accounts of her identity were either (it must be conceded) evasive (Eysenck, 1990, 1997) or incorrect (Buchanan, 2010 – despite best efforts in an otherwise historically meticulously researched biography). In addition to their contribution to the historical record, for which they provide documentary evidence (including clarification of Hans’s father’s non-Jewish ancestry), Colman and Frosch give their reasons for believing that Hans knew from an early age that he was partly Jewish and that, for reasons that submit only to speculation, he concealed this fact until much later in life.

One thing is clear though. Those who suspect Hans of this devious ploy are the most vocal opponents of his views on race-IQ (e.g., Rose, 2010) – more generally, as noted by Corr (2016a, p. 317/8), opponents of Hans are usually the very same people who oppose his ideas. As such, this discussion does need to be seen in the broader context of repeated attempts to “shaft Eysenck” (Buchanan, 2010, p. 21; see Corr, 2016a, p. 313; Corr, 2016b). This fact makes it difficult to untangle impugnation of Hans’s character from the motivation of those attempting it – although this should not be taken to lessen the evidential weight of their scientific arguments which must stand on their own merits. With this caution in mind, it may be possible to come to some conclusions.

Hans was brought up in Berlin by his maternal grandmother, who we know now was Helena Wiener. His mother and father were in the entertainment business and seemed to have little time – both literally and figuratively – for their only son. Given the fact that Hans’s grandmother, as Colman and Frosch show, was married in a Jewish ceremony, but later seems to have converted to Christianity, it may well be doubted that Hans’s was entirely unaware of this fact – after all he was very intelligent and inquisitive, and during the early 1930s the ‘Jewish Questions’ was all around. Hans’s son, Michael, is also of the view that his father knew full well that he was partly Jewish and that he had concealed this from his first wife, Margaret, who if she had known could have tried to do something to rescue Hans’s grandmother from the terrible fate that awaited her. However, it is quite possible though that Hans’s grandmother failed to disclose this fact in order to protect her young charge – the most authoritative biography of Hitler (Volker, 2016) provides reasons why this might have been thought a very sensible strategy. Whatever the case, it seems now unlikely we shall ever know.

Although perhaps convenient to think otherwise, there is a case to be made that Hans was not fully unaware of his part-Jewish background. Although Roderick Buchanan in his reply to Colman and Frosch’s paper takes issue with some of their conclusions, he too takes the view that:

“It is difficult to take Eysenck’s account of his exodus *entirely* at face value because it was *always* accompanied by half-truths. Once he became a famously combative ‘IQ warrior’, it suited him to emphasize the political over the personal. It suited him to portray his fated trek as a little more heroic, and a little more innocent, than it probably was.”

Well, we may ask, why is this matter important, and is it *really* anyone’s business? In careful consideration of this matter in the preparation of my 2016 biography of Hans, I came to the conclusion that, in this regard, we have no firm basis on which to impugn his character. First, we simply cannot know the true reasons for his words and actions, and too much speculation is invited. Secondly, and perhaps importantly, Hans’s surely had the right to define himself. Even if he knew he had part-Jewish origins, the facts are: (1) his maternal grandmother professed to being a Catholic (although she came from a Jewish family and was married in a Jewish wedding ceremony); (2) his mother was Catholic (although she was remarried to a Jew, Max Glass), and his father had no Jewish background whatsoever (as now confirmed by Colman and Frosch, this special issue). Quite reasonably, Hans could assume that he was not ‘Jewish’ according to his, and many other people’s standards – although not, of course, according to Nazi dogma and Rabbinic law. Therefore, *according to his own standards*, it is entirely reasonable for Hans to declare that he was not Jewish – not even half Jewish. However, one thing that does not tally with this view is the fact that Hans would often refer to others (e.g., psychologists and psychiatrists at the Institute of Psychiatry) as “Jewish” when he must have known fully well that there were not anymore practising in a religious sense (some were committed communists, e.g., Monte Shapiro; see Corr, 2016b). Even if he knew of his part-Jewish background, he might had good reason not to make an issue of it when he arrived in Britain which still had not escaped anti-Semitism, as Cyril Burt’s remarks testify (see Buchanan’s reply to Colman and Frosch, this special issue).

Finally, and for me the most important point, as highlighted by the subtitle of my biography of him, *A Contradictory Psychology*, Hans demanded the right to exercise freedom to define his own identity. After the trauma of his youth in Nazi Germany – and it *must* have affected him – and then finding out the terrible fate of his maternal grandmother, of whom he was very fond, is it not presumptuous of us to question his motives? Instead, we might want to showcase his principled defiance of Hitler, which he actioned with his feet in 1934. Given what we know about Hans’s temperament (Corr, 2016a, p. 42), it is not surprising that he, simply, wanted to put all of this terrible business behind him and to get on with his life. If this were the case, then he would not be alone. For example, Robert Maxwell, who helped Hans establish his scientific journals (Corr, 2016a, p. 294), came from an unambiguously Orthodox Jewish background but, for many years, this was vociferously denied, but in later life he came to acknowledge this fact and to cherish the state of Israel where he was finally laid to rest (Bower, 1995, p. 33). Maybe we must agree with L. P. Hartley who famously observed: “The past is a foreign country; they do things differently there” – we might add, for reasons, we cannot know.

I shall leave this matter with the view of Shulamith Kreitler, an Israeli Jew who knew Hans and is sensitive to the issues at hand:

“On the basis of the information I have concerning Hans Eysenck’s family background it seems clear that Eysenck’s family belonged to the mass of Jewish people who lived in Germany at large and Berlin specifically prior to World War II. As such it was only natural for him to be an assimilated Jewish person who neither cared too much about his Jewish background nor devoted too much thought to its meaning, if at all. By not considering his Jewishness he was not concealing it actively, but rather supporting actively his status as an assimilated European. It is possible that when he came over to Britain he would have encountered some difficulty or delay in getting full rights if he had declared his Jewishness. So, he did not

declare it, as incidentally many others did not, at that time and again later after the war. This does not however mean that Eysenck repudiated Judaism. On one occasion (at the end of the eighties, when we met in London) he said that for some inexplicable reason he thinks that it is of importance to maintain the existence of the Jewish people. This attitude may have played some role in Eysenck’s decision to identify himself as Jewish after his retirement. According to my experience, this behaviour on the part of Eysenck was neither surprising nor exceptional. A great many Jewish people in Europe who for many years withheld the information about their origin from family and friends decided to divulge the secret when they reached an advanced age or retired. At that point it would not have harmed them in any way and would resolve the discomfort many felt at concealing their identity. So in this respect too Hans Eysenck predated his generation.” (Personal communication; 7th February 2016.)

4. Final chapters

As the penultimate chapter in this special issue, Richard Stevens stands back and takes a high level critique of Hans’s general scientific approach pointing to limitations which, he contends, are addressed by his own by ‘trimodal theory’ – this calls attention to the need to consider three levels of analysis: biological, symbolic and reflexive. Stevens argues that the latter two have emergent properties which make them epistemologically distinct from the biological level. In one sense, it is difficult to disagree with this proposal; however, Hans’s point always was: can it be operationalised and measured? This ‘empirical’ requirement was central to his whole scientific mission – and it was a ‘mission’ to rescue psychology from this “ugly sister” of data-retardant philosophising. The reader may consider it doubtful whether Hans should be castigated for not operationalising symbolic and reflexive processing, and capturing their epistemological ‘emergence’ in the laboratory – after all, no one else has! He preferred to focus on the tractable, not the transcendental, and this is in the spirit of the empirical science he advocated.

Despite these reservations of the adequacy of Hans’s approach, Stevens is appreciative of his work; as he notes: “When I was a student, the work of Eysenck stood out in the otherwise often stodgy world of fragmented and often trivial non-theory based experimental studies. I appreciated his hard-headed rational approach, particularly at a time of rampant behaviourism when psychologists so curiously ignored the significance of biology. And subsequently when my own interests moved in very different directions, I maintained my respect for him.”

We end the special issue with a paper by Hans’s son, Michael Eysenck, who provides an authoritative overview which places his father’s work in proper perspective. He notes the zeniths and nadirs of Hans’s scientific endeavours, and ends by lamenting that he had a “preference for a lawyer-like approach to research rather than a more scientific and objective one”. He concludes by noting that his father was too “cocksure” of things and did not entertain a sufficient “doubt of certitude” required of a scientist – something which Patrick Rabbitt’s also notes in his contribution to this special issue and something which I found repeated when interviewing people for my 2016 biography (some people even thought he had a “God complex”). However, perspective is all: although we would like to harbour the pleasing image of the humble scientist, as Richard Passingham notes in the case of great scientists: “They know they’re right – whatever the data says” (quoted in Corr, 2016a, p. 332).

5. Reputation and legacy

Whatever one thinks of Hans’s scientific work, or of *him* – these two aspects formed the portmanteau *Eysenck* – historical facts are evident enough. The approbation of one’s scientific colleagues is a good

indicator of influence and academic esteem. In this regard and as measured against any standard, Hans was extraordinary. In the Britain, he was a long way ahead of other psychologists. As documented by Haggbloom et al.'s (2002) analysis of eminence in 20th century international psychology: Eysenck was the 3rd most cited psychologist (after Freud and Piaget – no other British psychologist even appears in the top 25); a survey of international psychologists placed him 24th (again no other British psychologist appeared on this top 25 list); and by a ranking of publications, awards, distinctions, etc. he was ranked 13th – the next British psychologist appearing in this list, Donald Broadbent, was way down this list at 54th.

In the USA, Hans was recognised and celebrated with the award of distinctions: from the *American Psychological Association* (APA), the Presidential Citation for Outstanding Contributions to Psychology (1993), the Clinical Division Centennial Award for Lifelong Contributions to Clinical Psychology (1996), and the Distinguished Scientist Award (1988); and from the *American Psychological Society* (APS) its highest honour, the William James Fellow Award (1994). Closer to home, the *International Society for the Study of Individual Differences* (ISSID), which he founded, gave him the Distinguished Contribution Award in 1991.

However, on his adopted home ground, Hans was denied official honours; as Jeffrey Gray said in his 1997 obituary in *Nature*, “he (scandalously) never received”. He was not elected to a Fellowship of the Royal Society (FRS) – although few psychologists were until recently – which according to Patrick Rabbitt (Corr, 2016a, p. 291) “he deserved for his best work”; and, quite remarkably, he was not even elected to a relatively humble Fellowship of the British Psychological Society (BPS) – he was blackballed too often despite the best attempts of Jeffrey Gray.

Despite these official snubs, Hans is fondly remembered by the scientific colleagues he inspired, less so by those who opposed his work, but much appreciated by the general public for making psychology so accessible, relevant and vital to their concerns. This is a fine legacy to leave, and one for which he will be forever remembered.

References

- Amelang, M. (1991). Tales from Crvenka and Heidelberg: What about the empirical basis? *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 233–236.
- Amelang, M. (1997). Using personality variables to predict cancer and heart disease. *European Journal of Personality*, 11, 319–342.
- Amelang, M., Schmidt-Rathjens, C., & Matthews, G. (1996). Personality, cancer and coronary heart disease: Further evidence on a controversial issue. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 1, 191–205.
- Bower, T. (1995). *Maxwell: The final verdict*. London: Harper Collins.
- Buchanan, R. D. (2010). *Playing with fire: The controversial career of Hans J. Eysenck*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corr, P. J. (2016a). *Hans Eysenck: A contradictory psychology*. London: Palgrave.
- Corr, P. J. (2016b). The centenary of a maverick: Philip J. Corr on the life and work of Hans J. Eysenck. *The Psychologist*, 29(3), 324–238.
- Corr, P. J. (2016c). Has history proved Eysenck right about genes and IQ? *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/has-history-proved-eynsenck-right-about-genes-and-iq-54716>
- Corr, P. J. (2016d). *Sometimes you need a pariah*. Times Higher Education, 31 March.
- Corr, P. J. (2016e). Review of ‘The Welfare Trait: How state benefits affect personality’. *Personality and Individual Differences*, in press.
- Eaves, L. J., & Eysenck, H. J. (1974). Genetics and the development of social attitudes. *Nature*, 249, 288–289.
- Egan, M., Daly, M., Delaney, L., Boyce, C., & Wood, A. (2016). Pre-labor market conscientiousness predicts lower lifetime unemployment. *Working paper*.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1939). Primary mental abilities. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 9, 270–275.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1944). General social attitudes. *British Journal of Sociology*, 1, 56–66.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1947). Social attitude and social class. *International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research*, 1, 49–84.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1950). General social attitudes. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 207–227.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1952). The effects of psychotherapy: An evaluation. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 16, 319–324.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1954/1999). *The psychology of politics*. London: Routledge (Reissued, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers).
- Eysenck, H. J. (1965). The effects of psychotherapy. *Journal of Psychology*, 1, 97–118.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1990). *Rebel with a cause: The autobiography of Hans Eysenck*. London: W.H. Allen.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1994a). Film of lecture by Hans Eysenck at University of Edinburgh, “Psychosocial factors in the causation and prevention of cancer and coronary heart disease” held in December 1994. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K9py57EGCV8&feature=youtu.be>
- Eysenck, H. J. (1994b). Meta-analysis and its problems. *British Medical Journal*, 309, 789–792.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1997). *Rebel with a cause: The autobiography of Hans Eysenck* (2nd ed.). Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1998). *Intelligence: A new look*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Gudjonsson, G. H. (1989). *The causes and cures of criminality*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Nias, D. K. B. (1978). *Sex, violence and the media*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.
- Fox, B. H. (1991). Quandaries created by unlikely numbers in some of Grossarth-Maticek's studies. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 242–247.
- Gray, J. A. (1997). Obituary: Hans Jurgen Eysenck (1916–1997). *Nature*, 389, 793.
- Hagenaars, S. P., et al. (2016). Shared genetic aetiology between cognitive function and physical and mental health in UK Biobank ($N = 112\,151$) and 24 GWAS consortia. *Molecular Psychiatry* (advance online publication 26 January).
- Haggbloom, S. J., Warnick, R., Warnick, J. E., Jones, V. K., Yarbrough, G. L., Russell, T. M., ... Monte, E. (2002). The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century. *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 139–152.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Chee, M. A. (1991). Personality, stress, and cancer: A re-examination. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 249–251.
- Lee, P. N. (1991). Personality and disease: A call for replication. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 251–253.
- London School of Economics (2016). Film of lecture by Adam Perkins, “The welfare trait: How state benefits affect personality”, held on 29th June. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/newsAndMedia/videoAndAudio/channels/publicLecturesAndEvents/player.aspx?id=3543>
- Pelosi, A. J., & Appleby, L. (1992). Psychological influences on cancer and ischaemic heart disease. *British Medical Journal*, 304, 1295–1298.
- Pelosi, A. J., & Appleby, L. (1993). Personality and fatal diseases. *British Medical Journal*, 306, 1666–1667.
- Perkins, A. (2015). *The welfare trait: How state benefits affect personality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rose, S. (2010). Hans Eysenck's controversial career. Review of Buchanan, R. D. (2010). ‘Playing with fire: The controversial career of Hans J. Eysenck’ (Oxford: Oxford University Press). *The Lancet*, 376, 407–408.
- Schuler, G., & Fox, B. H. (1991). Questions about Grossarth-Maticek's procedures and results. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 257–261.
- Van der Ploeg, H. M. (1991). What a wonderful world it would be: A reanalysis of some of the work of Grossarth-Maticek. *Psychological Inquiry*, 2, 280–285.
- Van der Ploeg, H., & Vetter, H. (1993). Two for the price of one: The empirical basis of the Grossarth-Maticek interviews. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4, 65–69.
- Volker, U. (2016). *Hitler: A biography (volume 1, ascent 1889–1939)*. London: The Bodley Head (Translated by Jeffrey Chase of 2013 German language edition).