

Dear President Byrne,

You have sent a very large number of letters internationally, compensate for the work of Professor Eysenck and Grossarth as "insecure" and the publishers who refer to the claim to distance themselves from the authorizations and even withhold them. I would like to refer to some aspects:

- 1) Neither you nor your two informants Pelosi and Marks have any information, or you do not disclose information about the actual work of Eysenck and Grossarth. So under your "criticism" you do not mention the methodological approach or the international advantages of our method (prospective intervention studies with data transfer to controlling institutions).
- 2) You, along with David Marks, to whom you are referring, are spreading untrue discriminatory allegations, slander and crimes without the slightest consideration of the great scientific benefits that the Grossarth-Eysenck research program includes.
- 3) The arguments that Pelosi and Marks receive and pass on are not only wrong, but also completely absurd. So I, the little German, should write texts for the big Eysenck that fit into the worldview of Eysenck, or should Eysenck write his own texts and report them to Grossarth.
- 4) The entire argument borders on racist claims in that Grossarth is portrayed as a small, uneducated German.
- 5) Grossarth is currently examining how far Professor Eysenck was blackmailed during his lifetime under the threat of an act of extermination against him. If he does not distance himself from Grossarth and portrays him as a cheater and a liar, after Eysenck has officially committed himself to Grossarth.
- 6) At the moment it seems that Marks and Pelosi discriminated professor Eysenck and that they reached the President of Kings College to persuade him to start an international activity against the long-deceased Eysenck and Grossarth.
- 7) Due to absolute ignorance of Grossarth's work, Byrne prevents the publication of key findings, e.g. the motivation for radicalism, fascism or the work on fever, pneumonia and cancer.

*Grossarth calls on the international judiciary to:*

- a) The withdrawal of extensive correspondence in which claims are made without actual knowledge of the research program.
- b) Provision of the international letters by the President of Kings College to Grossarth for reply.
- c) Completion of an indictment for the German judicial authorities, e.g. Public prosecutor.

R. Grossarth-Maticek: Preliminary research on the discriminatory expression and activity of Pelosi, Marks and Byrne. Against the scientific existence of Grossarth-Maticek and Eysenck.

Since the President of Kings College does not comment on multiple calls to justify his activities to justify his activities against Eysenck and Grossarth, Grossarth's analysis cannot yet be complete. Here are some facts:

1) Professor Eysenck has repeatedly said the following to Grossarth and an important witness who has financed our projects through the university society for years:

Dr. Pelosi blackmailed Professor Eysenck. He should publicly distance himself from Grossarth's work and describe him as a liar and deceiver who also lied to him. If he doesn't do so in the foreseeable future, the name Eysenck will be destroyed forever. He, Pelosi, researched Grossarth over many years. But it was difficult to destroy him without the help of Eysenck. So he tried Dr. To motivate cousins, but this turned out to be weak in character and still stands by Grossarth.

Eysenck: In what interest are you working so intensively against Grossarth?

Pelosi: Behind me is a large organization that you are not up to.

For example, Kings College, a powerful representative of British and Jewish psychology. All of them don't want the little German Grossarth to dominate the scientific world stage. The little German psychopath must not do that. Grossarth did not take Eysenck's warning seriously and did not believe that Pelosi was right.

Ms. G.S. responds. Professor Eysenck, Ms. G.S. met the European Court in the hotel and told her the same story. Ms. S. asked Eysenck for advice on whether it makes sense to finance the final evaluation of the study. Professor Eysenck advised Ms. Sturm on the grounds that there was no chance for us against the activities of the organization. Mainly because, according to Pelosi, it will turn to the public with daily discrimination. Only Grossarth did not take this warning seriously because he considered it unrealistic. Following the warning from Pelosi, his threat has surprisingly proven to be true, both with regard to the activities of psychologist David Marks and the activities of the President of Kings College London, who has sent endless letters all over the world without informing Grossarth in the least.

1) You don't mention the main advantages of the program, which has a leading position worldwide.

A: Research method: Through the application and development of prospective intervention studies, in combination with data delivery to controlling institutions, a flawless method for proving causal relationships has been developed.

It is a combination of prospective studies with experimental interventions and data transfer to controlling institutions before the results of the intervention studies are available.

B: Multicausal causes of researched phenomena e.g. if bronchial carcinoma develops. The Eysenck-Grossarth research program was able to show that the interaction of several factors in specific

constellations increases the ability to predict many times over in comparison to monocausal approaches.

C: The multicausal prevention of certain diseases developed by Grossarth and Eysenck is many times more potent than monocausal prevention.

Summary: The President of KingsCollege, as well as Dr. Pelosie and Dr. Marx makes no mention of the Eysenck-Grossarth research program and focus on international discrimination and develop the proposal to withdraw all work from the two authors.

These preventive activities relate not only to the public discrimination of the already published scientific articles, in which the advantages of the Eysenck-Grossarth research program have already been described, but they also actively prevent the publication of further research. (e.g. fever, pneumonia and prevention; radicalism, fascism)

The following text presents untrue claims and insults that have no connection with scientific criticism. In addition, the most important aspects of the research program are kept secret:

1) Synergy effects: All published studies which Mr. Byrne calls "unsafe" are psychophysical synergy effects that play a role in the predictability of specific chronic diseases. Synergy effects play a central role in our research program and are not mentioned by Pelosi, Marks or Byrne.

Example, synergy effects in the development of bronchial carcinoma:

Constellation A

- a) Heavy cigarette smoking (25-30 cigarettes / day, for life)
- b) Poor self-regulation (0-4 points for questionnaire to measure self-regulation)
- c) Traumatic isolation of objects of central importance
- d) Missing high fever (39 °) / blocked admission of acute inflammation

Constellation B

- a) Heavy cigarette smoking (25-30 cigarettes / day, for life)
- b) Good self-regulation (4-7 points for questionnaires to measure self-regulation)
- c) Lust-focused communication of objects of central importance
- d) Approval of high fever (39 °) / approval of acute inflammation

Results of a prospective study:

Constellation A:

Heavy cigarette smoking in 1236 people, thereof 1976-2007 321 bronchial carcinoma (43 percent)

Constellation B:

Heavy cigarette smoking in 1236 people, thereof 1976-2007 66 bronchial carcinoma (5.3 percent)

The results show that heavy cigarette smoking does not act autonomously as a risk factor for bronchial carcinoma and that synergistic effects are generated with the additional factors.

Replication studies

From the declared "unsafe" articles by Byrne are studies that have been replicated internationally with great success, e.g. the study on self-regulation (Grossarth, Eysenck 1994 Self-regulation and mortality from cancer, coronary heart disease and other causes; a prospective study. *Person Individ diff* 19; 781-795), which was replicated excellently by Michael Bloch (cross-sectional study for the study of self-regulation and smoking as predictors of lung cancer.). In the Bochum study it could be shown that cigarette smoking is significantly dependent on the development of bronchial carcinoma. Cigarette smoking works synergistically with self-regulation ability.

Multi-causal research:

Introduction:

The entire research program for medical and political cause research by Grossarth and Eysenck relates to the identification and presentation of multicausal factors and constellations and of synergy effects between different active factors. Neither Byrne nor Pelosi nor David Marks recognized the interactive multicausal research by Grossarth and Eysenck, let alone appreciated it.

The studies by Grossarth and Eysenck were able to show that when different phenomena arise, it is not usually one factor that acts as the cause, but several factors that achieve the interactive and synergetic effects.

Here are two examples:

1) The following factors are responsible for the development of a stroke:

a) high blood pressure (which reaches over 200 systolic and over 100 diastolic values in daily excesses).

b) Diabetes mellitus (usually poorly adjusted).

c) Tendency to chronic overexcitation (inhibition-overexcitation spiral, i.e. weak over-excitation is followed by intense overexcitation).

d) Family disposition for stroke

The reduction of overexcitation and the cessation of medication from diabetes and high blood pressure appear to be therapeutically relevant.

2) Two factors act synergistically in the development of pancreatic carcinoma:

- a) Severe traumatic isolation experiences from an emotionally important object
- b) Family disposition for pancreatic carcinoma

If both factors are present, the following risk factors have an additional and synergistic effect:

- c) Diabetes mellitus
- d) Pancreatic insufficiency
- e) cigarettes smoking
- f) Injury in the "pancreatic area"
- g) Acute pancreatitis

Interactive constellations as risk and protective factors have been identified several times in the Grossarth and Eysencks research program. The approximately one hundred articles are in the works described by Byrne as unsafe.

Reasons to call the research program of Eysenck and Grossarth unsafe:

1) In his text, which he sends worldwide to describe Grossarth's research program as unsafe and recommend that all articles be returned to the respective editors, Byrne gives only three references:

- a) Antony Pelosi
- b) David Marks
- c) Manfred Amelang

Of all the three authors who systematically discriminate against Grossarth and who do not represent any of the advantages of the study mentioned.

2) Accusations are made, e.g. that in some studies the therapeutic effects are over 100% or that the research results of Grossarth and Eysenck are better than the international studies without considering and publishing Grossarth's answers.

3) Insulting arguments are brought up without scientific justification, e.g. that Professor Eysenck's behavior is shameless, that the research program is the greatest scandal of all time, or that Grossarth is a fraudster who falsifies his data. This makes absurd claims that are more relevant than psychiatric. For example, that Grossarth writes works that Eysenck uses to spread his theories. It is left open whether Eysenck may be writing the wrong theories and subordinating them to Grossarth.

The Grossarth-Eysenck research program pursues the central goal of capturing psychological and physical risk constellations with the aim of identifying their synergy effects.

This research has enabled better prediction and prevention than all international monocausal research that covers only one of the areas mentioned.

For this it was necessary to present the entire relevant physical and psycho-social factors.

Pelosi and Marks criticize Eysenck for portraying the relevant psycho-social factors as if he regarded them as the sole psychosocial causes.

The criticism is contradictory when analyzing the multi-causal research results of Eysenck and Grossarth.

The physical risk factors, which Grossarth predominantly recorded, remained without an attack from Pelosi and Marks, because the two obviously have the medical cause research.

Grossarth was never called upon by Mr. Byrne to comment.

Grossarth was never called upon by Mr. Byrne to comment. Thus, it cannot be a professional and competent criticism of the Grossarth Eysenck research program. It is about slander, occupational damage and several criminal files.

Dr. med. Dr. phil. Dr. s.c. Dr. h.c. Ronald F. Grossarth-Maticcek

Professor ECPD