

Ronald F Grossarth-Maticek

Public letter to E. Byrne, A. Pelosi, and D. Marks on Discrimination and Prevention of a Multi-Causal Research Program.
introduction

Grossarth Maticek has established a new research direction with his numerous international employees, the so-called multi-causal preventive medicine. It could be shown that various chronic diseases as well as radicalism and longevity can be predicted well with a large number of factors and can even be differentiated from one another. The results introduce a paradigm shift in medical cause research.

The work should be briefly mentioned here:

- a- Multicausal exploration of radicalism, anti-Semitism and democracy. Origin: interruption of symbiotic needs-extreme polarization-Transformation into political, religious and national attitudes.
- b- Multi-causal disease development: With several combined variables different chronic diseases could be recorded. The autonomy training was shown to be a method for effective prevention.

Summary.

1- Antony Pelosi has been researching Prof. Eysenck and Professor Grossarth for thirty years with the aim of discriminating against their work
2- He found an absolute advocate in the psychologist David Marks
3- Antony Pelosi and David Marks have also convinced the President of King's College London E. Byrne to take a position against Eysenck and Grossarth. Byrne wrote to over a hundred editors and recommended that Eysenck and Grossarth's publications be withdrawn

4- Byrne is referring to Pelosi's criticism and Marks' recommendation.
5- Grossarth has written to Byrne several times asking him to share his arguments for evidence so that Grossarth can answer. A letter from Byrne am Grossarth never followed.
6- In all of the criticism by Pelosi, Marks and Byrne, it became apparent that they did not mention the theory, method and results of the multicausal research program by Grossarth and Eysenck at all.

7- Pelosi, Marks and Byrne have no evidence for their criticism and discriminatory claims related to Grossarth and Eysenck and relate solely to subjective claims (e.g. the results are impossible to believe).
8- I ask Mr. Byrne to share his arguments against Grossarth and Eysenck so that Grossarth can answer them. Grossarth will then provide detailed answers in a book and a scientific article.
9- If Discrimination claims against Grossarth and Eysenck are untrue and cannot be proven then Grossarth, Byrne, Pelosi and Marks designate an organization to destroy a new multi-causal research program.

While a large number of international research welcomes the multicausal

programs, some mainly British scientists fight against the founder of the multicausal research e.g. Grossarth, Eysenck with all methods of discrimination and false claims and above all insults. Grossarth consider the English critics to be morally, scientifically and intellectually inadequate. In their words as "Unsafe".

Pelosi describes Grossarth and Eysenck's research program as the greatest scandal. The program by Grossarth and Eysenck is possibly a brilliant work that Pelosi, Marks and Byrne do not understand.

Three people tried with all means of discrimination and false claims to destroy the research work of Grossarth and Eysenck and their international reputation.

Some arguments should be presented here.

Pelosi, Marks and Byrne form an international organization to destroy the work of Eysenck, Grossarth and over a hundred other international scientists.

1- The language of Pelosi and Marks is Aggressive and Discriminatory

Here are just a few examples:

Pelosi: Grossarth is a liar and a fraud who falsifies his data.

The research program of Eysenck and Grossarth is the greatest scientific scandal of all time (quote from)

David Marks: Hans Eysenck's attempts to discredit what already exists, namely the causal links between smoking, tobacco and cancer, are part of his eternal shame. He uttered the most shameful deceptions a scientist has committed in the 20th century.

David Marks has used his influence on the President of King's College London, Mr. Byrne, to urge him to withdraw all publications by Eysenck and Grossarth.

Pelosi's allegations. Marks and Byrne were drawn up without any evidence. A specific question to clarify the allegations was never directed to Grossarth von Byrne.

Byrne has written to a very large number of editors and institutions and has done great damage to the reputation of Eysenck, Grossarth and other scholars.

Byrne gives the wrong information that he has set up a competent international commission. In reality, He has oriented himself exclusively to Pelosi and Marks.

Neither Pelosi, Marks nor Byrne understood just a single result of Grossarth's multicausal research and pretended to be competent.

Instead of asking for a Scientific Replication Study in which you get an answer to your criticism, try to destroy the entire work of Grossarth and Eysenck. In your criticism you have shown that you have absolutely no idea of the entire research program. Thus they prevent a new and important research direction.

I ask whether Mr Byrne is abusing his office to the detriment of the International Publicity.

I ask Mr. Byrne to ask Mr. Byrne his critical question that caused him to send letters to the editors and institutions in order to cause the withdrawal of our work to finally give me a concrete answer and to answer this scientifically. I also ask Mr. Byrne to criticize every article he has to withdraw requires detailed reasons.

In the list of almost a hundred excellent articles that are discredited by Byrne, it is also and works that have been replicated internationally with great success, e.g. on the topic of synergy effects between smoking and self-regulation.

Particularly disappointing is the authoritarian fixation of some editors on Byrne who have agreed to the work of the world-famous and internationally most cited psychologists of the already

Died in 1997. In doing so, the reviewers who have approved the adoption of Eysenck's articles will be included. The chief editors expressly refer to the recommendations of Byrne.

"Concerns were raised with this article following an investigation by King's College London. King's College London has recommended retraction of the article, and the Editor-in-Chief of the journal has decided to retract the article with this retraction notice "

In my new book Preventive Medicine, Preventive Intervention Oncology, I will present the scientific results from our studies again. Pelosi, Marks and Byrne will certainly find further reasons for discrimination and write further letters.

The three authors have achieved considerable criminal data, e.g. "Paragraph §189. Disparagement of the memory of the deceased", Paragraph §163. StGB false suspicion

Clause §186. Defamation, and paragraph §1975

Anyone who asserts or disseminates a fact in relation to another which is likely to make the same contemptible or to be degraded in public opinion, if this fact is not proven to be true, will be punished with imprisonment for up to one year or with a fine and, if the act is committed publicly or by distributing writings (Section 11 (3)) is punished with imprisonment for up to two years or with a fine.

Through the activities of Pelosi, Byrne and Marks, the freedom of science is threateningly prevented by massive discrimination so that we will bring charges to the "European Court of Human Rights".

Dr. med. Dr. phil. Dr. med.sci Dr.h.c. Ronald F. Grossarth-Maticek
Professor of Preventive Medicine, Postgraduate Studies ECPD.