

Ronald F. Grossarth-Maticek

"Very Unsafe"

The network for the annihilation of the international program for multi-causal

Research and prevention in medicine, politics and sport

introduction

-Five people, one goal-

The multi-causal research program on genesis and prevention chronic diseases and political radicalism is a new development in the Framework of preventive medicine. The research program was supported by both Grossarth-Maticek and Hans-Jürgen Eysenck are essential driven forward.

Furthermore, more than 100 top international researchers have made it different Actively worked on it and in many international fields Journals published. The articles submitted at the time were approved by several Expert reviewers approved for publication. Many also emerged positive reports that were available to Grossarth-Maticek (see quotes on Grossarth's research).

A large number of international articles by Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek initially publishes with the aim of promoting multi-causal research in the to represent individual departments as a basis for subsequent integration. In the meantime, a network of five people has been established with everyone

Funds try to destroy the multicausal research program and get out of the To erase public awareness. In the collaboration between Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek had several defined objectives:

1. It should be examined to what extent distress and eustress play a role in the diseases and play well into old age
Psychosocial factors the effect of physical risk factors in the direction of diseases

influence the emergence of A large number of publications have been produced on this.

2. Eysenck admired on the one hand the innovative creativity of Grossarth-Maticek,
On the other hand, I knew about the enormous commitment against

Grossarth-Maticek.

Therefore, in agreement with Grossarth-Maticek, he decided to carry out the strictest control and verification of the methods and results ever in the empirical psychology. E.g. through home visits the information from checked by academic assistants. Eysenck also accepted data before the Results were known to verify the predictive power of the data.

1

Parallel to the development of what is possibly the largest international research program, five people in particular have tried to work with false claims to destroy the research program. At first it was noticed that the people do not say a word about the content of the multicausal research mention. In order to avoid the essential findings in the research program, they develop secondary scenes which are then integrated into an overall review.

For example, the Dutch psychologist Henk van der Ploeg claims falsely that it had reanalysed using original data from the Grossarth's study and published its results in international journals. All references from Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek, van der Ploeg none Original data were ignored by the journal editors. It deals the Heidelberg Intervention Study 1972/73. The original data can be seen at Grossarth-Maticek and he declares in lieu of oath that Henk van the Ploeg was never in possession of the original data, so that his approach was considered "unsafe" must be designated.

The British critics were David Marks, Anthony Pelosi and Edward Byrne repeatedly informed that Henk van der Ploeg was untruthful published. Even so, he was published as a key witness in those of them Reviews cited. This procedure must be described as "unsafe".

The other critic the three British authors are referring to is that German psychologist Manfred Amelang. It was awarded by the German Research community commissioned an objective replication study of the Grossarth's Conduct studies. He refuses to do the therapeutic experiments repeat and use the most successful measuring instruments and claimed even that these are not there at all. He felt compelled to do that Translating questionnaires from the English studies into German, although the German copies. From an objective replication study cannot be the talk. Thus the German Research Foundation was awarded for a study for which she paid a lot of money. Even so, the results were widely published internationally. This procedure must also be designated as "unsafe"

will.

The British critics launched a campaign against the long-dead

Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek in the i.a. it is claimed that the Grossarth-Maticek

is a fraudster who falsifies his data and that the Eysenck-Grossarthsche Research program represents the greatest scientific scandal of all time. It is imperative to prevent these studies from being quoted or even as therapeutic measures are applied. This procedure must also be used as a "unsafe".

David Marks has his views on Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek President of King's College London, Edward Byrne, and notified them

2

2

motivated to send thousands of certificates to editors and academic institutions

send with the suggestion that the articles by Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek to take back, because they are supposedly "unsafe".

Edward Byrne

also refers in its reasoning to the study by Amelang and Van der Ploeg as well as Anthony Pelosi and David Marks. He never has contact with

Grossarth-Maticek to get to know his position - and more than 100 reviewers and research assistants ignored their views Edward Byrne's approach must also be described as unsafe will.

The English psychiatrist Antony Pelosi worked intensively with the for 33 years

Attempt to present individual studies by Eysenck and Grossarth. ER has no Word mentioned the potential of multi-causal research. This would be a task for

Pelosi for the next 30 years trying to undertake the research program

I trust Eduard Byrne and David Marks to achieve such an achievement in the

The multi-causal research results should not be mentioned here briefly to make it clear what potential this is about.

Multi-causal prevention of bronchial carcinoma:

1: Risk constellations and interventions for the prediction and prevention of the bronchial

Karzionms in a randomized prospective intervention studies with data submission

three scientific institutions before the results are announced:

Characteristics of the risk constellations (a-d)

a) Intensive cigarette smoking (over 25 daily)

b) Chronic obstructive bronchitis

c) Family burden for bronchial carcinoma (two family members in straight

Line diseased)

d) Poor self-regulation (under 3 points on the questionnaire for measuring the Self-regulation.)

e) For the primary prevention of bronchial carcinoma:

a) Instruction to improve self-regulation

(ask based on a questionnaire of 16)

b) Reduction of cigarette smoking through RGM behavior therapy (method for Smoking cessation through alternative modeling in light hypnosis).

Preven therapy from 1973-1977: Determination of mortality and incidence 2007:

N = 328.

of which bronchial carcinoma = 31 (9.4%).

Randomized control group = 301

Of which lung cancer = 109 (36.2%)

The results show that the intervention of multi-causal prevention reduces mortality and the incidence reduced over an observation period of 30 years (by a factor of 3.85 in Ratio of percent).

3

After intensive research, Grossart got a clear picture of the organization of the network to destroy the research work of Eysenck and Grossarth Antony Pelosi worked hard for 33 years to recognize any mistake made for the two authors

When this failed, Pelosi used general insults.

After many rejections to the publication of his research, he finally found David Marks as

an absolute proponent. Marks activated the President of the Royal Collage Eduard Byrne

to get involved unilaterally against Grossarth. Byrne writes a critical letter against the

Works by Grossarth and sends them all over the world and above all to all institutions,

who know Grossarth and have worked with him. When analyzing the publications from Pelosi and Byrne's reasoning there is an absolute congruence, what

Byrne also with it

proves that only Pelosi quotes.

Byrne suggests that he has set up an international commission to review the all of Grossarth's publications. In reality, not a single article that contained

has been reported for withdrawal, analyzed and criticized by some scientist.

In order to

Byrne began an abuse of office ("very unsafe").

Byrne never contacted me, nor is there any analysis of an article by an alleged panel of experts. There were only the blanket

cancellations Pelosis
applied, e.g. that the results are better than any international research.
Without knowing Grossarth's arguments.
Grossarth came to the conclusion that the central person of organized
discrimination
David Marks was or is.
An even greater disappointment for Grossarth is that many of those who
are contacted

Institutions and even social representatives for fear of Marks and his
Lobby system did not take any backing for Grossarth.
The works of Grossarth are e.g. on the subject of radicalism,
Not only anti-Semitism and democracy or the prevention of chronic diseases
an absolute world top performance, but also urgently needed for world peace.
So 115 have read Grossarth's article on anti-Semitism and afterwards
95 have completely reduced their anti-Semitic views. The article was

published on its website but accept editors from leading journals
not for publications, and without any reason for scientific criticism.

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

Tel: +49 6221 6534654 Cell phone: + 49151 27027469
Mail: ronald.grossarth@gmail.com
www.grossarth-maticek.de