

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 distinguished 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 showed itself 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 Byrne wrote to over a hundred editors and recommended that Eysenck and Grossarth's publications be withdrawn.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. Byrne and Grossarth never wrote a letter.

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 allegations against Grossarth and Eysenck are untrue and cannot be proven then Grossarth, Byrne, Pelosi and Marks designate an organization to destroy a new multicausal research program.

10- David Marks writes: It is imperative to prevent these studies from being cited or even used as therapeutic measures.

11- Byrne, Pelosi and Marks tolerate Professor Van der Plog who publishes in prestigious journals and spreads lies instead of demanding the withdrawal of his articles. He would have known the original data from Grossarth and citing him better.
12- Pelosi, Marks and Byrne do not mention the impressive international replications e.g. on the subject of self-regulation and cigarette smoking.

13- In the work *Radicalism, Anti-Semitism and Democracy*, Grossarth was able to show that in fascism and every form of radicalism there is a direct connection between massive discrimination against the opponent and an act of extermination, usually without annual evidence to justify the discrimination.

14- According to Grossarth, Pelosi, Marks and Byrne form a criminal and criminalizing organization which, through criminal and unproven acts (e.g. defamation, insults, false suspicion, public incitement to criminal offenses) pursue Eysenck and Grossarth internationally, to completely discredit and Destroy your multicausal research.

While a large number of international research welcomes the multicausal programs, some mainly British scientists fight against the founders of the multicausal research e.g. Grossarth, Eysenck with all methods of discrimination and false claims and above all insults. Grossarth considers 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. Possibly the program by Grossarth and Eysenck is a brilliant work that Pelosi, Marks and Byrne do not understand.

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

Some arguments should be presented here.

Pelosi, Marks and Byrne form an international organization to destroy the work of Eysenck, Grossarth and more than a hundred 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 was guided solely by 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 his critical question that caused him to send letters to the editors and institutions to cause the withdrawal of our work to finally put me in concrete terms 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 one 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 take back the work of the world-famous and internationally most cited psychologist who died in 1997. The reviewers who supported the adoption of Eysenck's articles are ignored. The chief editors refer specifically to Byrne's recommendations.

"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 surely find further reasons for discrimination and write further letters.

The three authors have achieved significant criminal offenses, e.g. "Paragraph §189. Disparagement of the memory of the deceased", Paragraph §163. StGB False suspicion

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.

Clause of the Criminal Code (StGB) § 164 False suspicion

(1) Anyone who suspects another public official or a military superior who is responsible for receiving reports, or against their better judgment, of an illegal act or a breach of official duty with the intention of bringing about or continuing an official procedure or other official measures against him will be punished with imprisonment of up to five years or with a fine. (2) Anyone who, with the same intentions at one of the offices referred to in paragraph 1 or publicly about another against his better knowledge, makes any other assertion of a factual nature, which is suitable for bringing about official proceedings or other official measures against him or for

allowing them to continue. (3) Whoever commits the false suspicion is punished with imprisonment of six months to ten years in order to reduce the sentence or waive the penalty according to Section 46b of this Act or Section 31 of the Be to obtain the narcotics law. In less serious cases, the penalty is imprisonment from three months to five years.

Clause of the Criminal Code (StGB) § 111 Public invitation to criminal offenses.

(1) Anyone who calls for an illegal act publicly, in a meeting or by disseminating documents (Section 11 (3)) will be punished like an instigator (Section 26). (2) If the call is unsuccessful, the penalty is Imprisonment up to five years or a fine. The punishment may not be more severe than that threatened in the event that the request is successful (paragraph 1); Section 49 Paragraph 1 No. 2 shall apply. 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".

The three authors make massive accusations, without evidence and automatically advance to criminal offenses. This range of unproven discrimination and committed criminal offenses is the main characteristic of all forms of radicalism and fascism. These interrelations were described in my work Radicalism, Anti-Semitism and Democracy.

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

Clause §186. Defamation, and paragraph §1975

Literatur

1- Antony.J Pelosi, Personality and fatal diseases: Revisiting a scientific scandal "Journal of Health Psychology" 22.02. 2019, Vol. 24(4) 421–439

2-David. Marks, "The Hans Eysenck affair: Time to correct the scientific record" Journal of Health Psychology 2019, Vol. 24(4) 409–420

3- Sara Bosely, " Work of renowned UK psychologist Hans Eysenck ruled 'unsafe'" "The Guardian" 11.10.2019.

4- Michael Bloch, "Cross-sectional study on the investigation of self-regulation and smoking as predictors for lung cancer" "Inaugural dissertation Medical Faculty University of Bochum"

5- Grossarth-Maticek, R., & Eysenck, H. J. : Self-regulation and mortality from cancer, coronary heart disease, and other causes: A prospective study. Personality and Individual Differences Volume, No. 6: 781-795 (1994).

6-Radicalism, Anti-Semitism and Democracy <https://grossarth-maticek.de/>

7- Van Der Ploeg HM (1992) Psychological influences Van Der Ploeg HM (1992) Psychological influences on cancer and ischaemic heart disease. British Medical Journal 304: 1632-1633.

8- Van Der Ploeg HM and Kleijn WC (1993) Some further doubts about Grossarth-Maticek's data base. Psychological Inquiry 4: 68-69.

9- Amelang M and Schmidt-Rathjens C (1992) Psychometric properties of modified Grossarth-Maticek and Eysenck inventories. Psychological Reports 71: 1251–1263