

Greg Boyle <gregory.boyle@unimelb.edu.au>

Mo., 22.
Feb., 20:35
(vor 15
Stunden)

an Kate; mich

Dear Kate Wilson,

What right do you have to retract a published article based on mere speculations and malicious supposition orchestrated by well-known hateful enemies of Professor Eysenck?

Residing in Australia, I was completely unaware of any controversy whatsoever surrounding the data collection. What specific concerns in the King's College Report are you directing at my co-authored BRT (1995) paper?

Subsequently, I have seen that 30 years ago, Eysenck had already provided a detailed rebuttal to these very same allegations of data tampering--based on inferences and speculation (see Eysenck, 1991, attached).

At the time, the matter had been investigated by the *British Psychological Society* (BPS) but no action was taken since **there was no actual evidence that Grossarth-Maticek had made up or manipulated any data whatsoever!**

Recently, Marks and Pelosi have regurgitated these same old derogatory allegations which **would NOT be admissible in a court of law--because speculations are NOT evidence.**

The members of the King's College Report even admitted (p. 2) that they had not actually sighted any original data, so their accusations amount to little more than speculative inferences only.

Grossarth-Maticek has provided a **detailed and powerful rebuttal** to these regurgitated criticisms by Pelosi and Marks (see G-M, 2019, attached).

BRT needs to factor in Grossarth-Maticek's (2019) powerful response into its decision-making since **he essentially accuses Marks and Pelosi of making libellous and defamatory statements.**

I have ascertained that the position taken at *Personality & Individual Differences* was that **there was no actual evidence that either Grossarth-Maticek or Hans Eysenck had made up any data or manipulated it in any way.**

However, because effect sizes reported (in some of the studies only) were very large, a warning was issued by P.A.I.D. to that effect.

In relation to my co-authored article in BRT (1995), no excessively large effect sizes were reported which could in any way cast doubt about the veracity of the data collection. In fact, despite large sample sizes, reported significance tests ranged from Not Significant (10 instances), p < .05 (1 instance), p < .01 (3 instances), p < .001 (5 instances), and p < .0001 (1 instance only). Thus, half (10 out of 20) of 20 significance tests were not significant corresponding to miniscule effect sizes. Another 4 significance tests were

significant at low levels (corresponding to small effect sizes given the large sample size), while only 6 out of 20 tests exhibited moderate effect sizes. None of the 20 significance tests corresponded to the excessively large effect sizes that Pelosi et al. had claimed!

Rather than speculative, unproven accusations, properly conducted replication is required to establish the veracity of any results in question, as per normal scientific research practice. To date, there is no closely replicated study.

Given the detailed explanations and the implications of Grossarth-Maticek's (2019) response, the matter is now beyond any third party to debate. Marks and Pelosi are portrayed by Grossarth-Maticek as liars, who have made false and defamatory claims in order to cause reputational damage (i.e., libellous professional malpractice -- thereby opening themselves up to potential litigation should Grossarth-Maticek feel so inclined).

Journals such as BRT would be wise NOT to open themselves up to potential libel actions from Grossarth-Maticek (and/or any of his co-authors) by uncritically accepting the unproven accusations included in the King's College Report.

The King's College Report is clearly aimed at maliciously besmirching the good academic reputations of both Prof Grossarth-Maticek and Prof Hans Eysenck (a very prominent psychologist).

This resurrected attack by Pelosi and Marks appears to be yet another example of the "Cancel Culture" favoured by totalitarian societies that seek to deny others the right to freedom of speech. This flagrantly unethical abuse is also totally unacceptable in scientific debate and discourse.

I strongly advise that Elsevier and the Editor in Chief of *Behaviour Research and Therapy* reconsider and immediately rescind your premature and unjustifiable decision to retract this article.

Sincerely,

Gregory J. Boyle, Ph.D., D.Sc., FAPS

Hon Professorial Fellow, University of Melbourne

Research Centre for Positive Psychology

Fellow, Australian Psychological Society

Fellow, Association for Psychological Science

Registered Psychologist (AHPRA: PSY0001384439)

Tel. +61 411 732 024

University of Melbourne ranked Number 1 in Australia

<http://australianuniversities.com.au/rankings/>