

# Ronald Ferdinand Grossarth-Maticek

## **RADICALISM AND DEMOCRACY - MULTICAUSAL CONSTELLATIONS**

### **ABSTRACT:**

The study shows that all forms of ideological, religious, nationalistic, anarchistic and antisemitic radicalism have a distinctly pronounced destructive drive toward a defined opponent. This can be considered a central motive of radicalism. When the destructive drive in organizations transforms to destructive acts, one can speak of radical fascism.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Throughout history we see various forms of extreme radical behavior erupt which has caused systematic waves of killing, social isolation and streams of refugees. Behind these disturbing social events is a compelling social and physical urge to destroy, annihilate and exterminate. The precursors and motivations of the perpetrators have not been sufficiently studied (analyzed) and therefore no effective preventive measures have been developed.

Only after determining and understanding the psychosocial dynamic of the development of radicalism will it be possible to develop adequate preventive measures. Only then will we have the tools to effectively dampen radical and antisemitic behaviors. As long as the efforts remain as moral appeals and oaths, like "never again", preventive measures remain ineffective, as can be seen in the development of radicalism in society today. Society needs to consolidate its efforts for real prevention to take place. This must also include the energy provided by radicalism itself. Then the energy invested in recognizing abortive developments will allow for humane democratic behavior instead.

Up to date most of the attempts to understand such phenomena have come from mono-causal data from mono-causal disciplines. Such studies want to explain the events with single factors, which supposedly will solve the problems, but they are inadequate and unsuccessful.

Modern research has shown that multi-causal factors from multi-disciplinary studies can better properly approach the matter by including interconnections between factors such as family conflicts, polarizing ideologies, the development of social and physical tendencies toward destruction, or the physical and mental presence of (other) outside supporting individuals.

No factor in itself will create radicalism, but a combination of one or the other factor may greatly increase the predictability of radical behavior, including anti-Semitism.

### **THE DEVELOPMENT OF RADICALISM, CENTRAL FACTORS**

The topic of Radicalism and its relationship to democratic behavior, has interested the author, Ronald Grossarth-Maticek, since 1968. At first intensive retrospective studies were carried out with the goal of identifying different behavior patterns and comparing them to different varying political attitudes.

The results of those analytical studies led to the assessment of conditions leading to radical behaviors. The following factors were considered essential for the development of radicalism. (See also: Grossarth-Maticek, R.. Hohwacht, 1975 and Grossarth-Maticek, R. in Schwind, H.-D. (Hrsg.), de Gruyter, 1978)

1. There is a consistent (constant) and continuous emotional suffering in the radical individual, caused by not being able to achieve a goal that has been longed and strived for regarding a person, group, or goal, e.g. achieving the mother's love or affection. Failure to achieve the desired goal creates a sense of inferiority. Rather than live with the inferiority complex, it is substituted with hate, hate at strange or foreign objects and conditions. Action against those objects or conditions are aimed at the weak or indefensible aspect of those opponents, and not at equal or superior objects. An event or object, either a person, group or goal, is perceived as that which has prevented the individual from achieving the desired goal. The supposed goal-hindering object is perceived as causing fear, pain and a general negative experience. The blame for being unable to reach the desired goal is converted and passed onto the perceived objectionable object (person, group, event or social condition) and the radicalizing individual develops a tendency toward destruction and

annihilation of the supposed blameful object. This makes him temporarily feel superiority again.

2. An ideological, political transformation takes place as a projection of the polarization between good and evil.

The "good" is the representative of an idealized effect. The "evil", on the other hand, represents the effect of the threatening, created anxiety and negative evaluation.

The illusion occurs that the "good" can only occur by eliminating the "evil". Evil is represented by any foreign religion, nation, ideology or other "object" that supports the evil. An obsessive destructive tendency that grows to an addictive intensity is directed toward that object. Because of the ideological attitude involved, the "evil" increasingly becomes a motivation toward aversive political acts and behaviors. In order to justify the destructive tendency, individuals and groups of those who think similarly are sought out and publicly cited.

3. When supporters for their attitudes are found, radicals begin to turn to destructive behavior. That may be through public slander or physical attacks on adversaries and their supporters. The tendency toward destructive behavior aimed at political opponents occurs through generalized negation and is maintained by obsessive intensification of the negative assessments. If, for example, there is a single argument against an ideological opponent, then that statement will be generalized and transferred to all political adversaries. Thus, the hate toward all political opponents is intensified using the previously defined characteristics of the "evil".

4. There is a tendency to generalize singular points of information or experiences in order to generally condemn all the opponents.

5. There is a tendency to intensify the polarization of the idealized "good" and the opponent's "evil" with an obsessive trend toward destruction.

6. In the final phase of the process of obsessive destructive radicalism two possibilities are open.

a. The radical person or group may resign. They notice that their radical destructive tendencies do not help them reach their goals of proposed well-being and they thus turn to other activities, e.g. meditation.

b. The radical person or group intensifies their obsessive behavior toward annihilation of others and themselves.

The destructive behavior is experienced by the radicalized individual as freeing, as a relief, as liberating against those seen as "others" or those perceived as disturbing family members, especially when that destructive behavior is encouraged and legitimized by the presence of other like-minded individuals.

If one analyzes the massive drive toward destruction and the destructive acts of active radicals, it is astonishing to see that such a simple effective factor can have such an explosive synergetic result.

In the following we will describe our multi-causal research program on radicalism and democracy.

### **ASSESSMENT OF RADICAL ATTITUDES**

The study tried to compare what has been called extreme radical behavior patterns with basic democratic attitudes.

Here are seven questions for assessing radical attitudes.

1. Question for the radical: "Do you tend to polarize your thinking and behavior between an extreme positive, desired situation and groups, on the one hand, and extremely evil, negative and interfering objects like people, situations, religion and ideologies on the other hand?"

Radicals show distinct polarization between unreached, idealized objects and disturbing effects which interfere with reaching the desired objects.

2. Question: "Are you ready to destroy the political opponent."

Radicals show a distinct trend toward destruction (physically or socially) of an ideologically defined opponent.

3. Question: "Are politically similar thinking people very important to you because they support you and let you believe that your thoughts and actions are correct?"

They show a reaching out toward people who have similar ideological feelings.

4. Question: "Is there an important leadership person within your area of political behavior that you completely believe."

They adhere to the existence of a group leader with a perceived model character.

5. Question: "When you learn of negative aspects of your political opponent, does that help you to generally better understand the negative sides of your opponents."

They show an inclination toward generalization of negative aspects of their political opponent.

6. Question: "Does your aggression toward the political opponent increase from year to year?"

There is a tendency toward intensification of the trend toward destruction.

7. Question: "Have you already committed acts of aggression toward a political opponent, either physically or verbally?"

They demonstrate a preparedness take action against an opponent and indeed have already carried out a politically motivated act.

All forms of radicalism are considered particularly indicated when all seven variables are given. If none of the variables occur, then the trend toward radicalism is considered minimal.

## **CHARACTERISTICS OF DESTRUCTIVE RADICALISM AND DEMOCRATIC BEHAVIOR**

### **Group I: Destructive Drive in Extreme Radicalism**

1. Extreme polarization with regard to attachment and detachment of the primary family.
2. Negative experiences regarding a disturbing object (e.g. the father) and extreme positive feelings with regard to an idealized object (e.g. the mother).
3. A feeling of being inhibited by the disturbing object, while attempting to approach the loved object.
4. Transformation of the family polarization in a polarized ideology with corresponding behavior.
5. Destructive tendency toward objects considered disturbing and negative as well as extreme idealization of positively judged objects.
6. Marked motivation to hinder or destroy social, emotional and physical development of "objects" assessed to be disturbing.
7. Tendency toward inhibition and destruction of that which is experienced as foreign, strange or unknown with an extreme idealization of one's own kind (e.g. one's own religion, nation or ideology).
8. Pleasurably felt destructive drives toward what is perceived as strange, unknown or foreign.

9. Attracting like-minded individuals
10. Executed acts of destruction and hindrance drives in a destructive frenzy.
11. A conviction that the opponent has acted completely anti-social.
12. Drive toward communicating to the public about the successfully destructive act, in which the destroyed object is interpreted to have been antisocial and damaging for the community.
13. After confrontation with blame, different strategies are developed to justify the destructive act.

### **Group II: Democratic Behavior**

1. Tolerance toward those with differing opinions.
2. Performance is valued highly, one's own and that of others.
3. One's own economic interests are pursued.
4. One's own political interests are pursued.
5. Drive toward desire, well-being and security.
6. Favors free democratic elections.
7. Aversion toward unjust persecution.
8. Engagement for social, pro-community justice.
9. Attempts to integrate one's own attitudes with societal norms.
10. Permanent tendency toward developing one's own abilities.
11. Positive attitudes toward democratic organizations.
12. Integration of personal interests with the general well-being of the community.
13. Tendency toward integration of one's personal skills with occupational and private demands and expectations.

The researchers of this study compared these extreme radical behavior patterns with basic democratic attitudes. The results showed two different worlds of behavioral and emotional experiences. People and groups with "democratic" attitudes are oriented toward themselves and their own interests. They can also associate their feelings and interests with particular political organizations. Democratically oriented people tend to relate to positive mother and father relationships.

Radical people, on the other hand, tend to orient themselves toward an idealized mother and a hated father. Radicals tend to have fewer children. This can be

explained by the tension and polarization of extreme radical people in their original families.

### **INTERIM RESULTS OF THE STUDY**

Among the 328 subjects for which none of the seven variables applied, three subjects (0.9%) showed an extreme radical attitude. Of the 125 subjects for which all seven variables applied, 96 (78.8%) also showed an extreme radical attitude, but with an obsessive inclination toward destruction of the politically-national or religious opponent.

Considering antisemitic attitudes of the 533 subjects for which none of the variables applied, 2 subjects (0.4%) were extremely antisemitic with a considerate trend toward destructive behavior. Of the 125 subjects for which all seven variables applied, 84 people (67.2%) were extremely antisemitic.

### **THE SUBJECTS and the RESULTS OF THE STUDY**

The subjects for the research came primarily from Yugoslavia and its varying states and Germany and other European countries.

1. From 38,000 medically examined subjects between 1972 and 1978, scientific assistants were able to question 221 members of the former German SS (Schutzstaffel) suppression organization. 116 subjects rejected participation for the interview.

2. 439 former SS-members were compared to 403 subjects with democratic attitudes as a control group.

Of the 439 former SS-members, who answered the questioning in terms of the time of the Third Reich, 388 (90.2%) said that the 13 criteria of radicalism fit them better than the democratic criteria. Of the democratically oriented individuals during the Third Reich, 377 answered that the democratic criteria would better apply to them.

3. Radicals in the Heidelberger circle of students between 1968 and 1975 were examined. 35 right radical, 62 left radical and 7 Islamic radicals as well as 122 democratically oriented people were interviewed.

Results: Of the 62 left radical students, 60 (96.7%) met the 13 radical criteria. 30 (85.7%) of the 35 right radical students met the criteria, as well as 3 of the 7 islamic-radical students (42.8%). Of the 122 democratically oriented students only 1 (0.8%) showed a tendency toward the radical criteria.

4. There were 44 radicals from Serbia, 32 from Croatia and 37 from the Republic of Germany, at total of 113 subjects.

Results: 75 individuals (66.4%) demonstrated a dominance of the radical criteria whereas only 8 (6.6%) of the 120 democratically oriented.

The interviews were held during the Serbian-Croatian War.

Among the 44 Serbian radicals, 22 were in "Autonomic Training", and 22 were in a control group.

In Autonomic Training individuals learn to handle and reduce emotional injuries in the family by, among other things, "Sending love, sensing the pain and becoming autonomous".

5. In addition, 13 radical subjects from the Germany Republic were in Autonomic Training, with another 13 in an untrained control group.

Results: The groups were studied in a second step with respect to their communication forms in terms of dependence or autonomy. They developed autonomous behavior patterns using the "model learning" of Alfred Bandura. In a third step one concentrated on contradictions between applied methods in political conflict and results that possibly result in an possible in effects other that would have been expected. They also developed alternative behavior patterns. Three years after the training, 7 individuals (53.8%) had a higher tendency toward democratic behavior compared to the beginning of the training.

6. International interviews were performed with 18 radicals from Hungary, 15 from Russia, 5 from Israel and 12 from Palestine, compared to an equal amount of democratically oriented subjects.

Results: 9 of the 18 Hungarian radicals (50%), 8 of the 15 Russian (53%), 4 of 5 (80%) of the Israelis and 9 of 12 Palestinians (75%) had higher scores on the radicalism scale.

In comparison, only 2 of 53 (0,4%) democratically involved individuals had a higher score on the radicalism scale. These democratically oriented people were involved in political parties, whereas the radical individuals were engaged in subgroups. Everyone could be ascribed to a radical or democratic organization.

7. In addition, a personal interview with Albert A. Speer was organized by Reinhold Zundel, the then mayor of Heidelberg, Germany. As Hitler's personal architect and the commander of the transportation of Jews to the concentration camps, he reported that the presented variables of right radicalism presented here and their analyses fit completely with Adolf Hitler. He also confirmed that the radical variables presented also described a great majority of the top functionaries of the Third Reich, including Göbbels and Himmler as well as 9 of 11 further individuals in the center of the SS-Leadership. However, he emphasized, that not all of the Nazi leadership fit the presented criteria.

103 individuals were interviewed who were survivors of a concentration camp. All of them reported severe emotional damages. Among them, however, were 20 people who suffered less severely than others due to very good self-regulation.

Multiple interviews were performed on individuals who had been threatened by left radicals during the time of the student movements oder in former socialist countries. Generally, they suffered years of severe emotional and social impairments, e.g. through injustice and false arguments against them. This group included the former Rector of the University of Heidelberg, Professor Werner Conze, the former Director of the Deutsche Bank, Alfred Herrhausen, the Director of Internal Medicine of the University of Heidelberg, Professor Gotthard Schettler, the former President of the Federal Union of (German) Employers, Hans-Martin Schleyer. Two of the group were later murdered. All 27 of them experienced intensive devaluation of their person with long lasting emotional and social consequences. The personal emotional injuries and social exclusion, that went as far as physical destruction, is being newly expressed. It goes from libel and slander to false assertions against Dietmar Hopp, which cause emotional injury and social isolation within the area of sports, up to the encouragement of violence against other political representatives who think differently than the radicals.

A temporary system of experts was developed and implemented for democratizing radical people. 113 radical individuals were trained and a control group of 115 untrained radicals were compared. 17 of 130 questioned people denied participation in the project.

In a preliminary, not yet final expert system to be communicated in written form as a Test and Training System, results are to be expected as if an expert were carrying out the training.

In the expert system, several areas were covered.

a) Detailed introductory information about the causes of radicalism, possible counter effects, so that the individual concerned will be able to understand the purpose of the process and support it.

b) Application of instruments for measuring the difference between radical and democratic behavior patterns.

c.) Application of the five methods of self-analysis and self-activation:

- Autonomous Training for overcoming injuries suffered in the early family home.

- Determination of dependent and autonomous communication forms within the radical groups.

- Determination of contradictions between applied methodology in political conflict and the achieved results of that behavior.

- Development of alternative behavior patterns for integration of personal needs and positive expected results.

- Merging of personal skills and abilities with the expected political, social and occupational demands.

The System of Experts was applied for the first time in 1975 , then in 1978 for the post-examination and then in 1983 for the last post-examination. During the first questioning, all individuals demonstrated a high score for the criteria for extreme radicalism. In the last examination the control group was unchanged while 75% of the trained group (66%) showed a higher score on the democratic scale.

## **FURTHER RESULTS OF THE STUDY**

1. Based on the empirical interviews there was a clear difference between extreme radical and democratic attitudes. Of 332 "radical nationalists" vs. 398 "democratic" subjects, 318 right-winged and 374 democratic subjects could be classified according to the presented hypotheses, i.e. they correspondingly received high scores for either right radicalism or for democratic behavior.
2. Radical subjects were asked to describe their own status. They described the negative results of their own political goals and behaviors. One year after testing the subjects with their extreme radical attitudes, a significant reduction in radicalism could be determined. Of 119 trained radical nationalist subjects, 83 changed their radical behavior toward democratic behavior attitudes. Of the 107 control subjects on 8 changed their attitudes.
3. The nationalistic radical subjects had significantly less children than the democratically oriented subjects. 332 radical subjects had 241 children, i.e. 0.7 children per subject. The 396 democratically oriented subjects had 829 children, i.e. 2.8 children per person.
4. The nationalistic radical subjects are significantly more often oriented toward an idealized mother and a negative orientation to the father. Of 332 subjects attached to an idealized mother, only 64 were attached to an idealized father.
5. The democratically oriented subjects were positively centered toward their own father. Of the 398 democratically oriented subjects, only 77 were centered on an idealized mother, 144 were oriented toward an idealized father.

### **FORMS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF EXTREME RADICALISM**

A selective criterion for extreme radical subjects was an absolute intolerance for people who thought differently than the subject him-/herself, and the presence of a destructive drive toward those "others". Furthermore, the subject had to have an idealization of a historical leader with the same attitude.

For example the question: "Did Hitler behave correctly with regard to the annihilation of the Jews during the Third Reich?"

Among all the forms of radicalism, the primary factor is the marked tendency toward destruction of the opponent. Even though at first glance the leftist, rightest and anarchist radicalism seem to be of different forms. However, there are similarities and multilateral cooperation. All forms appear to have the same common factor of

searching for an idealized state, yet simulate the existence of a negatively acting factor. Destruction of the negative disturbing factor is assumed to be the necessary condition for them to reach their own idealized goal.

Communistic radicalism considers the destruction of their ideological enemy as the prerequisite factor. Nationalistic radicalism empathizes the destruction of the supporters of what they consider national dominance through foreigners. Islamic radicalism points to the destruction of those who think differently than they do or have different beliefs. Anarchistic radicalism focuses on prominent representatives of the government and of public life. Their ultimate goal is total destabilization of a controlled and social political order.

Because all forms of radicalism use untrue arguments and false methodology, they are bounded by the limits of human motivation. They tend to operate as anarchistic radicals in that they expand their destructive tendencies to a universal level.

Antisemitic radicalism, simply known as antisemitism, is concentrated on the social and possible physical destruction of Jews and Judaism as a prerequisite for a well functioning social order. Thus Jews are seen as an inhibitory factor in all societal areas. This occurred for example, after Stalinists were confronted with the recognition that they would or could not be successful in establishing of kolkhoz Soviet farms. Thus one can see the demonstration of the close cooperation between different forms of radicalism.

Each form of radicalism strives toward the establishment of alternative governmental and communicative forms in order to reach their own political, religious and personal goals.

Nowadays we are experiencing a massive development of anarchistic activity, ranging from public discrimination to assassinations. After each attack the radicalized present explanations and reasoning for their act in the hope of winning public opinion for their goals.

Democracy's response must above all include a precise analysis that clearly demonstrates objectively and transparently the context and interconnectedness of the radicals and their behavior, so that the public will become competent in its judgement of the radicals' goals and acts. All areas of social life are asked to

participate, as for example, a new evaluation of the right of freedom of opinion. As a matter of course, high value is placed on freedom of expression in a democracy. When, however, the anarchistic radical's move toward destruction, driven by false arguments, is directed at prominent public personalities, creating great emotional damage and social exclusion, then the victim needs legal and social assistance. This can only be achieved when the radical's destructive strategy is recognized and properly understood.

### **ON THE PREVENTION OF RADICALISM**

Obsessive destructive radicalism is nurtured by the illusion that the suffering endured by not being able to achieve a centrally important desired goal (such as closeness to the mother), will be resolved through ideological activities. In other words, the radical believes that achieving closeness to the mother, for example, can be achieved by lifting the polarization of attributions of good or evil and implementing idealized ideological conditions with destruction of disturbing objects and conditions.

In the course of his activities, a subject experiences the recognition that the emotional suffering cannot be dissolved or resolved. As a reaction to this situation, either resignation and retreat occurs, or the contrary, the destructive trend increases in intensification. For intensification to occur, the radical needs the cooperation of those with similar opinions. *It does not happen alone. It is, in that sense, a social act.*

If preventive discussions with people who have themselves recognized the need for resignation occur, then a common working-through of alternative behaviors is relatively simple. While someone is intensifying his ideological position, it is just as easy to find alternative forms of behavior. In that case it is helpful for the trainer to present his arguments with an authority that will more strongly influence the individual involved than he otherwise would be by the mass of similar thinking individuals. The radical thereby recognizes that with his ideological arguments he arrives at the opposite of that which were his original goals.

### **DEVELOPMENT OF A PREVENTIVE THERAPY PROGRAM**

How can extremely radical people and groups be motivated toward democratic attitudes and behavior patterns without being forced to attitudes that they otherwise deeply reject. A pilot analysis showed that politically active radicals try to optimally

enforce their ideology and their drive toward destruction. They are motivated by their fear and frustration of possibly not being able to carry through with what they see as a centrally important goal.

This principle was adapted and applied to radicals in a randomized experimental interventional study. Subjects were asked if they felt that their attitudes and behaviors, which demonstrated their drive toward destructive action, were constructive toward fulfilling their goals or if their attitudes and behaviors may have been extremely damaging in terms of reaching their desired goal.

After a long time of reflection, a high percentage of the subjects demonstrated a change in motivation, toward achieving their goals through democratic methods. In other words, they developed a different type of political communication.

Religious radicalism is characteristic of a tendency toward social isolation of those perceived as the enemy, which is, in the end, directed at physical elimination and destruction.

Left radicalism presented itself in our research as extreme anarchism. This could be seen in cases of armed social conflict, just as it was during the Stalinist dictatorship. Highly effective preventive measures toward democratization were developed within our research.

Self-activating problem solutions were promoted. The subjects were confronted with their own behavioral methods and their achieved public effects. Self-reflection was activated. When this was perceived by the subject as an accusation, of reproach or cautionary warning, then the preventive effect was considered to be zero. When the concept was presented to the subject as a question and perceived as such, then a self-competent reflection was triggered with the effect of the subject relinquishing his previously used behavioral methods.

Some of the children of the radical subjects were included in the study. It could be shown that those with a high degree of "Autonomy" rejected radicalism. Those children who were very emotionally dependent on their parents, tended to adopt their ideological radicalism.

Right and left radicalized groups tended to have similar goals, however they chose different means of achieving them.

## **RESULTS ON ANTISEMITISM**

Extreme antisemitism is closely related to the criteria for right-winged radicalism.

We can demonstrate that an extremely relevant connection exists between the development of a radical tendency toward destruction and antisemitism.

In this context, there are three psychosocial processes that move to the forefront.

1. The existing destructive trend is based on historically grown arguments and prejudices directed toward the Jewish religion and thus against Jewishness in general.
2. Every negative experience with Jewish individuals or groups are generalized and considered to be characteristic of Judaism as a whole. As such, positive experiences with the Jewish are not acknowledged or recognized and thus not even considered.
3. Due to the generalization of experiences and accumulation of negative information, the tendency toward nihilation is intensified to the point of becoming obsessive and an addictive trend is developed.

The development and maintenance of antisemitism can be seen as a multi-causal effect of family polarization in "good" and "bad" with regard to social pain of suffering.

The ideology of radicalism and antisemitism corresponds primarily to the feeling of relief from an emotional pain of rejection by idealization and ideology.

Thus, one tries to achieve a positive social and emotional status through destruction of the political opponent.

Antisemitism appears as the extreme expression of a drive toward destruction of an supposed imagined opponent.

Therapeutic intervention against radicalism automatically also reduces antisemitism.

The stronger the trend is toward "democratic" behavior, the weaker the antisemitism.

In the last months there is going on an international organized public extermination act with discrimination, insults and not true claims against Professor Eysenck and Professor Grossarth-Maticek. Grossarth-Maticek will answer in a detailed scientific article the discriminatory accusation. Is this a fascist extermination act?

#### **ON THE MEANING OF THE STUDY:**

The study is unique in the world in the context of written mediated prevention of radicalism. The text was presented to 33 radical individuals. A year later a reexamination showed that 16 subjects had altered their radical behavior toward democratic behavior.

123 Holocaust survivors and 141 Individuals who were held in communistic concentration camps longer than a year had significant more cancer, coronary heart disorders and died earlier than 255 individuals who were never imprisoned.

The field of research on extreme radicalism is part of multicausal preventive medicine, including political medical prevention and **causal research** of **serious** chronic illnesses.

Dr. med. Dr. phil. Dr. med sci. Dr. h. c. Ronald Ferdinand Grossarth-Maticek  
Professor of Preventive Medicine, Postgraduate Studies ECPD.  
International Center for Multicausal Research and Preventive Medicine  
Leiter der Deutsch-Japanischen Kooperation zur Interventions-Forschung  
Academician, Serbian Academy of Science and Arts.  
Ziegelhäuser Landstraße 35  
69120 Heidelberg  
Tel: +49 6221 6534654; Cell phone: + 49151 27027469  
Mail: [ronald.grossarth@gmail.com](mailto:ronald.grossarth@gmail.com)  
[www.grossarth-maticek.de](http://www.grossarth-maticek.de)

#### REFERENCES:

Adorno, Theodor W.: **Studien zum autoritären Charakter** / Theodor W. Adorno.  
Übers. von Milli Weinbrenner. - 1. Aufl., Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, **1995**.

Abdel-Samad, Hamed: **Der islamische Faschismus** : eine Analyse / Hamed Abdel-Samad. -  
München: Droemer, **2014**

Albert Bandura, Richard H. Walters: *Social Learning and personality development*. Holt Rinehart and Winston, New York 1963.

Albert Bandura: Lernen am Modell. Ansätze zu einer sozial-kognitiven Lerntheorie. Klett, Stuttgart 1976, ISBN 3-12-920590-X.

Ronald Grossarth-Maticek: Revolution der Gestörten – Motivationsstrukturen und Faktoren der Differenzierung bei politisch engagierten Studenten. Quelle + Meyer, 1982.

Helm Stierlin: Adolf Hitler. Familienperspektiven, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt/Main 1975 (Neuaufgabe 1995)

Klaus von Beyme: Politische Theorien im Zeitalter der Ideologien, Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag (2002)

Kai Arzheimer: Die Wähler der extremen Rechten 1980–2002. VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2008.

Fabian Virchow: Gegen den Zivilismus. Internationale Beziehungen und Militär in den politischen Konzeptionen der extremen Rechten, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2006.

Fabian Virchow, Alexander Häusler (Hrsg.): Handbuch Rechtsextremismus (= Edition Rechtsextremismus). Band 1: Analysen. Springer VS, Wiesbaden 2012.

Gideon Botsch: Die extreme Rechte in der Bundesrepublik 1949 bis heute. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt 2012.

Glanninger, Peter: Rassismus und Rechtsextremismus. Rassistische Argumentationsmuster und ihre historischen Entwicklungslinien. (Mensch und Gesellschaft. Schriftenreihe für Sozialmedizin, Sozialpsychiatrie und medizinische Anthropologie, Bd. 16) Peter Lang Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

Andreas Lienkamp: Zum Widerstand verpflichtet. Rechtsextremismus als Herausforderung für Christinnen und Christen. In: Herder Korrespondenz 63, 9/2009, S. 477–480

József Bayer: Rechtspopulismus und Rechtsextremismus in Ostmitteleuropa. In: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft. 31, 2002, S. 265–280 (online).

Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Hrsg.): Neue Entwicklungen des Rechtsextremismus. Internationalisierung und Entdeckung der sozialen Frage. Berlin 2006.

Thomas Greven, Thomas Grumke (Hrsg.): Globalisierter Rechtsextremismus? Die extremistische Rechte in der Ära der Globalisierung. VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2006.

Wolfgang Kowalsky, Wolfgang Schroeder (Hrsg.): Rechtsextremismus, Einführung und Forschungsbilanz. Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen 1994, S. 185–276.

Reich, Wilhelm: Die Funktionen des Orgasmus: sexualökonomische Grundprobleme der biologischen Energie. 8. Aufl. Köln: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, **2004**. - 309 S. : Ill., (Die Entdeckung des Orgons / Wilhelm Reich ; 1), (KiWi ; 122)

Trockij, Lev Davidovič: **Stalin** : eine Biographie / Leo Trotzky. - Köln [u.a.]: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, **1952**. - 579 S.

**Thanks to Professor H.J. Eysenck for the close scientific cooperation**

**and to the interviewers and employees in the study:**

- 1) Bärbel Hackenberg M.A.**
- 2) Lilo Kamp**
- 3) Karim Kurz**
- 4) Dr. Dieter Hildenbrand**
- 5) Dr. Thomas Rübke**
- 6) Dr. Fritz Kramer**
- 7) Professor Peter Opalic**
- 8) Renate Weber**
- 9) Josip Lucacevic**

10) Elisabeth Stroh

11) Teddy Kollek

12) Pantalazic

13) Veronica Lucac

14) Professor W. Maslow

**About the coordinated data collection method:**

- 1) All employees received from Grossarth the description of the criteria for classification into respective categories, e.g. German, Serbian, Croatian, Hungarian and Jewish radicals
- 2) Anti-Semites (e.g. the Jews are the main cause of economic and financial crises in the world, Hitler was not entirely wrong in annihilating the Jews, etc.).
- 3) Democrats

A division of labor took place after the handover of criteria. One group was active in identifying people who met the criteria. They were able to identify former Waffen SS members, radical nationalists, etc.

As a rule, Grossarth got in touch and explained the purpose of the study to the groups and their leaders. This was done somewhat constructively and even opportunistically. For example: The goal of their political engagement is justified in many areas. We want to investigate whether their method matches the objective. If not, certain fixes can be successful. If the interview was approved, other employees reactivated.

The method of the investigation was a combination of using an observation catalog with registration of the arguments of the respondents and, if necessary, subsequent explanation of the variables.

The answers were documented by the respondents as:

- 1) I agree with the claim (1 point)
- 2) I tend to agree with the claim (0.5 points)

After the survey, for example, the criteria for radicalism, anti-Semitism and democracy could be compared on the basis of points given, e.g.

**more democratic behavior or more radical behavior depending on the area in which the highest score was achieved.**