

Letter to: Kate Wilson (Elsevier), April 3, 2021

## **Ronald Ferdinand Grossarth-Maticek**

Answer to the discrimination by three Englishmen with their aim of total and absolute destruction of the scientific reputations of both Professor Eysenck and Dr. Ronald Grossarth Maticek.

### A) Scientific achievement by Grossarth Maticek

Grossarth-Maticek and his plethora of international collaborators have developed a universal research program that includes many different aspects, all scientifically rigorous.

Our method: Prospective intervention studies with the raw data passed on to independent/controlling scientists – before any statistical analyses are undertaken and the results are known – ensures the integrity and validity of the obtained results.

Our multi-causal theory for the development and prevention of chronic diseases shows that several factors interact synergistically to enable a high level of prediction (and possibly prevention) of chronic diseases. Predictive power of our prospective intervention studies is many times better than from mono-causal studies.

Modern" science: Our scientific results were published in over 100 international peer-reviewed journals and recommended for publication by over 300 independent expert reviewers. Now three Englishmen, led by psychologist David Marks and Professor Edward Byrne, demanded that Eysenck and Grossarth's published articles be withdrawn. Byrne systematically wrote to all editors and institutions and described our published work as "unsafe". At no time was due process followed. Byrne never spoke to me and never asked me to provide any rebuttal to any allegations about the integrity of the data collected in any of our multi-causal studies. It was unethical for the King's College committee to draw any definitive conclusions of "unsafe" data when they never viewed any of the original data nor subjected it to any statistical analyses. In fact, it would appear that they have merely drawn speculative inferences based on some very large effect sizes that were found in some of our collaborative studies only. In our methodology study published in *Behaviour Research and Therapy* (1995), there was no basis to conclude that this methodology study was based on "unsafe" data, since 50% of the statistical analyses were NOT SIGNIFICANT and no very large effect sizes were reported!

On the basis of subjective speculations, Pelosi and Marks express the most serious accusations, and discriminate against Eysenck and Grossarth without any objective evidence. Byrne's demand that the published articles be withdrawn despite the lack of due process (neither Grossarth, nor any of his co-authors were given an opportunity to defend themselves) is unethical and gives the appearance of a "Kangaroo Court" operating under a "lynch mob" mentality!

From 1972 to 2007, Grossarth carried out the largest psychosomatic study into radicalism, anti-Semitism, and democracy. He was able to show that radicalism and fascism are reduced when psychosocial motivations are addressed. The victims of fascism and

Stalinism fell ill with cancer twice as more often than those not subjected to such totalitarian control and intimidation.

## B) The Scientific Achievement by the English Critics

Psychologist David Marks, and psychiatrist Antony Pelosi both of whom are quoted by Byrne, have not produced a single scientific publication relating to the multi-causal synergistic prediction (and prevention) of chronic disease. In their criticism of both Grossarth and Eysenck, they did not provide any evidence of their own expertise in this specialist field of research. By exploiting the academic reputation of King's College (where Professor Byrne is Principal), the three Englishmen have attempted to destroy the academic reputations of both Grossarth and Eysenck, with the result that Grossarth is no longer able to publish his empirical research findings, nor defend the dignity of the now long-deceased Professor H.J. Eysenck.

The language of the English critics is insulting and derogatory. Out of no fewer than 158 unsubstantiated insults/accusations, here are but three examples:

- Pelosi claimed that Grossarth is a liar and fraudster who falsifies his data (The Guardian, 2020).
- Pelosi claimed that Eysenck and Grossarth's multi-causal research program is the greatest scientific scandal of all time (Personality and fatal diseases: Revisiting a scientific scandal, *Journal of Health Psychology*, February 22, 2019).
- Marks claimed that Hans Eysenck's attempts to elucidate the multi-causal synergistic links between cigarette smoking and cancer, are part of his eternal shame and that he uttered the "most shameful deceptions" of any scientist in the 20th century (The Hans Eysenck affair: Time to correct the scientific record, *Journal of Health Psychology*, February 22, 2019).

Marks continued that "It is imperative to prevent these studies from being cited or even used as therapeutic measures." Clearly, the aim here is absolute censorship.

### Summary:

- 1- Pelosi, Marks and Byrne make discriminatory claims based on subjective beliefs and speculative inferences without any objective/definitive evidence of "unsafe" data.
- 2- Professor Byrne wrote to the editors of all the journals in which Eysenck and Grossarth had published their multi-causal research with the demand that all their peer-reviewed articles be withdrawn.
- 3- Byrne wrote defamatory letters/emails to almost everyone whom Grossarth knew, and to the institutions with which Grossarth had been associated (e.g., Heidelberg University).
- 4- Byrne never contacted Grossarth, and did not follow due process by allowing Grossarth (or his international co-authors) the opportunity to address any of the allegations of "unsafe" data.
- 5- The language of Pelosi and Marks is highly offensive inciting the total insolation,

ensorship and destruction of the academic reputations of both Professor Eysenck (one of the most highly cited psychologists in the world), and Grossarth.

6- Byrne, Pelosi and Marks systematically and deliberately hide the information previously made available by Eysenck and Grossarth – that psychologist Dr. Van der Ploeg had made discriminatory, false accusations against Grossarth despite his having no original data from Grossarth.

7- The second psychologist, Professor Amelang whom Byrne quotes in his letter, has withdrawn his untrue claims before the Heidelberg district court. (See public session of the Heidelberg Regional Court, file number: 3 0 333/04, <https://grossarth-maticek.de/>).

8- According to Professor Eysenck's communication to Grossarth (in the presence of witnesses), Pelosi had demanded the following from Eysenck:

*“Get away from Grossarth-Maticek and claim that he is a fraudster and a liar who falsifies his data and that you came to this conclusion after checking the original data from Grossarth. If you make this statement public, then I'll leave you alone. If not then I will destroy you forever, together with your German slave.”*

Eysenck replied: *“I have checked Grossarth many times, he is absolutely correct and a great scientist.”*

Pelosi: *“We all know that; otherwise we wouldn't go to such great expense.”*

Eysenck: *“That is blackmail.”* Pelosi: *“Of course, but you have no choice.”*

Grossarth to Eysenck:

This information is bad for me. Unfortunately I can't prove that it is true even though

(Eysenck) absolutely believe. If Pelosi really said that then it makes me very wedding ring. I am very interested in cooperating positively with English scientists.

9- Van Der Ploeg's lies: He has pressured our head of data collection, Ms. B. Hackenberg, and asked for access to the original data from the prospective studies. Van Der Ploeg could not prove that he was in possession of any original data (resulting in conflict between Hackenberg and Van Der Ploeg). The original data from these studies more than 30 years ago no longer exist, yet are still cited in Pelosi's speculative allegations.

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

Van Der Ploeg, HM, Kleijn, WC (1993) Some further doubts about the Grossarth-Maticek database. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4: 68-69.

10- Grossarth is convinced that Pelosi, Marks and Byrne work closely together. Pelosi creates discrimination through claims without evidence. Marks justifies Pelosi and

introduces him as having absolute integrity. Marks advises Byrne to demand the withdrawal of published articles by Eysenck and Grossarth. Byrne quotes Pelosi and presents him as credible.

11-Byrne writes to Journal Editors asserting that the articles by Grossarth and Eysenck are based on “unsafe” data and refers to the King’s College inquiry that did not obtain or examine any original Grossarth data. Pelosi and Marks never saw the original Grossarth data either, yet all three Englishmen feel justified in insinuating that the Grossarth data was “unsafe”.

12- The attacked articles of Grossarth and Eysenck, have included 63 partial replications of which 58 were positive, including the following works:

R. Grossarth-Maticek, H.J. Eysenck, Creative novation behaviour therapy as a prophylactic treatment for cancer and coronary heart disease: Part I—Description of treatment. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, Volume 29, Issue 1, 1991, Pages 1-16.

H.J. Eysenck, R. Grossarth-Maticek, Creative novation behaviour therapy as a prophylactic treatment for cancer and coronary heart disease: Part II—Effects of treatment. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, Volume 29, Issue 1, 1991, Pages 17-31.

In one of the replication studies by Professor Petar Opalic, it was shown that metastatic cancer patients lived twice as long if they received autonomy training.

13-The editors of journals who have so far advocated withdrawal are almost all from Elsevier whose boss is E. Byrne (as President of the King’s College) with Dr. A. Pelosi recommended as reviewer. The denials of “unsafe” data and resistance of renowned scientists against Professor Byrne, Elsevier (Kate Wilson) and the Editor of *Behavior Research and Therapy* (Michelle Craske) is not taken into account.

14-Grossarth will seek legal redress pursuant to the defamatory insults levelled against him by Pelosi, Marks, and Byrne.

#### Summary:

Pelosi, Marks and Byrne discriminate against Grossarth and Eysenck with the aim of destroying their scientific reputations. Their denigrative criticism about “unsafe” data is based on subjective claims and pseudo-inferences without having access to any of the original data. Among other things, they have offended by casting false, derogatory suspicions and speculative insinuations.

Then the critics are asked to obtain scientific statements

#### Totalitarian behaviour exhibits the following characteristics:

- 1- Accusation without objective/definitive evidence.
- 2- No possibility for accused to defend against any allegations.
- 3- Total urge to annihilate the victims.

Grossarth advocates freedom of expression wherein all scientific research is considered “fair game” for academic criticism and debate. The activities of Pelosi, Marks and Byrne go

far beyond scientific criticism in the direction of an organized plot to destroy the academic credibility of Grossarth and Eysenck. In their act of attempted annihilation, they publicly disseminate derogatory insults and discrimination without providing any objective evidence.

Grossarth was never asked by Byrne to comment on the claim of “unsafe” data. Instead, Byrne calls on all editors and public institutions to withdraw Grossarth's work without informing Grossarth (or his co-authors) of what was going on. Grossarth has studied the motivation of totalitarianism and anti-Semitism for over 50 years and has made important findings that are now rejected for publication by international editors due to the malicious accusations made by Byrne, Pelosi, and Marks.

The tendency towards total annihilation of Grossarth's work without the opportunity for defence is reminiscent of the book burning of the Nazis. The act of extermination without evidence reminds Grossarth of Stalinist and fascist behaviour.

Here is an example from a renowned professor from Australia:

In relation to the retraction of a BRT (1995) methodology paper in which no excessively large effect sizes were reported that could raise any inference whatsoever that the Grossarth data was “unsafe”, an Australian professor replied to Ms. Kate Wilson at Elsevier as follows:

*“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?”*

Grossarth attempted to establish multi-causal, synergetic preventive medicine. In addition to a large number of internationally famous scientists who support the work of Grossarth, three English scientists are trying to set up an organization with the aim of a total destruction of the scientific reputation of Grossarth and his numerous scientific staff. Grossarth has only one final answer: He writes a summarized scientific article on the topic: Preventive Medicine Behavioral Oncology - Synergistic Effects in the Development and prevention of Chronic Diseases. A book will also be written on the same topic

Then the critics are asked to obtain scientific statements

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 Head of the German-  
Japanese cooperation on intervention research Academician, Serbian Academy  
of Science and Arts.

Brick houses on Landstrasse 35  
69120 Heidelberg

Tel: +49 6221 6534654; Cell phone: +49 151 27027469

Mail: [ronald.grossarth@gmail.com](mailto:ronald.grossarth@gmail.com)

[www.grossarth-maticek.de](http://www.grossarth-maticek.de)

