



# HIGH-INTENSITY



RALPH DEHAAN

## UNNECESSARY COMPLICATIONS

by Dr. Ken E. Leistner

**I**f I may be allowed to both paraphrase and expand upon something that was said to me many, many years ago, the point about complications will be well made: "If you could take double your bodyweight and do twenty squats with it; follow with stiff-legged deadlifts off a block using one-and-a-half times bodyweight for twenty-to-thirty reps; knock off your bench press using double bodyweight for sets of ten; hit the back with dumbbell rows—one-hundred-and-twenty pounders, strict form, sets of twelve-to-fifteen; come in with dips—one hundred and fifty pounds added to your bodyweight, full range, slow, steady, fifteen reps; do some chins, again with one hundred pounds added for a fully contracted, fully stretched set of ten; do some dumbbell presses, hundreds again for a seated, strict set of ten; and then finish with barbell curls, two hundreds times a very tight twelve reps—*would you be strong? Would you be a heck of a lot bigger—muscularly bigger—than you are now?*"

If there was ever a question that begged for a "yes" answer, this is it. Obviously, if the average, above average, or even genetic superior could stick with the above basic movements they would give more than ample stimulation to all of the major muscular structures in the body. I wouldn't put too much energy into worrying about "my underdeveloped rear deltoid head" either. The rows, presses, and dips will bust that one out very nicely, as well as the more obvious upper body bulges.

If you could do no more than add one-and-a-quarter, two-and-a-half, or five pounds to each basic movement during each workout session—or more realistically, every two, three or four workouts—and could and would do so consistently over time, you might eventually

use substantial weight in each movement.

Though the goals should be in front of the trainee at all times, the stated poundages might prove to be too much for many average and hard gainers. If you strive towards those stated poundage goals, and if nothing else, double what you are presently using in these basic movements, you will have provided ever progressive resistance over time.

Thus far, this simple procedure of

Unless you want to equate this type of training to manual labor, where one does arduous but steady work over the course of a few hours. Intense and brutal it is not—and for most, *that* is the requirement for stimulating gains.

If we choose the easy-to-relate-to, obvious examples of the arms, and you do no more than barbell curls, but do them so intensely—so "hard" that you literally cannot generate any bar movement before dropping the bar after the completion of one set—then you will pro-

## Bodybuilding and every other aspect of weight training has become so unnecessarily complicated that the true benefits of the activities have been lost...

choosing the basic movements and making them truly progressive, will have provided average bodybuilders with the opportunity to get much larger and harder than they are now. If you could actually get to the point that the original statement made—no matter what the starting point—you would have gained perhaps, all of the muscle tissue that your physical potential will allow. And is this necessary?

Simply put, *nothing else* is necessary or even justified. One does not build large, muscular biceps by changing the program every month, or upon the publication of a new magazine. It is not done by choosing four or more biceps and triceps movements. Once that is done, it becomes obvious that one is no longer working hard. It is impossible to utilize six or eight different arm movements, in addition to other movements that are necessary to train the rest of the body, and believe that one is working "hard."

Working long? Yes. Working hard? No.

vide *maximal stimulation* for the muscles involved in curling the barbell. Is a second set necessary? For most, no. For the minority that can benefit from a second set, fine. Does anyone now need one, two, or three other movements that also work the same muscles involved in flexion of the forearm? I think not—yet that is much more preferable than working the one or two sets of curls until one's eyeballs fall out.

"I need variety," you say. "I have to confuse my muscles with different stimulation patterns." If pure garbage such as this, taken as fact in the gyms and muscle magazines, ever made its way into a scientific journal, it would read better than any comic book.

Yes, a contest-level bodybuilder will want more variety, with the understanding that he might have already reached his muscular limit, yet wants to insure that he presents a "full muscle" look. Someone who is still screwing around with the weights that most of our high school athletes use after eight

*(Continued on page 144)*

