

YOUR KINDLE NOTES FOR:

The Wisdom of Mike Mentzer: The Art, Science and Philosophy of a Bodybuilding Legend

John R. Little and Joanne Sharkey

Last accessed on Saturday September 21, 2019

5 Highlight(s) | 0 Note(s)

Yellow highlight | Location: 766

> Overload can be explained in this way: the body receives no training effect from doing what it finds easy to do. To receive any benefit from his training, the individual must increase—beyond his usual level—the severity or intensity of the exercise he is performing. He must impose a demand on his muscles of a higher intensity than they are accustomed to in their normal, day-to-day activity.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 783

> Whether you train with free weights or machines, the greater the intensity, the greater the stimulus for greater size and strength. (Courtesy of Weider Health and Fitness.)

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 940

> However, no matter how effectively or scientifically the training programs are improved and intensified, these words of Mike Mentzer remain true: “You can train hard or you can train long—you just can’t do both. And it just so happens that it takes hard training to build big muscles.”

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,058

> “Two sets performed once every seven, eight, or nine days works almost like magic for the majority of bodybuilders I’m training.” A team of exercise physiologists would in fact verify Mike’s conclusion that

substantial periods of time are required simply to recover from intense exercise.

Note:

Yellow highlight | Location: 1,061

In a study that was published in the May 1993 edition of the Journal of Physiology, a mere six months after our conversation, it was reported that a group of men and women (ages twenty-two to thirty-two) took part in an exercise experiment in which they trained their biceps muscles in a negative-only fashion to a point of muscular failure. Negatives are considered by some exercise physiologists to be more intense than positive or concentric contractions because more weight can be employed, and thus the intensity of the exercise can be increased. In the experiment, the subjects sat on a preacher bench and performed three negative-only sets of preacher curls in which the resistance was raised for them, and they had to concentrate on lowering the resistance (determined to be 90 percent of their maximum isometric force capability) in a time span of five to nine seconds. Typically, each set consisted of five to fifteen such repetitions. After a two-minute rest period, a second set was performed in this fashion with a resistance that had been reduced by 10 percent. After another two-minute rest, a third and final set was performed with another 10 percent reduction in weight. All of the test subjects were found to be most sore two days after exercising (a common occurrence, by the way), and the soreness in their biceps was gone by the ninth day. However, the fact that the subjects' muscles were still sore after nine days meant that they had not yet recovered from their workout, meaning that even more time was still required to elapse before overcompensation (growth) could take place. Indeed, the day after their three-set workout, the subjects were in no condition to train again, exhibiting what the experimenters termed "a dramatic 35 percent loss of strength." And ten days after the workout, the subjects' recovery ability was only 5 percent better, as the experimenters noted, "even on the tenth post-exercise day the muscles had recovered only to about 70 percent of their control strength." If this rate of recovery is the "norm," then we are looking at 5 percent every ten days, and the full recovery process may take anywhere from sixty to seventy days (or longer)—after only a three-set workout for the biceps! The experimenters, John N. Howell, Gary Chleboun, and Robert Conatser (from the Somatic Dysfunction Research Laboratory of the College of Osteopathic Medicine and the Department of Biological Sciences at Ohio University, Athens), concluded likewise in their summary: "Muscle strength declined by almost 40 percent after the

> exercise and recovery was only slight ten days later; the half-time of recovery appeared to be as long as five to six weeks.” In

Note: