

## Wikipedia IDENTITY FRAUD CASE STUDY: IP ADDRESS 41.241.234.65

Investigated by Jason Dale


---

### Important notes

- This particular **CASE STUDY** has been extracted from a larger report which I have prepared entitled "**WIKIPEDIA INVESTIGATION**". If you would like a copy of the more comprehensive report please write to [jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com](mailto:jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com) and I will send you the information with pleasure
- Please note that the referenced Wikipedia article for which this case study refers; located at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code) has recently been deleted from Wikipedia by admin user "*Juliancolton*" on the 24 April 2009 at 02:33 on grounds of unverifiable claims and original research. However, all of the needed information was downloaded prior to the deletion of the article, which includes a more comprehensive report detailing changes that were made between the 30<sup>th</sup> of January 2006 and 22<sup>nd</sup> of April 2009 inclusive. The information presented can be validated by Wikipedia should this prove necessary.
- Douglas Forbes is the co-author of the book "*Human Pin Code*" [ISBN **186916001-0 / 9781869160012**] together with Richard Higgins. This book refers to a system now called the "DNA Pin Code", which is claimed to be a "scientific" system for personality analysis. Forbes insists that his system is not based on Numerology and also claims to integrate knowledge from disciplines such as "*bio-genetics, psychology, physiology and bio-mathematics*". Forbes also claimed on Wikipedia that his system "*has its basis strictly in physics and atomic theory*". Forbes has no formal qualifications other than a claimed PhD in Metaphysics, which is an esoteric field of study that has nothing to do with physics or atomic theory. The public are charged exorbitant sums of money to receive "Pin Code" readings from him and to attend his courses and workshops. The claimed "95-99%" accuracy of his system has never been proven. Many individuals have been hoaxed out of their money by believing these claims.
- Forbes has also documented that he has solved "*Pythagoras's theorem of the Octagon*" which Albert Einstein had supposedly been attempting to solve shortly before his death. Yet no theorem by this name has ever been proven to exist, nor has Albert Einstein ever been associated with any such theorem. Forbes has made a series of other claims of a "scientific" nature which include, *inter alia*, his own theories on the speed of light, "cell mitosis", a "correction" on one of Einstein's formulas as well as a supposed "link" which he has "discovered" between the physical and "metaphysical" worlds. Again, none of these claims have been proven or substantiated.
- I have engaged Forbes in a series of email exchanges where I demonstrated to him several inaccuracies and contradictions in his "scientific" theories which are documented in his books and reinforced further in his earlier emails and verbal representations. To date Forbes has failed to explain these contradictions.
- An individual claiming to be "Matthew Kirkland", presumably an associate of Forbes, claimed on Wikipedia that "*Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 23 October 2008*". My patent investigations in collaboration with an IP specialist/Patent attorney have proven these claims to be fraudulent. In response to my letter of the 4<sup>th</sup> of April 2008 addressed to a list of recipients which included both the "REAL" Matthew Kirkland and Douglas Forbes; the "REAL" Matthew Kirkland subsequently replied on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April 2008 at 7:07am and claimed that he was not aware of any such comments on Wikipedia, and that his name was used fraudulently and without his authorization.

- I investigated the matter further and conducted an in-depth analysis into the change history as recorded by Wikipedia for the article. The Wikipedia records revealed that the comments supposedly coming from individuals calling themselves "Matthew Kirkland", "**Justin Little Bcom Wits**" as well as "**Douglas Forbes**" all came from the **SAME IP address (41.241.234.65)** on the **SAME CALENDAR DAY (24 October 2008)** between the times **10:15 and 12:50**. The comments from both "Matthew Kirkland" and "Justin Little" were made in under **10 minutes** of each other. The dates quoted by the "contributors" as signatures for their comments do not match the dates and/or times recorded by Wikipedia.
  - Please note that apart from the BLUE CALL-OUT BALLONS and the underlined comments in **BOLD RED FONT,** The content that appears below was copied VERBATIM from the Wikipedia logs. Nothing was changed ... not even the colour of the fonts used.
- 

P.T.O



**CALL-OUT BALLONS ARE  
ADDED FOR ADDITIONAL  
COMMENTS BY JASON DALE  
WHERE APPLICABLE**

## **IMMEDIATELY BEFORE PATENT CLAIMS**

# Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**[Revision as of 09:17, 20 October 2008](#)** ([edit](#))

[Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#) | [contribs](#))

[← Previous edit](#)

**[Revision as of 10:15, 24 October 2008](#)** ([edit](#)) ([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#)

([talk](#))

([← Blanked the page](#))

[Next edit →](#)

### Line 1:

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

-

:I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - [[User:Sperril|Sperril]] 10:56, 19 March 2006 (UTC)

-

::The article should mention that there is no Octagon Theorem and that Douglas Forbes is extremely secretive. He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

-

This entire article reeks of BS. At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

-

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me - [[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

### Line 1:

**P.T.O**

Revision as of 10:15, 24 October 2008

# Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

[Revision as of 10:15, 24 October 2008](#)  
([edit](#))

[41.241.234.65](#)  
([talk](#))

([←](#)Blanked the page)

[← Previous edit](#)

[Revision as of 10:16, 24 October 2008](#) ([edit](#)) ([undo](#))  
[Maxis ftw](#) ([talk](#) | [contribs](#))

([Undid](#) revision 247355750 by [41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#)))

[Next edit →](#)



**Line 1:**

**Line 1:**

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

+  
+  
+I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - [[User:Sperril|Sperril]] 10:56, 19 March 2006 (UTC)

+  
+  
+::The article should mention that there is no Octagon Theorem and that Douglas Forbes is extremely secretive. He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

+  
+  
+This entire article reeks of BS. At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

+  
+  
+Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me  
+[[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

**P.T.O**

## Revision as of 10:16, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - [Sperril](#) 10:56, 19 March 2006 (UTC)

The article should mention that there is no Octagon Theorem and that Douglas Forbes is extremely secretive. He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

This entire article reeks of BS. At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

## THE PATENT CLAIMS BY “MATTHEW KIRKLAND” APPEAR

# Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**Revision as of 10:16, 24 October 2008**

([edit](#))

[Maxis ftw](#) ([talk](#) | [contribs](#))

([Undid](#) revision 247355750 by

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#)))

[← Previous edit](#)

**Revision as of 11:41, 24 October 2008**

([edit](#)) ([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

### Line 1:

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

:I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - [\[\[User:Sperril|Sperril\]\] 10:56, 19 March 2006 \(UTC\)](#)

- **::The article should mention that there is no Octagon Theorem and that Douglas Forbes is extremely secretive. He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.**

- This entire article reeks of BS. At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me  
[\[\[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve\]\]](#) ([\[\[User](#)

### Line 1:

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

+ :I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - **He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.**

+ **At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?**

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me  
[\[\[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve\]\]](#) ([\[\[User](#)

talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]] 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]] 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

+

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 23 October 2008.

## Revision as of 11:41, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 23 October 2008.

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

## AN ADDITIONAL SERIES OF EDITS FROM THE SAME IP ADDRESS

# Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**Revision as of 11:41, 24 October 2008**

([edit](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[← Previous edit](#)

**Revision as of 11:50, 24 October 2008**

([edit](#)) ([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

### Line 7:

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me  
[[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the -DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland **23** October 2008.

### Line 7:

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me  
[[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

+ Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the +DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland **21** October 2008.

+  
+

+ I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over +30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user 23 October - Justin Little Bcom Wits.  
+ Justin Little Bcom. WITS UNI. 23 October 2008

“Notice the bad spelling, plus all of the date edits” Jason Dale

## Revision as of 11:50, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?



Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#))  
09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21  
October 2008.

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE  
HUMANPINCODE - user 23 October - Justin Little Bcom Wits. Justin Little Bcom. WITS  
UNI. 23 October 2008

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

**MORE EDITS FROM THE SAME IP ADDRESS TRYING TO FIX ALL OF THE ERRORS. (Notice the spelling errors)**

## Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**[Revision as of 11:50, 24 October 2008](#)**

([edit](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[← Previous edit](#)

**[Revision as of 11:51, 24 October 2008](#)** ([edit](#))

([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

### Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user 23 October - Justin Little Bcom Wits.

- Justin Little Bcom. WITS UNI. 23 October 2008

### Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user 23 October - Justin Little Bcom Wits. **23 October 2008**

## Revision as of 11:51, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user 23 October - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

**YET MORE EDITS FROM THE SAME IP ADDRESS, AGAIN TRYING TO EDIT THE COMMENTS TO MAKE IT LOOK "AUTHENTIC". THE AUTHOR APPEARS CONFUSED AND MUDDLES SOME OF THE DETAILS**

## Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**Revision as of 11:51, 24 October 2008** ([edit](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))


[← Previous edit](#)

**Revision as of 12:03, 24 October 2008**

([edit](#)) ([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)



### Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user **23 October** - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

### Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

## Revision as of 12:03, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

**NOTICE HOW THE SECTION "DOUGLAS FORBES WRITES ..." SUDDENLY APPEARS ... AND AGAIN FROM THE SAME IP ADDRESS!**

# Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**Revision as of 12:03, 24**

**October 2008** ([edit](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[← Previous edit](#)

**Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008** ([edit](#)) ([undo](#))

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

"User 'Justin' still has something to say" <Jason Dale>

## Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA - alone of THE HUMANPINCODE - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

## Line 9:

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, **that should make a statement in itself.** - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

"Take note of the BAD SPELLING by Douglas Forbes. Notice also that user 'Justin' seems to have the same spelling problem ... and the same IP address" <Jason Dale>

Douglas Forbes writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge.

I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world.

The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward.

To the skeptics, and I have lerned more from the skeptics than anyone else, thank you, BUT, have I got a surprise for you. Watch this space. Please do put your real names so we know who you are.

We will all be accountable in the end, so please do not hide, all your titles and certificates should be added with your full name. Thank you.

I have the scientific proof, but how stupid could one be to release it and give another person a chance to 'steal' it because of endless funds and resourses, I fund myself, so it will take a little longer, I beleive in what I do, I have a passion for my work and research.

I research everything to the enth degree before writing a word about it. I beleive one day I will be accountable, and will gladly stand up and be counted.I consult with Dr Brauteseth, a leading psychiatrist in RSA, who checks my work and tests it. I am very aware that there are fragile people out there, and try to be as repsonsable as I can without loosing the message when I write books. The academics dont seem to undtstand this. it so easy to hide behind the work of founders and people who broke the rules before, who are now accepted as the be all and end all. The mere thought that I have

disturbed and challenged the academics means I am doing something right, or I would just be dismissed and ignored. Dont knock it until you have really tried it. Thank you all.

+ The person who breaks the rules is sure to get hit by the shrapnel.  
D.F.

---

## Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 Otober 2008

Douglas Forbes writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge. I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world. The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward. To the skeptics, and I have lerned more from the skeptics than anyone else, thank you, BUT, have I got a surprise for you. Watch this space. Please do put your real names so we know who you are. We will all be accountable in the end, so please do not hide, all your titles and certificates should be added with your full name. Thank you. I have the scientific proof, but how stupid could one be to release it and give another person a chance to 'steal' it because of endless funds and resourses,

I fund myself, so it will take a little longer, I believe in what I do, I have a passion for my work and research. I research everything to the nth degree before writing a word about it. I believe one day I will be accountable, and will gladly stand up and be counted. I consult with Dr Brauteseth, a leading psychiatrist in RSA, who checks my work and tests it. I am very aware that there are fragile people out there, and try to be as responsible as I can without losing the message when I write books. The academics don't seem to understand this. It's so easy to hide behind the work of founders and people who broke the rules before, who are now accepted as the be all and end all. The mere thought that I have disturbed and challenged the academics means I am doing something right, or I would just be dismissed and ignored. Don't knock it until you have really tried it. Thank you all. The person who breaks the rules is sure to get hit by the shrapnel. D.F.

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**



## **MORE MINOR EDITS**

# Talk:Human pin code

[From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia](#)

[\(Difference between revisions\)](#)

[Jump to: navigation, search](#)

[Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008 \(edit\)](#)

[41.241.234.65 \(talk\)](#)

[← Previous edit](#)

[Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008 \(edit\)](#)

[\(undo\)](#)

[41.241.234.65 \(talk\)](#)

[Next edit →](#)

**Line 12:**

**Douglas Forbes** writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge.

I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world.

The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward.

**Line 12:**

**DOUGLAS FORBES** writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge.

I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world.

The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward.

## **Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008**

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and

is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve \(talk\)](#) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

DOUGLAS FORBES writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it responsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge. I have now been approached by 2 Universities to incorporate the work into the academic world. The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward. To the skeptics, and I have learned more from the skeptics than anyone else, thank you, BUT, have I got a surprise for you. Watch this space. Please do put your real names so we know who you are. We will all be accountable in the end, so please do not hide, all your titles and certificates should be added with your full name. Thank you. I have the scientific proof, but how stupid could one be to release it and give another person a chance to 'steal' it because of endless funds and resources, I fund myself, so it will take a little longer, I believe in what I do, I have a passion for my work and research. I research everything to the nth degree before writing a word about it. I believe one day I will be accountable, and will gladly stand up and be counted. I consult with Dr Brauteseth, a leading psychiatrist in RSA, who checks my work and tests it. I am very aware that there are fragile people out there, and try to be as responsible as I can without losing the message when I write books. The academics don't seem to understand this. It's so easy to hide behind the work of founders and people who broke the rules before, who are now accepted as the be all and end all. The mere thought that I have disturbed and challenged the academics means I am doing something right, or I would just be dismissed and ignored. Don't knock it until you have really tried it. Thank you all. The person who breaks the rules is sure to get hit by the shrapnel. D.F.

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

**MORE MINOR EDITS – IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THE USER 41.241.234.65 IS PAYING SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE NAME “DOUGLAS FORBES”**

## Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**[Revision as of 12:48, 24 October 2008](#)**

[\(edit\)](#)

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[← Previous edit](#)

**[Revision as of 12:50, 24 October 2008](#) ([edit](#))**

[\(undo\)](#)

[41.241.234.65](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

**Line 12:**

DOUGLAS FORBES writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge.

I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world.

The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward.

**Line 12:**

""DOUGLAS FORBES"" writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge.

I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world.

The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward.

### Revision as of 12:50, 24 October 2008

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve \(talk\)](#) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

***DOUGLAS FORBES*** writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge. I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world. The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward. To the skeptics, and I have lerned more from the skeptics than anyone else, thank you, BUT, have I got a surprise for you. Watch this space. Please do put your real names so we know who you are. We will all be accountable in the end, so please do not hide, all your titles and certificates should be added with your full name. Thank you. I have the scientific proof, but how stupid could one be to release it and give another person a chance to 'steal' it because of endless funds and resourses, I fund myself, so it will take a little longer, I beleive in what I do, I have a passion for my work and research. I research everything to the enth degree before writing a word about it. I beleive one day I will be accountable, and will gladly stand up and be counted. I consult with Dr Brauteseth, a leading psychiatrist in RSA, who checks my work and tests it. I am very aware that there are fragile people out there, and try to be as repsonsable as I can without loosing the message when I write books. The academics dont seem to undertstand this. it so easy to hide behind the work of founders and people who broke the rules before, who are now accepted as the be all and end all. The mere thought that I have disturbed and challenged the academics means I am doing something right, or I would just be dismissed and ignored. Dont knock it until you have really tried it. Thank you all. The person who breaks the rules is sure to get hit by the shrapnel. D.F.

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"

**P.T.O**

**THE COMMENTS ABOUT THE PATENT ARE SUDDENLY REMOVED (THIS TIME FROM A DIFFERENT IP ... PRESUMABLY BY THE "REAL" MATTHEW KIRKLAND AFTER MY LETTER OF THE 4<sup>TH</sup> OF APRIL)**

## Talk:Human pin code

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

([Difference between revisions](#))

Jump to: [navigation](#), [search](#)

**[Revision as of 12:28, 2 April 2009](#) (edit)**

[SineBot](#) ([talk](#) | [contribs](#))

m (Signing comment by [196.212.210.98](#) - "")

[← Previous edit](#)

**[Revision as of 09:32, 6 April 2009](#) (edit)**

([undo](#))

[198.54.202.114](#) ([talk](#))

[Next edit →](#)

### Line 6:

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

-

Forbes has a granted patent - please check with the -DTI in PTA. User Matthew Kirkland 21 October 2008.

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 Otober 2008

### Line 6:

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [[User:Sc00baSteve|Sc00baSteve]] ([[User talk:Sc00baSteve|talk]]) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

I have ckecked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 Otober 2008

## Revision as of 09:32, 6 April 2009

Why have so many (contradicting) changes been made to this article in such a short amount of time? If you read through the history, it sounds like someone is hiding something. If this system is scientific, where is the peer review? I can only find information about the human pincode from the creator's website. There's something fishy about this whole article and I think it should be removed from wikipedia. Why is it categorized under Numerology if the creator says it isn't numerology?

I edited the article for POV and removed the NPOV tag. If anyone feels the need to put the tag back, please do so. - He has published no research, has made no patent applications and is even unable to grasp that applying for a patent means making information public. It is also the case that in the classical view space and time are separate. Space and time being inseparable aspects is a fairly modern idea in physics.

At best it deserves merging in with Numerology or a related page about the systems or modern applications thereof, etc., but I really have to question the relevance, notability, legitimacy and existence of acceptable sources for this subject. Anyone else have thoughts on the matter?

Just to be clear, the article itself isn't bad, it's the topic that concerns me [Sc00baSteve](#) ([talk](#)) 09:17, 20 October 2008 (UTC)

I have checked the amount of printed copies, over 30,000 in RSA alone of THE HUMANPINCODE, that should make a statement in itself. - user - Justin Little Bcom Wits. 23 October 2008

***DOUGLAS FORBES*** writes - I have not revealed everything in my books for obvious reasons, for one, it would not be of the general public interest to read scientific material. It would also be very dangerous to allow certain information to be printed that could effect people in a negative way, so I thought it repsonsible to write what I did, and allow the public to be the judge. I have now been approached by 2 Universaties to incorporate the work into the academic world. The fact that I have helped many hundreds of people understand themselves, has given me the validation of my work. here in lies my reward. To the skeptics, and I have lerned more from the skeptics than anyone else, thank you, BUT, have I got a surprise for you. Watch this space. Please do put your real names so we know who you are. We will all be accountable in the end, so please do not hide, all your titles and certificates should be added with your full name. Thank you. I have the scientific proof, but how stupid could one be to release it and give another person a chance to 'steal' it because of endless funds and resourses, I fund myself, so it will take a little longer, I beleive in what I do, I have a passion for my work and research. I research everything to the enth degree before writing a word about it. I beleive one day I will be accountable, and will gladly stand up and be counted.I consult with Dr Brauteseth, a leading psychiatrist in RSA, who checks my work and tests it. I am very aware that there are fragile people out there, and try to be as repsonsable as I can without loosing the message when I write books. The academics dont seem to undertstand this. it so easy to hide behind the work of founders and people who broke the rules before, who are now accepted as the be all and end all. The mere thought that I have disturbed and challenged the academics means I am doing something right, or I would just be dismissed and ignored. Dont knock it until you have really tried it. Thank you all. The person who breaks the rules is sure to get hit by the shrapnel. D.F.

Aside from the arrogance of the comments above, and the reprehensible spelling of a so-called scientist, I have reinstated the link pointing to the critique, the fact that Richard Higgins was a co-author on the first book, and a previously deleted paragraph on the still unsubstantiated "science". I vote for this article to be deleted. —Preceding [unsigned](#) comment added by [196.212.210.98](#) ([talk](#)) 12:27, 2 April 2009 (UTC)

Retrieved from "[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human\\_pin\\_code](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Human_pin_code)"