

## **Emails and communications**

A collection of key emails, correspondence and supporting commentaries by Jason Dale

---

### **Important notes**

- Please read the “LEGAL CORRESPONDANCE” document for the relevant background into my historical association with Forbes. This will be useful for gaining a brief overview.
  - In some cases the full names and contact details of certain individuals will be withheld in order to protect their identity. Accordingly, the substituted names will be marked in *colour italic* font followed by an asterisk ‘\*’. Otherwise, names that appear in standard black Arial font are the correct and valid names. Regardless of whether the full names and contact details are reflected or not, the contents of the emails themselves will always be represented **verbatim** without any modification whatsoever.
  - Many historical emails have not been shown on basis that they are not strictly relevant; however such emails can be presented at a later stage to reinforce certain points should this prove necessary.
- 

## **OVERVIEW OF CONTENTS**

**SECTION 1: Page 2:** Contradictions about Brian van der Spuy, (a critic of the Human Pin Code)

**SECTION 2: Page 3:** Douglas Forbes responding to a customer who was unhappy about his service

**SECTION 3: Page 6:** Contradictions on the speed of light, Albert Einstein’s energy and mass equation and the non-existent formula “*Pythagoras’s theorem of the Octagon*”

**SECTION 4: Page 9:** Evasiveness, deception and the “Scientific Awareness Publications Project”

---

**P.T.O**

## SECTION 1): Contradictions about Brian van der Spuy, who is a critic of the Human Pin Code

### Email by Douglas Forbes to Brian Van Der Spuy on the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 (See website below)

<http://www.geocities.com/brianvds/skeptic/pinque.htm>

*"I notice from your birthday - you are highly intelligent and do not accept anything without careful scrutiny of all the facts - and even then you are not convinced. You are very analytical and enquiring and quite chatty when you find a subject that you enjoy. You do not suffer fools gladly - and are very sceptical"*

### Email by Douglas Forbes to Jason Dale on the 5<sup>th</sup> of October 2007 at 11:53, concerning the very same Brian Van Der Spuy

*"You should really read his website, he even debunks The Meyers Briggs test. The illustrious Mr Brian Van Der Spuy. I think he is daft, in the Wikipedia pages there should be reference to what he is up to, I think the man needs therapy"*

#### Comments:

- a) Brian van der Spuy does not recall having ever "debunked" the Meyers Briggs test. No reference can be found to Meyer's Briggs on his website.
- b) Forbes claims on Wikipedia that *"I have lerned more from the skeptics than anyone else"* (verbatim, spelling mistakes not corrected).
- c) The Wikipedia link to Brian van der Spuy's website above was removed towards the end of 2008.
- d) Contradictions of this nature are not isolated and are further prevalent in Forbes's scientific theories. (See SECTION 3). This may have serious implications for practitioners, customers and associates who assume the accuracy of the DNA Pin Code (formerly Human Pin Code).
- e) On the 8<sup>th</sup> of April 2008, through an attorney who is a member of the Douglas Forbes Trust, Forbes threatened to pursue legal action against me on account of comments I made on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2008 which were allegedly *"derogatory"* and *"severely prejudicial"*. This response followed my allegations directed to Forbes in a closed forum concerning non-performance, lack of scientific evidence and deceptive behaviour on his part with regards to a project which he requested me to initiate in October 2007 on his behalf. (See SECTION 4) This project involved contacting a university Professor as part of an initiative to write articles for both **Wikipedia** as well as for further adaption into papers for publishing in peer-reviewed academic journals. The university professor insisted upon the strict adherence to proper academic practice, which includes following ethical guidelines for research and publishing as well as the submission of papers for scrutiny and peer-review. I further insisted that all articles written for Wikipedia must be thoroughly researched, verifiable and backed by scientific fact. When it was later established that Forbes had deviant and ulterior motives, the project was stopped. In conjunction with my comments on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March, I had requested a meeting with Forbes to present the evidence and substantiation of my allegations, and to hear his side of the story. My meeting request was declined and subsequently delegated to his associates who had no knowledge or involvement in the matter. Forbes has also failed to respond to the specific points in any my allegations; both on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March and beyond.

**SECTION 2) Douglas Forbes responding to a customer who was unhappy about his service**

**Email by Douglas Forbes to *Tertius\* [Not his full name]* (Forbes also CC's his attorney)**

**From:** Doug Forbes [mailto:dforbes@telkomsa.net]  
**Sent:** 26 October 2007 01:03 PM  
**To:** *Tertius\* [Not his full name, email withheld]*  
**Cc:** tcw@rmwattorneys.co.za  
**Subject:** RE: Reading - 25 Oct

Hello *Tertius\* [Not his full name]*

*I am in receipt of your email, see below.*

*Thank you for bringing this to my attention. I have gone over the recording, and the TIME spent in the session, to my observation based upon your questions, was what you wanted.*

*Obviously you are disappointed in one respect that is with what YOU wanted, even though you seemed to have enjoyed and got the secondary objective.*

*In spite of you being late for the appointment, in which time we may have covered the primary objective; my time is on the hour from the top of the hour. I only do appointments from the top of the hour. Please note that I gave of my time well into the next hour, so if you really look at this in a very fair and objective way, you gained at least a twenty extra minutes from me at no extra charge. Fortunately the person, who was waiting, understood, but I still had to give a full hour to her and thus had to start at the bottom of the hour, which then impacted upon the next person, whom we were able to contact and ask if he did not mind coming half an hour later.*

*I think you should have stopped me right at the beginning of the session, rather and not let me go on thinking that it was your primary objective. I have copy, which I keep, for the records, in case of any disputes. Mainly for people who go away and without realizing it, may or may not misinterpret what I am saying, it protects me.*

*Sadly, your email has brought me to a conclusion, it is obvious I do not know what people want, it therefore my intention as of today, to conclude my business and shut it down. In this way I can be sure not to upset people, for I love my work, for which I have an absolute passion, or should I now say had a passion for what I do, and if this is how people interpret my work, I am no longer worthy to continue.*

*I am forwarding a copy of this email to my attorney, as Thinus is one of the trustees of The Douglas Forbes Trust and should know of my intentions as this will impact my income revenue, my life, and my responsibility to the trust.*

*I wish you and your family well for the future.*

*Kind regards,*

*Douglas Forbes.*

**P.T.O**

**Tertius\* [Not his full name] responds to Douglas Forbes (Forbes copies the email to his lawyer)**

**From:** *Tertius\* [Not his full name, email withheld]*

**Sent:** 26 October 2007 01:57 PM

**To:** 'Doug Forbes'

**Subject:** RE: Reading - 25 Oct

*Hello Douglas*

*It is with great surprise and regret that I read your reply and interpretation of what I said in my mail, today.*

*I am sorry that you do not see it from a business point of view, as well as an honest request for information that you are blatantly gifted with.*

*Your decision and state of mind about the request is your own choice and will be a pity if you are to allow this to influence your life in a less than positive way.*

*My request was and still is: a plea for information in order to understand myself better. And not an attack on you as a person or to point out any misconceived interpretations of how you go about or do your business. Forgive me for I am the student and not the teacher.*

*You mentioned yesterday that my son possesses the characteristics of being "ruthless in his approach to things". Maybe, if I knew myself better, with your help, I might know if this is part of my make-up as well and thus the reason people act the way they do around me. E.g. the way you have interpreted my message.*

*Accept my humble apology if my request has upset you.*

*Your passion in what you do is very obvious and it will be a tragedy if you allow your interpretation of my message to strangle your spirit.*

*I sincerely hope whatever decisions you make, are made for the correct reasons.*

*I also wish you and your family well for the future.*

*Vriendelijke Groete / Kind regards*

***Tertius\* [Not his full name, email and contact details withheld]***

**P.T.O**

**The original message from Tertius\* [Not his full name] that caused all of the drama**

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Tertius\* [Not his full name]

**To:** 'Douglas Forbes'

**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2007 9:08 AM

**Subject:** Reading - 25 Oct

Hello Douglas

*I am referring to the meeting of yesterday 25 October.*

*My wife and I listened to the recording again last night and I thank you very much for the in-depth explanation of my wife and son's pin codes. This provided and I am sure will in future provide for understanding and insight into many aspects of their characters. It also pointed out to me what wonderful people I have in my life and that they deserve a lot of recognition. But this was a secondary objective of the visit.*

*My primary reason for coming to see you was to get a thorough breakdown and explanation of my own pin code. I feel this is very necessary for me to have a better understanding about who I am and how to understand myself. I don't think I need to explain this need, for this is exactly way and what your business is about. By not performing this obvious task, you have now created the situation where I have to make assumptions. I feel that assumptions leaves room for many misunderstandings and wrong interpretations. Please help me out here. My perception is that I did not get value for my money in terms of my primary objective and that is to gain an honest, proper, unbiased, calculated and thorough breakdown, interpretation and explanation of the birth date: XXXX-XX-XX\* [withheld].*

*It is very obvious that you have insight and interpretations to answers that I am searching for. Thus, I sincerely hope to hear from you soon.*

**Vriendelike Groete / Kind regards**

**Tertius\* [Not his full name, email and contact details withheld]**

**Comments:**

- a) Forbes forwarded this email exchange to me on Sunday the 28<sup>th</sup> of October 2007 at 4:35 PM for reasons which are completely unknown. I assume that Forbes wanted to make me aware of the fact that he has a responsibility to the "Douglas Forbes Trust", and that his attorney serves on that trust.
- b) Forbes has broken a golden rule of ethical conduct by disclosing information about his clients to another individual, and without the client's consent. Personal information such as Tertius's\* [Not his full name] family is discussed, including the character traits of one of the family members. Full names, email addresses and contact details of the sender were also evident in the above emails, information of which has been withheld prior to publishing in this document.
- c) Forbes insists upon his workshop delegates signing "non disclosure" agreements prior to them receiving tuition, and yet Forbes himself does not sign any such non-disclosure agreement with regards to personal information that his clients may divulge to him in during consultations, correspondence or in private conversation. Should such clients happen to enter into conflict or disagreement with Forbes at a later stage, there is reasonable concern that such personal information may be disclosed, misappropriated or distorted out of spite, or as a means of gaining leverage.

**P.T.O**

- d) I do not believe that this is the appropriate way to treat customers, regardless of who is in the "right" and who is in the "wrong". Involving an attorney in a situation like this is totally unnecessary and unprofessional. The business world typically does not make allowances for individuals who feel that they should have a special level of entitlement on basis of their stress levels or individual personality characteristics. The principles of ethical and appropriate conduct apply to everyone.

**SECTION 3) Contradictions on the speed of light, Albert Einstein's energy and mass equation and the non-existent formula "Pythagoras's theorem of the Octagon"**

**Email by Jason Dale (myself) to Douglas Forbes** (Colour font for emphasis has been retained)

**From:** Jason Dale [jedale@telkomsa.net]  
**To:** Douglas Forbes [DNA PIN CODE]  
**Cc:** [douglas@douglasforbes.com](mailto:douglas@douglasforbes.com)  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 22, 2007 6:05 PM  
**Subject:** The speed of light?

Hi Douglas,

I am studying your formulas and books very closely, and I already have numerous questions / concerns that I would like to discuss with you in due time.

At this stage however, I just wanted to ask you about the following, with regards to the **speed of light**:

- **"Human Pin Code"** book, page 20, roughly 2/3 way down the page, you say that the **"speed of light is 670,618,800 miles per hour"**. If I go strictly by your figure, this translates to **299,793,428.352 meters per second (1 mph is 0.44704000 m/s)**
- In the **"Blu Genes"** manuscript, page 16, paragraph 3 lines 4-5 (of the paragraph) you say that **"The electron travels at 186,5454' X 10<sup>3</sup> miles per second (Speed of light)"**. Also, on page 20, paragraph 2, line 1 you make reference to the same number **for the speed of light**, namely **186,5454 X 10<sup>3</sup>**, except here you make reference to the **Octagon Theorem**, and not the speed of an electron. This is very confusing.

These are the comments I have at this point

- There are **3600 seconds in 1 hour**. Thus, if I take the speed of light **as it is referenced in your book, Human Pin Code, 670,618,800 miles per hour** is actually **186,283 miles per second. (670,618,800 divided by 3600)**.

Your **"Blu Genes"** book claims that the speed of light is **186,5454' X 10<sup>3</sup> miles per second**. I don't understand how you get to this, nor do I understand your use of the inverted comma after the '5454'. This is not normally the way Scientific notation get's used, but if I treat this number at face value and convert it to an integer, I get 1,865,454,000 miles per second, which expressed using conventional scientific notation is 1.865 X 10<sup>9</sup>

- With reference to your book **"Human Pin Code"**, where you say that the **speed of light is 670,618,800 miles per hour**, or **299,793,428.352 meters per second**. Actually, all the scientific books and references I have say that the speed of light is **299 792 458 meters per second**. The difference between your figure and the scientifically recognized figure is a variance of approximately **970.352 meters per second**. If you start calculating in terms of light years, the difference in distance will be quite significant for the same period of time travelled. Why is your figure in the Human Pin Code different? what definition of a "mile" do you use?
- I have searched all of the references I have concerning Pythagoras' theorem on the internet, and I cannot find any reference to the **"Pythagoras' Octagon Theorem"**, as you mention in the **"Human Pin Code"** on page 11, paragraph 4, lines 4-5 within that paragraph. Thus, I

cannot independently verify whether or not the work of Pythagoras has anything to do with the speed of light, as your manuscript "**Blu Genes**" seems to suggest on page 20.

- P.S. In an email response to an earlier question of mine about your use of  $(E = MC^2) T = 1$  in the book "Triple Six" (and you are now saying that you have 'moved beyond' this) your response to my question was as follows:

" $E = M (1548686 \times 10^3 \times (\text{not sure but check the number of feet in one mile divided by the number of feet in one nautical mile} \times 8 \text{ over } 9) = 144,000$ "

It looks as though you have transposed/muddled some of the digits. Is the correct number 1865454 (as you have it in Blue Genes) or 1548686 or are they two different numbers? Given that your formula is an alteration of Einstein's formula  $E = MC^2$  I assume these numbers are talking about the same thing, which is the speed of light. (I have a few other concerns such as your use of nautical miles, but I will ask those at a later stage, as I am still reading all of your books).

That's it for now. I have many more concerns and questions, but I will ask these at a later stage depending on how things go.

Please assist my understanding in this regard. It's important that I have a clear and accurate grasp of these kinds of issues if I am ever to assist you in getting your work scientifically recognized.

Thank you and have a good day,

Jason

#### **Douglas Forbes responds to Jason Dale (myself)**

**From:** Douglas Forbes [douglas@douglasforbes.com]

**Sent:** Friday, November 23, 2007 1:30 PM

**To:** Jason Dale

**Subject:** Re: The speed of light?

*Hi Jason,*

*to qualify, the speed of light is  $1865454 \times 10$  to the power of 3 do not worry, I have a 9 and can have blonde moments.*

*Thank you, and have a good day.*

*Douglas.*

#### **Comments:**

- a) This is one of the most thoroughly comprehensive answers to any of my questions that I have ever received from Forbes. (I am being sarcastic). He offers no evidence or substantiation of his theories, and furthermore refuses to offer explanations for the contradictions in his books and emails. Therefore, it is not reasonable to expect the academia to automatically endorse work which is shrouded in secrecy and contradiction. (See SECTION 4) Neither is it fair to arrogantly assume superiority over the academia when such superiority has never been proven. Academics must subject themselves and their works to scrutiny, criticism and peer review on a regular basis without the luxury of being able to file "defamation" lawsuits against their critics and detractors.

**P.T.O**



- b) **"Blu Genes"** (ISBN number unknown) is claimed by Forbes to be the "scientific" bedrock upon which the **"Human Pin Code"** is based, and yet most of this book seems to be esoteric and metaphysical. The only "scientific" content that I could find was in the form of "pockets" of established knowledge, which upon further investigation was found to be already documented in a plethora of other sources, and yet Forbes failed to reference or acknowledge any such sources in his writing, as is required by academic best practice. A wide range of subjects is covered, ranging from the functioning of the human pancreas all the way to the Holy Trinity, and absolutely no tangible explanation was given as to how all of this material fits together. Nor was any supposed link between the **"Human Pin Code"** and physics or atomic theory ever explained. The book contains material that I found to be confusing and incoherent to say the least, and demonstrates structural inconsistency and poor content flow. This was further exacerbated by the fact that it references theories which contradict Forbes's other published books. Not surprisingly, Forbes requested his book back before I could ask any further questions.
- c) What is interesting is that Forbes also claims to hold a PhD in METAPHYSICS which he supposedly achieved after taking a correspondence course through the University of Metaphysics in the 1980's. Apparently, **"Blu Genes"** was based on the dissertation that he submitted for his PhD. Yet PHYSICS and METAPHYSICS are two completely different fields. It is very convenient indeed that the institution that Forbes got his PhD from has now changed ownership, and therefore I cannot verify the validity or even the *existence* of his PhD. To date, I have never seen any "certificate" of this PhD which Forbes at one stage claimed to have on display in his office. For all intents and purposes, he may have even enrolled for the PhD without ever actually completing it. This is all speculation of course, but regardless of whether he has a PhD or not, there is no proof that **"Blu Genes"** had roots in any dissertation. I further speculate on grounds of personal suspicion that large chunks of **"Blu Genes"** was quite possibly nothing more than repackaged material that Forbes sourced directly from the University of Metaphysics. All I am legally obliged to say at this point is that in light of everything that has transpired, I am entitled to have strong reservations about Forbes's theories and claims as well as the true origin of **"Blu genes"** and the **Human Pin Code**.
- d) Please note that **"Triple Six"** as I have paraphrased it above refers to the book **"SIX SIX SIX"** (ISBN 0-620-20380-3) written by Douglas Forbes. It is in this very book that Forbes writes the formula  **$(E = MC^2) T = 1$**  on page/section 5-2 in the chapter entitled **"Eins Time"**. I had already been asking Forbes questions for almost a month, with absolutely no success or guidance. In an earlier email which I wrote on the 30<sup>th</sup> of October 2007 at 01:08 PM, I asked Forbes to explain his formulae as it did not make sense. He replied on the 30<sup>th</sup> October 2007 at 20:05 and **admitted that the formula was not correct**, and that I should refer to the book **"Human Pin Code Relationships"** (ISBN: 9781869160104. ISBN-10: 186916010X) for an explanation of the correct formula. No explanation or formula was found there, and finally on the 31<sup>st</sup> of October 2007 at 9:37 AM, he writes this (and this time he refers me to **"Blu Genes"**):

*"Good morning Jason,*

*Tut tut, I will give you the formula when I see you, just need to check the book myself this means I will have to scan it, but, it goes like this,*

*$E = M (1548686 \times 10^3 \times (\text{not sure but check the number of feet in one mile divided by the number of feet in one nautical mile} \times 8 \text{ over } 9) = 144,000$*

*And that's the formula. It is also the number of revolutions that the electron takes to navigate the nucleus of the Hydrogen atom.*

*Enjoy your day.*

*Douglas,  
(a couple of brain cells sleeping, maybe even dead)."*

P.T.O



- e) The book "**SIX SIX SIX**", written by Forbes and subsequently published in 1997, is categorized under **philosophy**. In this book, Forbes presents himself as a psychic and as a prophet. Forbes also claims, *inter alia*, to have extended Einstein's theory of relativity, to have found the "*common denominator between the physical and metaphysical worlds*" and even claims to have made a "discovery" of "*cell regeneration at atomic levels*" which would "*reveal results in mitosis that had never been documented before*". Forbes also claims to be able to make future predictions based on "*an interpretation of the Bible and all of the prophets*". I happen to have a copy of "**SIX SIX SIX**" in my collection, but the book is no longer in print.
- f) Forbes claims on Wikipedia that "*I research everything to the enth degree before writing a word about it*". The contradictions that have been demonstrated above suggest otherwise.
- g) Albert Einstein and Pythagoras are no longer alive today to set the record straight, nor can they defend themselves against any distortion, misrepresentation or defacement of their work. Similar applies to situations where "*ancient knowledge*" is acquired and used commercially for personal gain without acknowledging the sources from which such "*ancient knowledge*" was acquired; and where such "*ancient knowledge*" is distorted, misrepresented or defaced.
- h) In simplistic terms, Einstein's  $E = MC^2$ , defines the composition of energy as being equal (=) to mass (M) multiplied by the speed of light (C) squared. It therefore follows that contradictions about what the speed of light actually is will render any further hypothesis on the composition of energy useless. Energy cannot be both " $(E = MC^2) T = 1$ " and also " $E = M (1548686 \times 10^3 \times (not\ sure\ but\ check\ the\ number\ of\ feet\ in\ one\ mile\ divided\ by\ the\ number\ of\ feet\ in\ one\ nautical\ mile \times 8\ over\ 9) = 144,000$ " at the same time. Forbes was to later refuse to offer explanations of his contradictions on grounds that his "Intellectual Property" has been assigned to the Douglas Forbes trust, and that the trustees need to consent to any disclosure thereof.
- i) " $(E = MC^2) T = 1$ " supposedly factors TIME into the equation as denoted by "T". If one takes this "equation" at face value, and according to the rules of algebra, the contents of the brackets are calculated first before attempting to solve the remainder of the equation. Thus the resultant composition of energy is multiplied by "TIME"; and regardless of the product of such a multiplication, the value is deemed to always be equivalent to the decimal value of "1". This is algebraically self-defeating and makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.
- j) Forbes does not appear to interpret "*scientific evidence*" the same way that the academia does. Given Forbes's obviously esoteric background, he appears to treat "*scientific evidence*" as being synonymous with "psychic revelations", and further demands that such "*scientific evidence*" be accepted as truth without supporting evidence or substantiation. My observation is that Forbes is attempting to reposition himself as a physicist in order to gain access into larger markets and to come across as more credible. While Forbes argues that secrecy is necessary for him to protect his work, one could also argue that secrecy makes it easier to hide work that is either mistakenly false or deliberately fraudulent. Regardless of Forbes's actual motives, it is widely held in academic circles that secrecy is the antithesis of science.
- k) "*Pythagoras's Octagon Theorem*" does not exist. Yet Forbes assumed ownership of this theorem on grounds of "IP" being assigned to a trust. Please refer to comments in g) and h).

P.T.O

**SECTION 4) Evasiveness, deception and the “Scientific Awareness Publications Project”**

**Email by Douglas Forbes to Jason Dale (myself), about contacting a university professor**

**From:** Doug Forbes [dforbes@telkomsa.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2007 9:50 PM  
**To:** Dale, Jason J  
**Subject:** RE: FW: Comment on my website re Pin Code

Hello Jason,

*Please do not worry about this letter to Warren, there is always a reason for everything. The 9 is just tongue in cheek. Don't take this seriously, besides, I would most grateful if you would write something about DNA Pincode on Wikipedia.*

*I am hoping that Professor \* [name withheld] will write something to contribute. Perhaps you can contact her and ask her.*

*I would like Humanpincode to die a slow death so that all these people attached to it will fall away with it*

*Thank you for trying, I know you have my best interests at heart, and I am most grateful.*

*Please do not worry yourself about Mozart and the Whale DVD, I have bought another copy. The people should have made an effort, just as you made an effort, it should not rest on your shoulders when all you are trying to do is help, they should understand their obligation, you are too nice and people take advantage of you.*

*Enjoy your day.*

Douglas.

**P.T.O**

**Email by Jason Dale (myself), contacting the professor as requested by Forbes**

From: **Jason Dale** <[jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com](mailto:jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Oct 3, 2007 at 11:24 PM  
Subject: DNA Pincode article on Wikipedia?  
To: \* *[Name of the Professor has been withheld]*

Greetings Professor \* *[Name of the Professor has been withheld]*,

This is Jason Dale from the DNA Pincode. You may remember me from the workshops.

Douglas seems to be very impressed with my writing abilities, and has asked me to write an article about the DNA Pincode, with the purpose of getting it posted on [www.Wikipedia.org](http://www.Wikipedia.org).

However, he is especially interested in getting you involved with this article. I believe that the reason for this is because you will be able to bring the brain power, the scientific backing and the credibility to the party.

I am quite happy to be a background person in all of this - doing all of the spade work, and leaving the more brainy stuff to the people who actually have the brains ;-)

Can we get together sometime for coffee to discuss this? There is a bit of history behind why Douglas has asked for this, which revolves around counteracting an existing Wikipedia article that is trying to discredit Douglas and his work.

Perhaps I can elaborate on this history when I meet you in person, and possibly we can discuss any further ideas about how to go about tackling this assignment.

This is of course ONLY on provision that you are both interested and willing to be a part of this. (The greater part, in fact).

From my perspective, if I write something like this on my own, it simply will not achieve the desired effect. What an article like this needs is someone who has the scientific knowledge, the intellectual firepower and the credibility that will certainly be more recognized by the scientific communities.

Please let me know!

Thank you and kind regards,

Jason Dale

**P.T.O**

Comments:

- a) I am not at liberty to mention the name of the professor above, and the reason for this is because the professor has reported having received communications of a “threatening and disturbing” nature on the 28<sup>th</sup> of April 2008, possibly as an attempt to deter the professor from standing as a witness against Forbes in the event of any future litigation. I will also withhold any emails and/or content that can be used for identification, purely for the purposes of trying to prevent any undue harassment. Please note that any such incidences where an individual has allegedly been harassed, bullied or intimidated as a result of my present course of action will be investigated, and if necessary, appropriate action will be taken.
- b) My investigation and subsequent exposé of Forbes is as a result of my own initiative, which I am undertaking purely for the purposes of uncovering and exposing truth for the benefit of the public. I have not in any way “influenced” or persuaded the professor to “take sides” on my behalf. My initial allegations emailed between the periods 22<sup>nd</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> of March 2008 inclusive were also copied to the professor in plain sight of Forbes. Given the sensitivity of the situation following the alleged threats, I am no longer able to do this.
- c) The above-mentioned professor was familiar with Forbes’s work, after having attended workshops arising out of curiosity that Forbes claimed to have a scientific system for personality analysis. (My interest in the **Human Pin Code** was for the very same reason).
- d) The rest of the contents of the first email from Forbes is irrelevant, and serves only to prove that on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October 2007, Forbes did indeed ask me to contact the professor for the purposes of writing articles for Wikipedia, and that promptly on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of October 2007 at 11:24 pm, I established contact with the Professor. Take special note that I mention the need to bring “*scientific backing*”, “*scientific knowledge*” and “*credibility*” to any writing that gets done on Wikipedia.
- e) What the email exchanges that I present in this section will not clearly reflect however, was that verbal meetings had taken place between Forbes and the professor, either at an earlier or later stage; which included Forbes giving the professor a personal DNA Pin Code (Human Pin Code) consultation. Emanating from one or more such meetings was a further clarification (or development) in the scope of the professor’s involvement. It was conveyed verbally and by the mutual consent of all three individuals (Forbes, the professor and myself) that a “**project**” would be set up to not only write fully researched and scientifically backed Wikipedia articles, but that further tasks and activities would be considered and undertaken as a means of promoting and creating a “scientific awareness” of Forbes’s work, and to assist in getting such work “**scientifically recognized**”. These additional tasks and activities include, *inter alia*, the further adaption of all written articles into papers that could be submitted for academic scrutiny and peer-review.
- f) I was told by Forbes that I have very good researching, writing and presentation skills, further complimented by my background and training in public speaking and **Toastmasters**. I was nominated to act as a “*technical writer*” and “*researcher*” in the project, and needless to say, Forbes’s role was to provide the “**scientific evidence**” and “research” that he claimed was readily available. My writing would be based on the material provided by Forbes. As such, the professor only briefly scanned very small sections of “**Blu Genes**”, because it was in fact my role to study the manuscript more closely.

P.T.O

- g) The professor insisted that no short cuts be taken and that strict adherence to academic standards and practice be followed; which includes observing ethical guidelines for research and publishing as well as the submission of papers for scrutiny and peer-review. **Notably, the professor emphasized that because he/she was not qualified in any fields pertaining to science or physics; that the professor was individually in no position to make a formal assessment of any “scientific evidence”, research or the subsequently written articles and papers.** While the professor was willing to help in guiding and advising on the writing of any articles or papers for Wikipedia or otherwise, the professor insisted that his/her correct and appropriate role would be to establish contact with the relevant academic experts, as well as with any such contacts who may provide funding for Forbes’s work; within the context of academic research. Interestingly, Forbes never mentioned that the professor was not qualified in physics or science.
- h) I myself happen to be an Information Technology professional, and therefore my knowledge and skills are not relevant to the fields of physics or science either. For the sake of mentioning, you will also notice that Forbes claims on Wikipedia as well as in his publications that the *DNA Pin Code (Human Pin Code)* is ratified and tested by **Dr. Leif Brauteseth** who is a **consultant psychiatrist**. For those of you who do not know, psychiatry and psychology are not the same fields. While I do not deny that there are perhaps psychologists who happen to practice the Human Pin Code, a **qualified psychologist** would have been in a far better position to “test” and “check” Forbes’s work closely, in opposed to a psychiatrist. Don’t take my word for it though, because Forbes seems to imply this himself when he claimed in his book **“Human Pin Code”** that he *“has managed to integrate and condense truths from bio-genetics, psychology, physiology and bio-mathematics”* (See the foreword). That said, the Human Pin Code is a wide matrix of diametrically opposing attributes that every human being exhibits at some or other stage in their lives, and is thus subjective and open to interpretation. The anomalies that I had spotted in the use and application of the Pin Code were such that my initial interest and excitement in the system was slowly being replaced by doubts, which is why I never practiced the DNA Pin Code (Human Pin Code) commercially, despite having access to more “inner circle” knowledge and that most “certified” practitioners have never seen. I have recently discovered that the “accuracy” of the Human Pin Code is more of a mental and psychological *“illusion”* than it is scientifically established fact, and that the Human Pin Code will most likely FAIL any truly scientific examination such as the notoriously feared and very humbling **“triple blind test”**. I was too trusting and too “nice” to consider these points earlier, but isn’t it amazing how Forbes surrounds himself with all kinds of experts, except the very experts that actually have the relevant knowledge, such as scientists and physicists?
- i) No meeting minutes were kept outlining exactly what was discussed in the aforementioned meetings between Forbes and the professor, apart from various hand notes which were taken. Throughout the duration of the **scientific awareness publications project**, Forbes had never requested nor insisted upon anything being committed to writing or formal agreement. Quite the contrary, he was keen to keep the project as informal as possible; while still maintaining utmost focus and commitment. At a later stage, Forbes used this to his advantage by denying his commitment and involvement by stating *“At no time was any paper work regarding forming of committees, minutes of any meetings taken, and no formal formation of any association was formed”*. (Mar 23, 2008 at 11:01 PM) Forbes also made no offer to make any funds available to the project, and as such, the project was funded primarily from my own pocket.

P.T.O

- j) Please refer back to the email that I wrote to Forbes on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of November 2007 entitled “*The speed of light?*” in SECTION 3 above. This email was written weeks after Forbes’s initial request for me to contact the professor. Take note of the last sentence that appears in my email to Forbes: “*Please assist my understanding in this regard. It’s important that I have a clear and accurate grasp of these kinds of issues if I am ever to assist you in getting your work scientifically recognized*”. I must emphatically point out that Forbes recommended the “**Blu Genes**” manuscript as being the source of NOT “esoteric” material, NOT “METAPHYSICAL” material, but **SCIENTIFIC MATERIAL**, containing **SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE**.
- k) While I may repeat what has already been mentioned or implied; no sensible academic professor will want to risk jeopardizing his or her name and reputation by being associated with published articles and/or papers that have not been academically verified or scientifically proven, regardless of whether they are written for Wikipedia or otherwise. It was agreed that the best course of action was to write “*technical articles*” that were thoroughly substantiated by scientific evidence; given that Forbes promised that such scientific evidence was readily available. Thereafter, the technical articles could be cosmetically adapted for publishing in various mediums, including Wikipedia. As for accredited academic journals however, the requirements are naturally more stringent. The base technical articles would then have to be adapted into papers for the purposes of submitting them for academic peer-review and examination by an appropriate body of experts. It was assumed that the process of creating the aforementioned technical articles would be relatively quick, as Forbes claimed that he already had all of the needed evidence and research.
- l) To digress once again, take note of the fact that Forbes’s rather unflattering comments about Brian van der Spuy (See SECTION 1) were made on the **5<sup>th</sup> of October 2007**, literally **days** after Forbes asked me to contact the professor for the first time. If you read my email to the professor, I mention that there is an article on Wikipedia trying to discredit Forbes and his work. Brian van der Spuy just so happens to be one of the most outspoken critics of the Human Pin Code, and the epicentre of his website exposé focuses primarily on the very *lack of scientific evidence* that the **Human Pin Code** is supposed to have! Not only that, but there also just so happened to be an article on the **Human Pin Code** on **Wikipedia** at that time as well, and apart from the Wikipedia article mentioning Forbes’s *lack of scientific evidence*, it also brandished a link to Brian van der Spuy’s website. I was the **observant researcher** who pointed that fact out to Forbes shortly before the 2<sup>nd</sup> of October 2007, and Forbes was apparently oblivious to this. It was then that I mentioned to Forbes, on a very conceptual level; the obvious need to create a “**scientific awareness**” of his work, **by presenting the very scientific proof that Forbes’s detractors said he did not have**. This way, critics such as Brian van der Spuy could be successfully refuted, because after all, the **Human Pin Code** did claim to be a scientific system. To attempt to argue against such detractors as Brian van der Spuy without scientific evidence would have weakened Forbes’s position. I did NOT suggest, however, than anything should be written on Wikipedia, nor did I suggest anything about contacting any university or any professor. I simply emphasized the need for creating “*scientific awareness*”. Please refer below for a few more emails ...

P.T.O

**Email by Jason Dale (myself), to the professor after meeting on Sunday the 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2007**

**From:** Jason Dale [jedale@telkomsa.net]  
**Sent:** 15 October 2007 01:44 AM  
**To:** \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld]  
**Subject:** RE: Our meeting on Sunday

**Attachments:** The DNA Pincode - scientific awareness campaign.pdf

Hi \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld]

Thank you once again for sharing your time with me on Sunday!! it was really such an honour to be working with you!!

Attached please find a PDF document which visually outlines what we spoke about on Sunday, specifically regarding the campaign to create both awareness and credibility of Douglas' work within the scientific communities, both locally and internationally.

Please let me know if you are happy with the way I have summarized the concepts we spoke about, and if there are any corrections or amendments to make.

Once this document is up to the level of quality that you expect, may I forward this to Douglas?

Warm regards,

Jason

**P.T.O**



**Emails to and from Jason Dale (myself) and Forbes, on the same day, keeping him up-to-date of the progress (The PDF attachment of the meeting minutes was forwarded to him separately)**

**From:** Doug Forbes [dforbes@telkomsa.net]

**Sent:** Monday, October 15, 2007 12:23 PM

**To:** 'Jason Dale'

**Subject:** RE: Meeting with \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld]

Hello Jason,

I still like FORBESNETWORKING website. Whats your thoughts on this?

Douglas.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Jason Dale [mailto:jedale@telkomsa.net]

**Sent:** 15 October 2007 01:56 AM

**To:** Douglas Forbes [DNA PIN CODE]

**Subject:** RE: Meeting with \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld]

**Importance:** High

Hi Douglas,

I just wanted to let you know that my meeting with Prof. \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld] was very successful.

We are focusing on launching a campaign to get you as much positive awareness and credibility amongst the scientific communities as possible, both locally and internationally, and how we can do this in the shortest amount of time possible.

I am in the process of putting together an action plan that has specific actions and target completion dates.

I also talked to \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld] about the **forbesmatchmaker** website I am designing for you, and the urgency of getting it developed as soon as possible. The timing here is key ... so ideally we should create as much positive awareness of your work in the scientific communities as we can before releasing the **forbesmatchmaker** website.

Jason

**P.T.O**

### Comments (continued):

- m) This particular point may not seem relevant at first, but it goes a long way in proving just how ready Forbes is to abuse the skills, time and resources of others purely for his own benefit – and at no cost to himself. If you refer briefly back to the first email written by Forbes in this section, and then to my email written to Forbes on the 15<sup>th</sup> of October 2007 above, you will notice that I was working on a number of different things for Forbes. These tasks included, *inter alia*, running errands, answering emails, assisting with workshops, setting up equipment, providing technical support for his office PC's, meeting with workshop delegates to support them in their training (Yes, I paid in full for my own initial training, and no, I never practiced commercially and I never became certified) and even included other full-blown projects. I have still kept many files and emails that will prove this. At that stage, I was working as a full-time I.T. professional in a financial institution, and all of these tasks and projects had to be juggled in my own time. I was working for Forbes until late in the evenings, plus on weekends, and even when I was on leave. One such project that Forbes asked me to do was to design a website that incorporated the technology of the DNA Pin Code into a “matchmaking” service which performed synergy calculations on dates of Birth in the background. This was a MAMMOTH task, which actually requires a team of software developers over several months to do, and even then it would be a tall order to achieve. Yet that did not stop Forbes from demanding that I complete the project in little over a calendar month; at the promises from Forbes that it would become a **joint venture**. Nevertheless, I had to fund the development myself, and I also had to work this project on an “as soon as possible” basis, because really, “as soon as possible” is the only answer that you can give to someone who has no clue as to how long this kind of development takes. For the record, I expressed my reservations to Forbes about this website as well, because I was concerned about the ethical issues arising out of mixing and matching people on the web purely on basis of a number crunching process that has NEVER been proven to work, or even come close to the “95-98% accuracy” that Forbes claims for the DNA Pin code (Human Pin Code). Thousands of people's lives could have been hurt or damaged by that service if I had allowed these “ethical” matters to slip through the cracks by rustling up a dingy website with a bunch of slap-dash algorithms plugged into them. Needless to say, that project was never completed, because for one, the training that Forbes offers in his workshops is scant at best; consisting of ¼ actual training and ¾ shooting lines about his exploits or holding lengthy introductions that take up the whole morning. For another; The DNA Pin Code (formerly Human Pin Code) suffers from the same kind of anaemia that his scientific theories do: contradictory information, lack of proof, lack of documentation and lack of explanation. Even after completing the “advanced” levels of DNA Pin Code training (Gold) I was not confident enough to practice commercially in a one-on-one situation, let alone write software that automates the pin code calculations for thousands of people in the context of a relationship synergy. *If you cannot do it RIGHT manually and on a small scale, then for GOODNESS sakes, don't automate it in mass production!!* I was on a very tight schedule and budget as it was, and Forbes asked me to contact the professor while I was still working on the *design* of the matchmaking website, much less the actual programming. Once again, “**Blu Genes**” was touted as containing the “nuts and bolts” of the DNA Pin Code (Human Pin Code).
- n) Notice that Forbes did NOT make any mention of the lack of “*paper work regarding forming of committees, minutes of any meetings taken*”. Most curious, as he was very quick to complain about this on the 23<sup>th</sup> of March 2008 after making my opening allegations on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March a day earlier. Some more emails follow ...

P.T.O

**Email from Jason Dale (myself) to both Forbes as well as the delegates in attendance of the GOLD workshop that took place on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of November 2007**

From: Jason Dale [jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com]  
Sent: Saturday, November 17, 2007 3:33 PM  
To: \* **[Recipients of workshop not disclosed]**; douglas@douglasforbes.com  
Subject: Re: DNA Pincode gold workshop

Hello \* **[A member of the workshop thanking me for my prompt attendance in processing and forwarding relevant materials to the coursework]**,

I am glad you found the DNA Pin code GOLD workshop beneficial.

There seems to be a bit of confusion with regards to the Pin code website, and what my specific role actually is. I am therefore posting my reply to everyone who attended the most recent DNA Pin code GOLD workshop. If I have left anyone off the email distribution list, please let me know and I will forward this to them as well.

The website [www.douglasforbes.com](http://www.douglasforbes.com) is NOT my creation. This site was built and up and running for some time before I officially came into the picture.

My primary involvement with Douglas and with the DNA Pin code was originally to assist with I.T. programming and development on a very specific web-driven project; in what was to become a joint venture arrangement.

Aside from that, I have now also been giving my personal time, my skills and my resources at Douglas' request to assist with various "handyman" related tasks.

These extra tasks I perform are completely free of charge, and they include things like setting up the computer equipment for workshops, assisting with workshops and presentations, document editing, answering emails, assisting trainee practitioners and aspiring DNA Pin code professionals, as well as performing software installations, configurations and general administration on all of the computers, printers and audio recording equipment that gets used on-site.

Up until the end of January 2008, I will still be in the employ of \* **[My previous employer]**. This means that all of the work I currently do for Douglas has to be done after hours and in my own personal time. This happens at great personal expense and sacrifice. It has been very difficult for me to juggle the responsibilities of THREE full-time jobs (Standard Bank day job, DNA Pin code project-related programming and development, as well as ad hoc IT support and administration).

For those of you who are NOT aware of what I.T. is all about, it takes a LOT of work, which is not always visible to the general public. For example, Website administration (particularly web-driven application development) can be a full time job which requires a lot of money and many hours of solid work.

Following the announcement that Douglas made to close the DNA Pin code offices during the GOLD workshop that you all attended, I have given serious reflection and consideration to my personal status quo.

It is with regret that I inform you that I have decided to cease all of the I.T. related work that I do for the DNA Pin code for some time

*indefinitely. The future direction for DNA Pin code related I.T. projects is no longer clear to me. Furthermore, I am no longer able to maintain the significant drain on my finances and personal resources.*

*I may however elect to continue my studies as a Pin code practitioner, and apply for a DNA Pin code practitioner license, depending on how things go. This application will naturally need to be reviewed and vetted by Douglas.*

*As for linking your individual practitioner websites to the main [www.douglasforbes.com](http://www.douglasforbes.com) website, all that will need to happen is that you submit your website addresses and contact details by email DIRECTLY to [douglas@douglasforbes.com](mailto:douglas@douglasforbes.com).*

*Thereafter, Douglas or Wendy will submit those website addresses to the current administrator of [www.douglasforbes.com](http://www.douglasforbes.com), who will then link your websites for you, pending approval by Douglas.*

*I trust that you will understand and accept my position, and I wish all of you every success in your future endeavours.*

*Sincerely,*

*Jason Dale*

*I.T. Technical Specialist and Researcher*

Comments (continued):

- o) Much of what is written here is just further substantiation of what I mentioned earlier in point m). Furthermore, some of my comments in the email above indirectly make reference to a temper tantrum that Forbes threw in the middle of the workshop after being pressed by one of the delegates to stick with the workshop programme instead of deviating onto other irrelevant subjects. In not-so-surprisingly similar fashion to the behaviour displayed in SECTION 2), Forbes “*strips his moer*” (Proudly South African slang for losing your temper) and dramatically announces in pitifully bad taste and judgment that he wishes to close his business down for good. While this was arguably just a knee-jerk reaction, it demonstrates that Forbes has very little regard for the impact that his antics and actions have on other people. He also does not appear to give any consideration to the consequences that this may have had on the various projects that I was running for him, including none other than the “**Scientific Awareness Publications Project**”. This was not the only episode that took place, however. Forbes also unexpectedly shouted at and humiliated me in front of all the delegates during lunchtime, for an unbelievably petty reason. In my subsequent email to all of the delegates above, I decided not to mention the “**Scientific Awareness Publications Project**” or the incidences that took place, and instead made objective reflections on my own *status quo*. A fair reaction, considering everything.

**P.T.O**

- p) The almost *cult-like* influence that Forbes has over certain people should also not be underestimated, because one of the Delegates even wrote back to Forbes on Tuesday the 27<sup>th</sup> of November 2007 at 1:21 PM saying that *"It was indeed the best course I have attended to date, I felt especially that the group present needs to meet again There was a great positive energy that will lead to positive activity and get the DNA pincode moving forwards"*. In an attempt to defend Forbes by trying to make me look weak and confused, the individual further wrote that *"I did get an e-mail from one of the members present. However I let it go, as I think he is busy sorting out his Career path and that e-mail was just some of the thoughts that passed through his mind, while he is working it all out"*.

Below is one of the most reprehensible emails that I have read from Forbes concerning the **"Scientific awareness publications Project"**, which he sent secretly to the Professor without my awareness. This was one of the emails that the Professor agreed to hand over to me when I decided to initiate my official investigations:

P.T.O

**Email from Forbes in response to the professor, after the professor, *inter alia*, showed concern for Forbes's apparently distraught state, and asked about whether Forbes had any qualifications in PHYSICS. The Professor also made some enquiries about keeping "Blu Genes" for another month for the purposes of showing "Blu Genes" to TOP CLASS German Scientists and Physicists, some of which belonged to the European Union.**

**From:** Douglas Forbes [mailto:douglas@douglasforbes.com]  
**Sent:** 30 November 2007 02:56 PM  
**To:** \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld]  
**Subject:** Re: Good news??

Hi \* [Name of the Professor has been withheld],

*thanks so much for your comforting words, I know deep down you really are sincere and of the many people I have met, you always act with integrity and honesty. What a pity there are so few people such as yourself. remember, I am a 5, well, I have 2 fives. so I tend to say things as they are, and at times the 5's get a little sharp with the tongue, but it is really the number of fairness, and fighting for the underdog and humanity. To top it all, a P/G, ag shame.*

*Forgive me if I sometimes get defensive, and sound "aggressive" it is not my intention, nor would I harm anyone deliberately. My whole life is devoted to helping other people. I am just so grateful that I have someone like you to lend a helping hand.*

*Firstly, let me just correct one thing, I have a doctorate in META-PHYSICS, which when I wrote for the doctorate, I did it via an institute in USA in the 1980's. But, I had to keep referring to physics to get the answers. This is why I never use the title, because I do not want to be something I am not. My whole life shifted into physics, and therefore, I have never used the doctorate. The institute has since changed hands and now operates under an new name, so to me, it is not worth the paper it is written on. That does not worry me, as I believe it was a stepping stone to lead me to where I am now. I still have the dissertation which I submitted, but, I changed a lot of it and turned it into the book called BLU-GENES.*

*As Gandhi once said when asked a question, and then a week later gave a different answer to the same question, "In one week, I have learnt much"*

*When I look at my work of that time to now, I am embarrassed, I have a 7, so I try and distance myself from that work and doctorate as far as I can.*

*If the academia are prepared to listen, I still have much more evidence to show you that I have not even discussed with you yet, but we talk about this when you are ready.*

*I think that by writing the papers, with or without there approval, it will one day be seen as the truth. For what I have to write about will come to pass as evidence.becomes clearer. then they will have to pay attention and acknowledge my work. I have desire to go out there because I need to have my ego fed, not in the least. I remember when the first Homeopath started business in Jhb, he was slated by the medical doctors, propaganda in the papers, braded a witch, even had death threats and his house stoned. Yet today, humankind has determined that it more powerful than the allopathic method. Now the doctors recognise it, and incorporate it as part of there healing methods.*

*I do not expect in my life time to get the recognition for what I have uncovered, but I know it will make a difference and humankind will have reference one day. Of course it would be nice to be accepted, this would accelerate my ability to do more research and spur me on, but until then, I will do what I need to do, giving of my time with love for my passion. For me, I am at peace with what I do, I love what I do, and enjoy sharing what I do with those who are willing to listen.*

*Early next year, I will announce my new plans for the Pincode business. I have spoken with the relevant people, who are very happy and willing to take on what I have offered, they too have a passion for my work. I believe it will grow in the right direction. I will no longer be teaching. I will continue to write and be happy to work with you, I believe in you, and the new work really belongs to*

you, and what you can do with it. Several others have offered, but my gut instincts have told me it is wrong. You I believe in, to the point, I do not mind if I do the writing, and you do the presentation, talking and representation, I know it is good hands and you will nurture the baby. I still believe that there is a purpose, and the work will go to the right people. I am not driven by money, I have enough to live a comfortable life, obviously one wants more, it is a security thing more than anything else, but until then, I am happy.

I must say in conclusion, and this is for you, I always had a feeling that you would go to \* [LOCATION WITHHELD], or \* [LOCATION WITHHELD], but somehow, if you went to \* [LOCATION WITHHELD], you would not reach the potential you are capable of. The year 2009 is going to be one of the best years of your life for your work and what you are meant to do on this earth. The opportunities are busy opening your eyes and the doors. I think you are about to make some radical but very good career choices. A lot of travel, and a lot of people are going to look up to you for help and advice. You may not like it to begin with, but you will soon see the reason and then enjoy it.

I will soon be off, going to CT and then onto Istanbul, then to London. I wish you and your family a wonderful, peaceful and safe festive season.

thank you for your support, of course you may keep Blu-Genes, I just hope it is what you want it to be. Just wait until you see what is coming with the new work, now that will blow your mind.

Love from me,

yours sincerely,

Douglas.

**P.T.O**



Comments (continued):

- q) If the email above isn't a demonstration of sheer arrogance, manipulation and deceitfulness, then frankly, I don't know what is. We can clearly see from SECTION 3) that I had been battling tremendously to get to grips with the confusing and contradictory material in "**Blu Genes**", and yet over here, we can see how Forbes seems to admit that "**Blu Genes**" is perhaps not quite the scientific cornerstone that he claimed it to be. This was the opportunity of a lifetime to get his Work recognized, and he turned it down!
- r) Forbes's ulterior motives become blatantly clear here as well. Forbes knows full well that I am working hard under the impression that he has agreed that the Professor would receive my written articles and put them through the usual university channels. In actual fact, Forbes's REAL agenda with the professor was to use the professor's influence, titles and credentials for his own benefit, and directly within his own workshops and public engagements, in the same way that he uses the titles and credentials of Dr Leif Brauteseth. Very few members of the public pay much attention to the concept of "relevance" when it comes to qualifications and titles. So long as an individual bears a "Dr" or a "Prof" behind their names, the fields that they acquired their qualifications in seem to melt away into oblivion. For all you know, the professor could have had a doctorate in accounting or finance! Forbes wanted to get all of the benefits of "scientific profiling" without any of the drudgery (and risk) of showing his "very secretive" work to experts in relevant fields who would have been in a better position to establish the efficacy of his work. Forbes also believed that I would be out of the picture very soon and that I would not give him any further trouble. Forbes tries to convince the professor that the "approval" of the academia is actually not needed and that all of his theories and work would eventually be seen as "evidence" anyway. What ARROGANCE! Yet when I challenge Forbes "officially" on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2008, take note of what Forbes attorney (who is a member of the Douglas Forbes Trust) writes:

**Email from Thinus Weldhagen in response to my allegations of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of March 2008**

From Thinus Weldhagen [tcw@rmwattorneys.co.za](mailto:tcw@rmwattorneys.co.za)  
reply-to [tcw@rmwattorneys.co.za](mailto:tcw@rmwattorneys.co.za)  
to Jason Dale [jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com](mailto:jason.eddison.dale@gmail.com)  
cc Douglas Forbes [douglasfrbs@yahoo.com](mailto:douglasfrbs@yahoo.com)  
date Tue, Apr 8, 2008 at 1:00 PM

Subject RE: [ADDITIONAL COMMENTS] - Mr. Dale's RESPONSE to Mr. Forbes - RE: Blu Genes + the Scientific awareness publications project

Dear Mr Dale

*Please accept my apologies for only now replying to your e-mail. After I received your e-mail, we had to replace our server and I did not have access to my e-mail account for a couple of days.*

*Mr Forbes is currently abroad, and I will discuss the content of your e-mails with him, on his return and, if necessary, respond more fully at a later stage. My failure to respond to any and/or all of the issues raised in your e-mails, should therefore not be construed as an admission that the allegations made, are indeed correct.*

*I do however wish, at this early stage, wish to place on record that*

*1 It is our instructions that client assigned the IP in his work, to a trust and that the trustees need to consent to disclosure thereof; and*

2 Some of the comments made about our client, can be severely prejudicial to our client and our client reserves his rights to recover damages he may suffer as a result of your comments.

Comments (continued):

- s) Don't get me wrong here, I am fully in favour of protecting *Intellectual Property* or IP, and incorporating such IP into a trust is a very effective way of doing just that. What I am contesting here is that Forbes's makes false promises, and then suddenly pulls the "IP restriction" card when it suits him. If point 1 above was indeed correct, why didn't Forbes include the "trust" and its trustees in the activities of the project RIGHT FROM THE START? Surely he would need to get their approval for this project first?? Why did Forbes not mention this trust when he asked me to contact the professor? Why did Forbes not make me aware of the restrictions concerning the divulging of "Intellectual Property" when I emailed him all of my questions about the **Speed of light, Einstein and Pythagoras's theorem of the Octagon** in SECTION 3)? Why is an attorney who happens to be a member of the "Douglas Forbes Trust" accusing me of being "*Severely prejudicial*"? WHY, WHY, WHY???
- t) There are indeed many unanswered questions at this point. I have no doubt that at least some of Forbes's minions, followers, representatives and associates will have very unflattering comments to direct at me as a result of my taking the stand that I have. I also do not doubt that many more unbiased and objective readers will have much criticism to direct at me for various reasons. Some of these criticisms may even be fair, as some of my own decisions and actions in certain matters mentioned were far from perfect. Yet I acted as ethically and as professionally as I could, with the best of what I knew and had, and did so under extremely difficult and complicated circumstances. As Forbes well knows, I had given my employers **six months notice** after I announced that I would quit my career and go into the DNA Pin Code (Human Pin Code) fulltime. I had a passion for the DNA Pin Code and what it could offer humanity, and I was really excited about the vision that I had for using the tool in various capacities to help thousands of people. What I found especially appealing about the tool was that it claimed to have a basis in science, which will naturally appeal to my mind and interests. I acted on basis of trust and belief, but at the same time I demonstrated the ability to think logically and critically, and I applied my intellectual faculties, resources and time to my projects and studies in a way that very few aspiring practitioners would have. Initially I overlooked Forbes's antics and comments and instead tried to demonstrate more patience and understanding towards listening and seeing things from his point of view. Yet all of that amounted to nothing more than having my trust betrayed and my skills, resources and time selfishly abused.
- u) In so far as the **Scientific Awareness Publications Project** is concerned, perhaps my critics will say that I made my own assumptions about the nature of the project and that I simply did not listen or pay attention to Forbes's instructions to simply "*write something about DNA Pincode on Wikipedia*" and to get the professor to "*write something to contribute*". Perhaps it will be argued that there was a lot of *hearsay* involved with this project and its activities, and that the doubt should not exclusively benefit my own point of view. Perhaps there were miscommunications between Forbes, myself and the professor and that not all of us were "*on the same page*" so to speak. Perhaps ... neither the professor nor Forbes *really knew* about the exact manner in which I was approaching the project, and perhaps Forbes *would have* interjected about my using "**Blu genes**" if I simply communicated my ideas and mindset more clearly to him. Well, these criticisms would be NONSENSE. Forbes knew very well what my views and thoughts were towards how the project should be conducted, and those views and sentiments were echoed by the professor. For those who require PROOF of this statement, my next and LAST email will offer all the PROOF you need.

P.T.O

Email from Jason Dale (myself) to BOTH Forbes and to the professor, in response to a newsletter forwarded from Forbes concerning a government gazette to regulate the alternative health industry, regulations of which would have meant enforcing more control over alternative practitioners in health, healing and alternative counselling (referring to the Proposed Amendments R968 and R969 to the Health Professions Act)

Take note that is email was sent on the 19<sup>th</sup> of November 2007 at 15:49, approximately THREE DAYS before I wrote my email on "The Speed of Light?" in SECTION 3)!!!

*From:* Dale, Jason J [mailto:Jason.Dale@standardbank.co.za]  
*Sent:* 19 November 2007 07:55 PM  
*To:* Douglas Forbes  
*Cc:* \* [Name and email address of the Professor has been withheld]  
*Subject:* RE: Legislation  
*Importance:* High

Hi Douglas,

I would like to add my two cents worth at this point.

I think that there is more to this government gazette than meets the eye.

To me, this gazette reminds me of the 1992 legislation passed by the **FDA** (Food and Drug Administration) which made the outrageously absurd claim that "No diseases could be cured without drugs". The ramification of this was that ANY natural / alternative health care practitioner COULD be sued for selling Vitamin C to people suffering from Scurvy. Under this kind of insane legislation, Vitamin C would then be classed as a drug on basis that it actually DID cure Scurvy with near miraculous results.

At the end of the day, it is **ALL** about the **MONEY** and **ONLY** about the **MONEY**.

In this context, **MONEY** comes from **CONTROLLING MARKET SHARE**.

It is not uncommon for governments and larger corporations to close down their smaller and more numerous competitors to gain control of the market, **ESPECIALLY** if the "little guys" are producing products and services that have been proven to be superior.

Which leads me to my next point ...

The "Little guys" (which in this context includes "alternative" practitioners such as the DNA Pin code life path coach) could be put under severe pressure to **PROVE** the **EFFICACY** and **SCIENTIFIC GROUNDING** of their "alternative" systems.

Why do I say all of this?

Surely, this gazette will **ONLY** affect the people who are "**Claiming to be psychologists without being properly qualified**"?? as per some of the commentaries below?

Don't be too quick to make assumptions here or to breathe a sigh of relief ...

This particular gazette could be the **START** of things to come.

It is important to "read between the lines" to see where all of this is going, and it is equally important to consider **BOTH SIDES OF THE STORY**.

There are literally **THOUSANDS** of different counsellors, alternative healers, practices, practitioners and establishments that are offering products and services to the unsuspecting public, and **MANY** of these so-called "alternative" products and services have been found to be nothing more than the work of con-artists and snake oil merchants.

Don't get me wrong here ... I am not saying that ALL "alternative" practitioners fall into this category. Indeed, many of them produce quality work and ARE the bona fide "real deal".

The problem is ... how does the **CUSTOMER** discern the **SHEEP** from the **WOLVES** in the world of "alternative" cures, spiritual healing and "personal development"? Seriously ... do you have ANY IDEA as to just HOW MANY CHOICES a customer has in choosing an "alternative" cure, over a more conventional form of treatment, such as psycho therapy?

On the South African internet alone, I can find **PAGES UPON PAGES UPON PAGES** of "alternative" practitioners, who offer everything from "energy healing" to Tarot card readings. There are some that even claim to be able to give accurate personality profiles using your palm or your date of birth.

One may find that some of these "alternative" practitioners are GENUINE, and actually DO make a POSITIVE and LASTING DIFFERENCE in the lives of their customers. This does happen ... but it happens "here and there".

Yet, if I pay ANY one of these "alternative" practitioners for their services, and I find that they DON'T live up to their claims, what recourse do I have as a customer? If I attend a course or a workshop from one of these establishments, and I am NOT happy with the contents of the course, what options do I have?

**ABSOLUTELY NONE!!**

Therein lies the "**OTHER**" side of the story.

Psychologists are complaining that they have to spend YEARS studying towards their professions, and they have to WRITE EXAMS and pay HUGE tuition fees, and are accountable to governing bodies for their actions. YET ... an "alternative" practitioner can read one or two books, attend a few weekend workshops, and be PRACTISING ON THE SAME CLIENTS for commercial benefit, and charge almost the SAME amount of money per hour!!

If the customer ends up with an "alternative" practitioner that is incompetent, and becomes personally compromised in the process, can that customer really do anything about it? who does he or she speak to? and who will take action?

The fact of the matter is ... the "alternative" health care, personal development and counselling industries are **NOT BEING REGULATED OR POLICED**.

Alternative practitioners of all kinds can make the most **OUTRAGEOUS CLAIMS** and produce the most **USELESS PRODUCTS AND RESULTS**, without ever having to be accountable to any regulating body for their actions.

If psychologists come under flack for not doing their jobs properly (and believe it or not, that has happened quite often) then the **SAME RULES** must apply to "alternative" practitioners. More often than not, the rules that govern the actions of "alternative" practitioners are extremely lax, if not totally non-existent.

While it is indeed true that many self-professed psychologists are not what they claim to be, it is also true that many unsuspecting members of the South African public have been bitten and burnt by "alternative" practitioners who are selling nothing more than pixie dust and snake oil.

As much as the "alternative" practitioners are going to wage their own private war over this gazette, the general public who **PAYS** for these kinds of services (whether contemporary or alternative) are inevitably going to ask the SAME question:

### **"HOW IS THE LAW GOING TO PROTECT US AS CONSUMERS?"**

What is good for the Goose is good for the Gander.

The **GOVERNANCE** that applies to psychologists must also apply to alternative practitioners. It does not matter which side of the fence you are on, you must prove the quality and scientific basis for your work, and you must be accountable for your actions.

The politics around "who is better" ... the conventional psychologists versus the "alternative" practitioners can get rather messy, and the most POPULAR tactic used by the "one side" to gain the upper hand over the "other side", is to play what is known as the **"CREDIBILITY GAME"**.

If you DO want to take on the government over this gazette, then by all means, go right ahead.

YET ... the "Joan of Arc" approach will backfire on you in a nasty way if you **LACK PROOF OF EFFICACY and SCIENTIFIC GROUNDING** when it comes to YOUR OWN products or services. In the final analysis, you will need to provide **PROOF** of your claims.

Anticipate that ANY challenge on ANY powerful organization like the government will have repercussions, and if your OWN house is not in order, you can be carried away in the ensuing storm.

AGAIN, don't get me wrong here ...

You could have the BEST product ...

The BEST service ...

The BEST customer support ...

The BEST HONESTY and the BEST INTENTIONS ...

... but if you make **CLAIMS THAT YOU CANNOT PROVE** ... you are DEAD IN THE WATER ... because **PROOF IS KING!**

I would say that this is a very good time to start making preparations for what could be waiting for the DNA Pin code further down the line.

In my humble opinion, here is what you can do to protect yourself and your work:

- Find ALL documentation and **REGISTRATION** and/or **PATENT NUMBERS** that you may hold, and keep these on hand.
- Find ALL documentation and **PROOF** of any **DOCTORATES, PhD's** and/or **DEGREES** that you may claim or claimed to have had.
- If you undertook any **DOCTORATE, PHD** and/or **DEGREE**, find a **SUITABLE REFERENCE** (a person, fellow colleague and/or classmate) than can confirm your attendance at the university or institution at which you studied
- Find all of the **TECHNICAL WHITE PAPERS** that **CLEARLY EXPLAIN** all of the **THEORIES** and **FORMULAS** that form the basis of your work. You DON'T need to release these for peer review just yet, (after all, this **IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY!!**) but **AT LEAST** find them and keep them handy. Going forward, you will want to have at least SOME of these published in



Scientific journals and peer reviewed as soon as possible. Make sure that all of this I.P. (Intellectual Property) is **OWNED** by a **TRUST** before you do this.

- Start formulating a **GOVERNING BODY** that ensures the **LAWFUL** and **CORRECT APPLICATION** of the DNA Pin code system
- **If you DO decide in future to resume holding workshops**, ensure that all **TRAINING MATERIALS** and **COURSES** are up to standard, and are sufficient so as to imbue all students of the DNA Pin code with the **COMPETENCE** and **SKILL** of the application of the DNA Pin code, in a way that allows them to achieve the very same "98% accuracy" in practice that you claim to be able to achieve.
- Incorporate a **COMPETENCY BASED CERTIFICATION SYSTEM** that **THOROUGHLY TESTS THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE OF YOUR PRACTITIONERS**. The rule of thumb here is ... if you **CANNOT** produce practitioners who can **DO WHAT YOU DO**, then **DON'T HAVE PRACTITIONERS** in your organization or your company.
- Use "TRULY" **SCIENTIFIC METHODS** such as the **TRIPLE BLIND TEST** to **PROVE, BEYOND ALL REASONABLE DOUBT**, that the DNA Pin code is in fact "98% accurate". **ANY CLAIMS MADE ABOUT ACCURACY MUST BE SCIENTIFICALLY PROVEN AND SUBSTANTIATED**. Please note that Anecdotal "evidence" received in the form of an email or a testimonial is **NOT** classed as **PROOF** by the Scientific community. So ... receiving an email entitled "*Hi, my name is Percy, and your DNA Pin Code reading saved my marriage and helped me turn around my life ...*" is **NOT** classed as **PROOF**. This is circumstantial and anecdotal. **MOST "scientifically proven" products and services make the FATAL mistake of NOT ruling out what is known as the "Placebo effect"**. I would heartily recommend that you find documentation for as many of your historical case studies as you can. Anticipate the kinds of questions that scientific people will ask, and have ready answers.

Please trust me when I say that if you take the above measures that I have outlined above, you will be **WELL** on your way to protecting yourself and your work against whatever storm may come from this government gazette.

**EVEN IF THIS WHOLE THING "BLOWS OVER"** and turns out to be nothing of substance or concern ... you would **STILL** do well to follow the above guidelines. It will push you **WAY AHEAD** of your competitors.

Remember ... **HONESTY** and **SINCERITY** cannot be **FAKED** ... and there is **NO SUBSTITUTE** for these things in the business world.

Sincerely,

Jason

**END OF DOCUMENT**

---