


PUBLIC INTEREST ARCHIVE

A resource of publicly available published material for researchers, authors, publishers, journalists, lawyers and the law enforcement community

By Mike Sutton (author of [Nullius in Verba: Darwin's greatest secret](#))



Archive No. 1 (Public domain, published data) [PDF Here](#)

Archive No. 2 (Public domain, published data):

In UK Law, under section 1 of the Malicious Communications Act 1998, it is an offence to send an indecent, offensive or threatening letter, electronic communication or other article to another person.

The published obscene and offensive misogynistic abuse below has been reported in the Scottish and English regional press [here](#) and [here](#), and [here](#) and [here](#).

Despite this, Wikipedia's organizational response is to allow this particular individual to substantially edit a Wikipedia page about me ([edits here](#)) and their Patrick Matthew page about me and my research (e.g. [here](#)).

Despite such verifiable hard published evidence to the contrary, Wikipedia's owner Jimmy Wales maintained on a BBC programme on 24th January that its editors are not malicious or malevolent: [here](#) (archived [here](#)).

Offensive Communication from a prolific Wikipedia editor of their [Patrick Matthew page](#) and [Mike Sutton page](#)



Original Twitter Account Tweet: [Here](#)
Archived: [Here](#)

Archive No. 3 Wikipedia organizational response to the "New Data" Wikipedia has facilitated its editors to reference their own biased blog sites, emails and claimed emails from others to lie and publish malicious and malevolent falsehoods about peer reviewed journal articles and the verifiable facts published in them. Wikipedia's Patrick Matthew page ([archived here](#)).

Wikipedia's Patrick Matthew page editors involved in organizational response to the "New Data" (archived):

- a. <http://archive.is/ZxVTr>
- b. <http://archive.is/pEJWG>
- c. <http://archive.is/NWGgZ>

Ignoring the fact, [reported in the press](#), that Dr John van Wyhe sat on the editorial board of the journal that published my [peer reviewed science journal article](#) on the newly discovered independent facts of Darwin's glory stealing science fraud and proven lies, Wikipedia editors focus merely on what they call an "open letter", which (you really could not make this stuff up) one of them sent as an email to a number of people!


Next, they focus on Dr van Wyhe's mere unevidenced opinion that newly discovered disconfirming facts for Darwin's independent conception of a prior published theory are a conspiracy theory, and a mere opinionated fact denial blogsite written by an apparently otherwise unpublished Darwin superfan. (Wikipedia's biased claims [all archived here](#)).

At the time of writing, the Wikipedia Patrick Matthew page cites a dreadfully misleading review of my (2014) book Nullius in Verba: Darwin's greatest secret to support the claims of its editors. The review is by [Grzegorz Malec \(2015\)](#). However, with typical "Darwin Lobby" bias, Wikipedia does not cite my published reply in the same journal as that review ([Sutton 2015](#)), presumably simply because my published right of reply completely refutes, with reason and independently verifiable evidence, all but one genuine, and acknowledged as useful, claim in that review.

Moreover, on the Patrick Matthew page, in a long history of publishing the most incredible and easy to detect malicious falsehoods, Wikipedia currently publishes the lie (even though the lie has been "whack-a-mole" corrected countless times with full citation to the independently verifiable facts) that my peer-reviewed British Society of Criminology paper was *not* peer reviewed. The fact that it in fact most certainly *was* peer reviewed - as dishonest Wikipedia editors know very well because they have published the truth of it in the past (see the archived history page of edits on the Wikipedia page in question - [here](#)) - is proven by what the British Society of

Criminology Journal's Editor wrote on that very topic in the British Society of Criminology's online journal: [here](#) (also [archived](#)), where the article on Darwin's BigData detected plagiarism and lies ([Sutton 2014](#)) can be found.

Screenshot (taken on 24/01/2018) of several Wikipedia falsehoods being published and disseminated about me and my scholarly research publications on their [Patrick Matthew page](#).



Conclusion

Dealing with biased and corruptly malicious and malevolent Wikipedians and their editors is like playing Whac-a-mole. In my opinion, it is better to do what professors Ben-Yehuda and Oliver-Lumerman have done, which is to publish in scholarly publications links to allow readers to see exactly what Wikipedia editors are up

to. On which note, those two highly respected academics, [Professor Nachman Ben-Yehuda](#) and [Amalya Oliver-Lumerman](#), in their 2017 book '*Fraud and Misconduct in Research: Detection, investigation and organizational response* ([here](#)), note that the Wikipedia page about me reveals the backlash against the facts published in the first edition e-book of 'Nullius' (for proper academic reference purposes, page details and full quotations to what they have written in their book on tis topic see the PDF file available [here](#)).

For more details of Wikipedia falsehoods and “Darwin Lobby” fact denial bias please visit the relevant pages of PatrickMatthew.com for the independently verifiable and fully referenced facts E.g. <http://patrickmatthew.com/Book%20Reviews.html>