



## Response to Paracast Defamation

---

On the latest episode of the Paracast show, hosts Gene Steinberg and Chris O'Brien took it upon themselves to defame me during their discussion at the beginning of the show.

Gene Steinberg announced:

*"There is a character who calls herself Emma Woods who has been stalking UFO abduction researcher David Jacobs for several years."*

<http://www.theparacast.com/podcast/now-playing-august-14-2011-david-kaiser/>

Steinberg and O'Brien went on to allege that I was "obsessive" and on a "vendetta", and said that Dr. Jacobs should not have to go through it.

Both Steinberg and O'Brien have defamed me on previous episodes of the Paracast as well. As they are continuing to do this, I think that I should respond to their statements.

Dr. Jacobs took me on as a research subject by leading me to believe that I would be a research subject of Temple University. He had me sign a research consent form citing the University. However, I was later informed by Temple University that the form that he had me sign was "unauthorized" by them, and that they do not view his work as "research".

Over a period of two years, Dr. Jacobs conducted intensive hypnosis with me. He used overt leading and suggestion to implant false memories in my mind of traumatic events, including of violent assault and rape. His leading was so extensive that, in my opinion, he had to have been aware of what he was doing. I have provided audio recordings on my website of him doing this:

<http://www.ufoalienabductee.com/#hypnosis>

While I was in the vulnerable hypnotic state, Dr. Jacobs implanted hypnotic suggestions in my mind that I had Multiple Personality Disorder (MPD). I have provided an audio clip on my website of Dr. Jacobs putting those hypnotic suggestions in my mind:

<http://www.ufoalienabductee.com/#mpd>

Most people know that Dr. Jacobs' action in putting hypnotic suggestions in my mind that I had Multiple Personality Disorder was reprehensible.

Dr. Jacobs has admitted publicly that he put hypnotic suggestions in my mind that I had MPD. He talked about it during an interview on Coast to Coast AM. It is a fact, and it is not contested.

<http://www.coasttocoastam.com/show/2010/12/19>

However, neither Steinberg nor O'Brien has ever publicly addressed the fact that Dr. Jacobs put hypnotic suggestions in my mind that I had MPD.

What is worse, Steinberg has tried to imply that I may have falsified the recording of Dr. Jacobs implanting those hypnotic suggestions in my mind (even though Dr. Jacobs himself recorded it and could easily provide the recording himself if I had done such a thing.)

I wonder how Steinberg and O'Brien would feel if Dr. Jacobs put hypnotic suggestions in the mind of their daughter, wife, sister, or mother, that they had a serious mental disorder? Would they turn a blind eye to such abuse? I doubt it. Perhaps they consider other people to be somehow expendable? Whatever the reason, I find their inhumanity to be incomprehensible.

At the time that my case became known in the field, I was vociferously attacked on the Paracast forum by Steinberg's moderator, Michael Schuyler. He also sent me an offensive email. Steinberg openly supported him in doing this.

Eventually, Steinberg invited Dr. Jacobs onto the Paracast show, and allowed him to defame me with impunity. Steinberg did not tell the listeners what my allegations were, nor where to find the information I had presented.

It was only after Steinberg had allowed Dr. Jacobs to defame me on his show that I eventually began to post on the Paracast forum, in an attempt to defend myself.

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/6692-April-4th-show-Hopkins-Randle-Jacobs/page5?p=87209#post87209>

A friend of Dr. Jacobs, using the pseudonym "Archie Bedford", attacked me viciously on the Paracast forum and defamed me. Steinberg allowed him to do this.

"Archie Bedford" engaged in communication with two friends of mine, and let them know that he knew my real name, as well as where I lived. That is information that he should never have gained access to. He claimed that Dr. Jacobs had not told him my name. If that is the case, one wonders how he knew it. "Archie Bedford" said that my identity was going to be revealed publicly, although he claimed that it would not be done by himself or by Dr. Jacobs personally. It was, in my opinion, a clear attempt to intimidate me into keeping quiet by making me afraid that my identity was going to be revealed publicly.

Steinberg later allowed "Archie Bedford" to defame Carol Rainey on the Paracast forum in the same way that he had defamed me. Ms. Rainey eventually contacted "Archie Bedford" personally. She had obtained his actual name and discovered his position in a medically-related firm whose Board would be dismayed to learn of their executive's serious breach of research ethics that were evidenced in his threats that my identity as a research subject -- an identity he *never* should have been told -- would be disclosed. Ms. Rainey stated that he had fabricated the story of meeting with her and knowing her motives for writing a critical article. She requested that he retract his defamation of her. In short order, "Archie Bedford" subsequently admitted on the forum that what he had said about Ms. Rainey was not true, that he should not have said what he did, and that it was a good time for him to take a hiatus from the Paracast Forum.

Eventually, Steinberg banned me from the Paracast forum, saying that I could only post there if I revealed my identity. Like most experiencers, I need anonymity to protect my family and myself from the stigma associated with the subject. Steinberg knew that it was the one thing that I could not do.

Steinberg recently posted this on the Paracast forum:

*"We allowed 'Emma Woods' to post loads and loads of messages until they became repetitious and we saw evidence of outright deceit. Since she has given her real name to others, I asked her to do the same here, inasmuch as she is attacking a person by their real name while using a fake name. No response. So she's gone."*

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/9040-I-had-know-Idea?s=2987acc8eb9c9e97c59b63c017043487&p=121452#post121452>

However, I had provided evidence of everything that I said.

Steinberg banned me after I responded to a post by "Archie Bedford" in which Bedford said that sources in Intelligence organisations had known about "hybrids" long before Dr. Jacobs did, and I asked whether that meant that the idea of "hybrids" originated from the Intelligence organizations.

"Archie Bedford's" post is here:

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/6826-Alien-hybrids-Nephilim/page2?p=89258#post89258>

My response is here:

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/6826-Alien-hybrids-Nephilim/page2?p=89261#post89261>

Steinberg then banned me in a post in which he said:

*"... as far as I'm concerned, you are just someone who wears a mask. It is time we set this singular episode aside until or unless you are prepared to tell us who you really are. That means no more posts here until I see that information. You say you crave privacy and thus you keep your real identity a secret, but your public behavior demonstrates otherwise.*

*"It's time for you to take off your mask – and when you do, I shall be happy to restore your posting privileges."*

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/6826-Alien-hybrids-Nephilim/page2?p=89267#post89267>

Neither Steinberg nor O'Brien appears to have any understanding of the need of most experiencers to protect their identity. This is especially the case outside of the USA, which is far more advanced than the rest of the world. In my country, being an experiencer is beyond the pale, and anyone who is open about it will have a very difficult time indeed.

The idea that I am somehow "hiding" behind anonymity is absolutely not the case. I am keeping my name private to protect my family and myself. However, I knew

when I came forward that it might come out. It was one of the reasons that I found it so scary to do. Dr. Jacobs had threatened to reveal my identity if I talked in public, and I was frightened that he was going to do that.

This is an audio clip of Dr. Jacobs threatening to reveal my identity:

<http://www.ufoalienabductee.com/david-jacobs-threat-reveal-my-identity.mp3>

Nevertheless, I still went ahead. I did it because I had to defend myself, and because I did not want anyone else to be hurt like I was.

Paul Kimball, who periodically co-hosted the Paracast show with Steinberg, finally left the Paracast over Steinberg's double standards. Kimball explained his reasons on his blog:

*"Now, 'Emma Woods' is a difficult case. She has remained anonymous to all but a few people, while mounting a serious and sustained campaign against David Jacobs that questions his integrity. But she has also provided some evidence, incomplete though it may be, to back up her claims. That evidence can ultimately be examined without reference to her identity.*

*"'Archie Bedford' has provided nothing. Nothing.*

*"And yet 'Emma Woods' is not welcome at The Paracast, and 'Archie Bedford' attacks Carol Rainey with impunity. That's the kind of fundamental error that tells you everything you need to know about a person, or a group of persons. ...*

*"Barring a complete mea culpa by Gene Steinberg, who runs The Paracast, and is ultimately responsible for what goes on there (memo to Carol Rainey: when someone accuses you of 'fraud' without any supporting evidence, you might want to contact your lawyer), I won't be listening anymore. I can guarantee that you won't ever hear me on the show again, and you won't see me post in their forum anymore ..."*

<http://redstarfilms.blogspot.com/2011/03/paracast.html>

Although posters on the Paracast forum tried to discuss the issue, Steinberg shut down numerous threads about it. In addition he banned a number of people who supported me. He did everything that he could to try to cover for Dr. Jacobs.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the posters on the Paracast forum, especially Harvey Price ("Paraschtick") and Susan Brown ("Brownie"), who saw what was happening, and who supported me.

It appears that Steinberg is still allowing Michael Schuyler to attack me on his forum. In a recent post Schuyler said:

*"... my opinion is that Emma Woods is clinically insane and needs to be institutionalized for the safety of herself and others."*

Steinberg and O'Brien both thanked Schuyler for the above comments.

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/9040-I-had-know-Idea?p=121479#post121479>

Steinberg went on to imply that I was mentally ill. He referred to Dr. Jacobs' character assassination of me, saying:

*"Actually, Jacobs' response does describe in laymen's terms what his advisers claim is the nature of her illness."*

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/9040-I-had-know-Idea/page2?p=121506#post121506>

It is patently obvious that no competent mental health professional in their right mind would ever support Dr. Jacobs in putting hypnotic suggestions in my mind that I had Multiple Personality Disorder. All competent mental health professionals would know that Dr. Jacobs' actions constituted serious psychological abuse, and that I had every right to make that known.

I have been assessed as psychologically normal by both my former and current therapists. They are qualified and in a position to make that assessment. I have a psychological assessment of me by former therapist on my website, which assesses this. Dr. Jacobs has the original signed copy of it, and he spoke to my former therapist about it.

<http://www.ufoalienabductee.com/therapy-assessment.html>

Dr. Jacobs is fully aware that I do not have a mental illness. In my opinion he is cold-bloodedly trying to imply that I do, in a desperate attempt to discredit me personally so that people do not examine the evidence that I have presented about his misconduct as a researcher. It appears, in my opinion, that Steinberg and O'Brien are following Dr. Jacobs' lead in this.

It appears that the defamation that I have been subjected to on the Paracast is not an isolated incident. I was told by Nancy Birnes that Bill Birnes was defamed on the Paracast show, and I listened to the section of the show concerned. The comments were highly offensive in my opinion. Steinberg now appears to be letting one of his forum moderators, Don Ecker, defame Alfred Lehmborg on his forum without asking him to provide any evidence for his claims.

Paratopia Magazine recently published an important article by Carol Rainey on abduction research. In response, Steinberg sent a mass email to his listeners in which he grossly misrepresented the content of Ms. Rainey's article in an offensive manner.

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/8205-Your-Paracast-Newsletter-%C2%97-January-22-2011?p=107803#post107803>

After a complaint by Jeff Ritzmann, one of the publishers of Paratopia Magazine, Steinberg did not send a retraction to the people on the mass email list to correct his comments. Instead, he posted a partial retraction on the Paracast forum, which he must have known would never reach the people on his email list who did not read his message board.

<http://www.theparacast.com/forum/threads/8205-Your-Paracast-Newsletter-%C2%97-January-22-2011?p=107870#post107870>

On the latest episode of the Paracast show Steinberg made the false claim that I have been banned from other forums because I use a pseudonym. He said:

*"... more and more forums will not allow Emma Woods to post until she presents some authentication as to who she really is."*

This is completely untrue.

To my knowledge, the Paracast is the only forum that has banned me and told me that I cannot post there unless I reveal my identity.

What would motivate Steinberg to make such a claim? Did he think that by saying that, it would make people think that his action in banning me unless I revealed my identity was reasonable?

At the end of the day, the facts are what they are. Dr. Jacobs can try to cover them up by attempting to destroy my personal reputation. His supporters, like Steinberg and O'Brien, can try to assist him with this. But what happened, happened.

As Jack Brewer, of the *The UFO Trail* blog says, Steinberg's claim that I am stalking Dr. Jacobs at the core implies that I should be quiet, and that I should not make known what happened. It implies that I should cease discussing my case while *Steinberg continues to do so*. It appears that Steinberg would like me to go away.

Well, something did happen, and I am speaking out about it. Not only do I have the right to do it, but I think that I should do it. Speaking out will help to protect other research subjects in the future from being hurt. That can only be a good thing.

---

Posted on 08.17.2011 by [Emma Woods](#) | [48 Comments](#)

#### Reader Comments (48)

Thank you for posting Emma!

Though I think you haven't much to worry about. I check the paracast forum regularly (to see who they are attacking) and there seem to be only about 6 (at the most) super paracast fans that actually post and agree with their opinions of you and most others that they attack. If there are other fans, they don't care enough to post about such things.

August 17, 2011 | [Lesley](#)

Thanks Emma, i've cancelled my sub to the paracast podcast.

August 18, 2011 | [ian](#)

Hello Emma,  
Fine, but don't let you be distracted in your crusade and forget who your main target and persecutor is or was.

The two present individuals are not even worth your time for an answer.

Yours,  
F.Boitte

August 18, 2011 | [F. Boitte](#)

In my view, the field as a whole has been diminished by all of this. Not so much by 'Emma Wood's' conduct as by the actions and words of commentators and researchers in ufology. Some of them were people who I had admired for years and couldn't understand where their judgement was coming from. Now it appears judgement is defined by friendship and bonds of necessity.

Personalities and loyalties have probably played too great a part in all this and deflected attention from methodologies, ethics and good practice within abduction research. The original points were to question if Jacobs' conclusions were reasonably yielded from sound data. To many, it was evident that his conclusions ('I no longer have the luxury of disbelief') exceeded the quality of evidence. Also to question if his treatment of customers was duly ethical?

A positive outcome of the arguments and attacks (on all sides) is that a potential customer of Jacobs should find reasons to think twice before

approaching him. Likewise, I think some of his vociferous supporters have given it a second thought and have lost their certainty.

Unfortunately, I think 'Emma Woods' has the choice between walking away and letting personal attacks stand, or refuting them until they fade away. Neither are appealing; It's clear that there's no dénouement in this narrative and Jacobs will continue without any oversight of conduct, objectivity etc.

One final point is that I've yet to read a response from 'Emma' that wasn't measured, calm and glued to the points. The name-calling has been sourced entirely from elsewhere.

August 18, 2011 | [Kandinsky](#)

***"We allowed 'Emma Woods' to post loads and loads of messages until they became repetitious and we saw evidence of outright deceit." -- Gene Steinberg***

Repetition may become necessary with the odd drongo apparently incapable of absorbing the message—as very thoughtfully presented—in the first place, and, in the second, an entirely oblivious Gene Steinberg is challenged yet again to list these real or imagined "outright deceits" and "evidences" of same. Not enough to just *say* so. Give examples, Mr. Steinberg, or it is just slander only satisfying insentient and cowardly snakes, snakes with canted attitudes, an appalling lack of imagination, and an especially—remembering Don Ecker—belligerent bias.

Let's remember where we're coming from here in a birds-eye low down on the whole caper: Even apart from ignobly collected female undergarments, and the uneasy facilitation of medieval sexual continence devises... we're talking about a man, Gene Steinberg, in support of a seeming psychopathic and *unqualified* individual who suggested hypnotically to one "Emma Woods" that she had a SEVERE mental illness!!! This has to be addressed or human research subjects in the aggregate, may be on the way to being treated as sexual chattel by the unscrupulous "researcher" who may be just working out a pathology of his own. No one should get a pass on "rape"... especially "rape" with clear evidence. It's on vetted tape! Justice must be brought to bear! What do people not understand about that!

Closing, good work, Ms Woods, sane, cited, rational, calm, and with it! More confirmation that you are very obviously NOT the person described at the gulled standard of incontinent cack that is Gene Steinberg's Paracastia.

August 18, 2011 | [Lehberg](#)

...I admonish any fan or troll of Paracastia / Hopkins / Jacobs / Steinberg / Ecker that they are *entirely* free to make their contributions and or apologies here... I think you have to eat an actual baby to get banned from *this* forum so bring your *best* game, eh? A pledge? When you're right, you're right! Though, let's see you ring that bell, and you actually *have* to ring it. Just saying "ding" doesn't count. I will eat you for it. Jus' sayin', eh, Don? ...Jus sayin'.

August 18, 2011 | [Lehberg](#)

An excellent, point-by-point response, Emma!

I echo what the poster Kandinsky has written in the commentary above : "One final point is that I've yet to read a response from 'Emma' that wasn't measured, calm and glued to the points. The name-calling has been sourced entirely from elsewhere." .....

I think your self-control, politeness and staying on point drives them mad!

Even though I'm sure you tire of it, keep up the good fight. Continue speaking truth to power!

- Susan Brown

August 18, 2011 | [Susan Brown](#)

Oh, and by the way -- statements made in Paracastia are going to be dragged by mangy neck scruffs, even kicking and screaming, over *here* for dissection, jus' sayin'. Let's roll.

August 18, 2011 | [Lehberg](#)

As is the norm, Emma yet again backs every single point she makes with evidence and references.

I recently saw a post on the Future Theater blog for the show that Emma did with Bill & Nancy. It was from a young lady who was thinking of using the services of David Jacobs. After hearing the show she decided it best to avoid him. That in itself shows that Emma was completely justified in speaking out.

Ms. Woods, right there you have saved another human from harm and should feel proud of what your bravery has achieved thus far.

Steinberg, remove those magnets from your moral compass. It's clearly out of whack.

August 18, 2011 | [Paul](#)

*"The two present individuals are not even worth your time for an answer."*

We must agree to disagree, Sir. The path to the already disarmed antagonist is through his invalidated and irrelevant, so crumbling shield. From where would defense come, then? There are a significant number, increasing every day, of disappointed Jacobs fans out there unable to work through the cognitive dissonance of their champion gone so *demonstrably* bad. Highlighting the profiling Steinberg as a less than competent Jacobs booster does not do Dr. Jacobs a service, yea and verily. Finally, "Lisbeth" knows what she's doing, eh?

To the disappointed fans. Abduction by the "other"? Likely, given it is humankind's oldest story. Only, it seems the Jacobs / Hopkins path may not be the approach to an understanding of it. Look for a new paradigm, eh? It won't be the last time.

August 18, 2011 | [Lehmborg](#)

Thank you everybody for your kind comments. It is much appreciated.

August 18, 2011 | [Emma](#)

Well said Emma, although at this point I can't imagine that anyone can listen to Steinberg and O'Brien and think they have any credibility.

Here's the really crazy thing. Steinberg at one point had O'Brien, Paul Kimball, Greg Bishop and Nick Redfern as co-hosts. And he wound up keeping O'Brien, the one that was banned from the X-Zone. Think about that for a moment. A show that had Kal Korff as a regular guest host thought so little of O'Brien that he was booted off the air and banned. And this is the guy that Steinberg wound up with.

It makes sense though when you think about it. Redfern has a real career writing successful book after successful book. He does semi-regular gigs on Coast to Coast. He clearly doesn't need something like The Paracast and if you listen to the episodes he co-hosted it's also clear that he never really meshed with Steinberg, probably because he didn't appreciate Steinberg constantly interrupting him and whoever the guest was to tell another Donald E. Keyhoe story. The same is true but even more for Bishop, who has his own far better podcast. Listen to the Paracast episode with Moseley cohosted by Bishop. You can almost hear Bishop banging his head on the desk after yet another insipid interruption by Steinberg. Bishop doesn't seem to suffer fools gladly and Steinberg is nothing if not a fool. And then there's Kimball who seemed to be the guy who brought his pals Redfern and Bishop along. Listen to the Dolan episode. Kimball and Dolan are very bright guys, and it was great to hear them stretch out and talk about things beyond just UFOs, like the rise of the far right in America and other things, right up until the point where Steinberg desperately tried to steer the conversation back onto ground he could understand like Keyhoe and flying saucer stories. I knew when I heard that episode that Kimball would bolt and sure enough I think he only did one episode after that and then he was gone.

So Steinberg gets O'Brien, the only person of that original group of co-hosts who needs the Paracast and can stomach Steinberg. Like I said when you think about it, it makes perfect sense. They deserve each other. Like always winds up attracting like.

August 18, 2011 | [Duke](#)

Excellent job, Emma! Your clear writing style and rational demeanor have become such constants that we have come to expect it of you. Your ability to calmly state the facts and present verification thereof - while your detractors stoop to personal insults and never provide documentation of their accusations - speaks both volumes and for itself.

As others who have provided comment have suggested, your willingness and ability to speak out about the circumstances of the Jacobs 'investigation' have indeed been a productive and needed addition to ufology. Much more attention needs to be given to the handling of research subjects by self-described ufologists, the witch hunt taking place via regressive hypnosis, and related issues. Your case is indeed very important, Emma, and the central issues, as I recently commented on at

<http://ufotrail.blogspot.com/2011/08/central-issues-of-emma-woods-case.html>

...are most certainly not being completely overlooked. Thank you for your efforts.

August 19, 2011 | [Jack Brewer](#)

Thank you for your efforts, Mr. Brewer. Your piece provides excellent commentary.

August 19, 2011 | [Paul](#)

Lehmberg: Gene Steinberg attempts too serve Regan Lee on her own board at the "Orange Orb," and Ms. Lee sticks a demure finger in his eye. Let me help.

Steinberg: It is unfortunate people continue to spread falsehoods about what we say and do.

Lehmberg: Rofl! Facile "stuff" and flaccid "nonsense"! *List* the falsehoods and *identify* your slanderer's slander! Merely assuming the patronizing language or pedantic if unctuous tone of the elder statesman does not belie your own production on your own boards and programs... in your own words and the words of others, as Emma Woods takes pains to laboriously point out to you. I'm unmoved where I'm not laughing in your face.

Steinberg: To answer your silly allegations:

Lehmberg: Tone Mr. Steinberg! Your cast aspirations are not bourn out in fact or spirit! Contrarily, your *continued* defense of "wild blueberry bukis" IS!

Steinberg: 1. We haven't lied about "Emma Woods." She has given her real name to the people at Paratopia and UFO Magazine, and we'd be happy to accept that information in confidence, as she knows full well.

Lehmberg: ...Haven't *lied*? Well then, *have you \_mised?* Have you *obfuscated?* Have you been *disingenuous?* Have you prosecuted an *agenda?* Have you employed a *bias?* Have you crippled with a *cant?* Have you ground an *ax*, employed a *fallacy*, or ignored a *logic?* None dare call these a lie.

Lehmberg: There's an essay map right there, Mr. Steinberg! Challenge me!

Lehmberg: No, you have not, I fear, stayed as far north of the line of "plausible deniability" as you think you have. That Ms Woods is reluctant to give you her name is only proof of how little trust she must have in you.

Steinberg: Pro and con opinions have been expressed about her claims in our forums, but she displayed evidence of deceit when she began to post messages in support of herself under an assumed name. That only validates our decision to block her posts. But she has always known what she has to do to get her posting privileges back.

Lehmberg: Privileges? *That* provokes an *especially* squirty giggle... especially where Ms. Woods, a woman *clearly* maligned and assaulted--intemperately, incessantly, and without competent moderation of same--feels the necessity of employing a sock puppet to plead her case... where no one else is allowed or tolerated on your board but lap dogs and enablers. Paul Kimball, say what you will, has honor and bears that out! Your reasoning is convenient, overweening, and not *remotely* illustrative of a reason for her blockage. She. Was. Blocked. Because. She. Can. Prove. Her. Case!

Steinberg: 2. Nobody who claims to have had the experiences she claims to have had is free of serious emotional scars.

Lehmberg: An especially flaccid statement apropos of precisely nothing! ...Throw that in to sound *compassionate*, did you? It's a FAIL!

Steinberg: 3. She has spent several years doing nothing but attacking Dr. David Jacobs. That rises way above the issue of whether any of her complaints are valid. That shows an unfortunate obsession with the issue.

Lehmborg: The woman put her faith in a "professional," in contact with her credentialed therapist... she was then, subsequently, emotionally raped, mind-fucked (sorry Don Ecker, but I try to use the right word), and otherwise manipulated by what I might describe on a *charitable* day as a serial psychopath. Tell you what, Steiny! Let *me* do to *you* or your wife, child, ...pet ...and for as long... what *he* did to *her*! Lets see how long *YOU* hold a grudge, eh? Let the rapist get a "by"! Why? What's in it for you?

Steinberg: 4. We did not accuse her of being a child molester. Where do you get this stuff?

Lehmborg: ...Just another example of you not reading to the period and thinking everything is about you, Steinberg! It's not.

Steinberg: 5. We do not like or dislike "Emma Woods."

Lehmborg: No, you just slander, demean, and ever prosecute her ongoing humiliation for trying to get a little justice.

Steinberg: 6. Kimball's complaint, as he knows full well, is bogus. He has my response, but refused to publish that response.

Lehmborg: I'm betting the only bogus thing in *that* tedious exchange *was* your response.

Steinberg: Feel free to actually visit our forums or listen to the show to see what we really do, not what people imagine we do.

Lehmborg: Imagination is not required, in any way, where your activities, prerequisites, and proclivities are published and broadcasted for all to see and hear, Mr. Steinberg. You're busted. Retire in moot irrelevancy!

August 19, 2011 | [Lehmborg](#)

Actually, Kimball DID publish Steinberg's lengthy and indeed tedious and disingenuous response, as anyone can see if they go to the original post at Kimball's blog, which Regan linked to.

August 19, 2011 | [Duke](#)

Read the post, Steinberg you liar:  
<http://redstarfilms.blogspot.com/2011/03/paracast.html>

Scroll down through the comments. There's your response in tedious black and white.

He must think people are completely stupid or too lazy to ever check on his crap.

August 19, 2011 | [Duke](#)

Yep, it's there in black and white. Another pathetic attempt at a rebuttal from Gene.

I hope he doesn't have my phone number...

August 19, 2011 | [Paul](#)

Jeebus... if he's going to be *that* lame I'm going to stop kicking him around... wait... no, I'm not going to stop. It could be a ruse.

August 19, 2011 | [Lehmborg](#)

Thank you so much everybody for your supportive comments. It means a lot.

August 20, 2011 | [Emma](#)

Is this an actual UFO over Tehran?

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EiZrXkEHbVw&feature=related>

<http://youtu.be/ezF-X8k8bRc>

August 20, 2011 | [winston](#)

I can only conclude that slander does not break the Paracast forum terms of service.

August 20, 2011 | [Paul](#)

It didn't for Archie Bedford, who left of his own accord after his lies were revealed but was not removed or reprimanded by Steinberg or O'Brien.

August 20, 2011 | [Duke](#)

it seems like acid runs through steinburg's veins and he has cotton candy for brains. all he has to do is read the evidence - but he seems to enjoy the circle jerk much more than the truth. guess he has painted himself into a corner -- where does he go from here?

August 24, 2011 | [Pat](#)

Here you go folks... Gene Steinberg writes Emma Woods a terse note in support of his Grand Mal Unprofessionalism, yellow journalism, and astonishing hypocrisy... He can have zero expectations of privacy at this point, eh?

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

Date: 8/23/2011 10:33 PM

From: Gene Steinberg <gene@theparacast.com>

To:emma@ufoalienabductee.com

**Subject: Enough is Enough...**

Lehmberg: Mr. Steinberg has long abdicated the responsibility to make that call or any demands. I'm just warming up.

**Steinberg: Read your piece in UFO Magazine's blog.**

Lehmberg: Interesting! So you saw the vetted citations, the list of quotes correctly attributed to you, the time lines regarding who said what to whom, the refutations of statements made by your crow's murder of slack-jawed hangers-on, dull enablers, and bubble nosed facilitators, or Emma Woods calm, deliberate, and authoritative iteration of same?

**Steinberg: It's a lie.**

Lehmberg: Riiiiight! All cited reports contrary to a "preferred" explication of the cogent facts have ever been dismissed in this manner... only... your three disconsolate words stacked against Emma Woods production of MP3s, essays, and interviews don't seem to carry your deflated pig-skin into the end-zone. At best you fumble the ball for a touch-back into you own end zone... which, by the way, needs a decided adult diaper at this point.

**Steinberg: I never asked you to reveal your name in public, only to me in confidence, as you've done with others. Stop telling falsehoods.**

Lehmberg: And yet the record seems to show an antithesis of that, eh? See, you always thought you were clever enough to stay north of a professional line of plausible deniability on this, but no. You're up to it passed the wattles under your chin with quality co-hosts marching away from you in disgust, a dwindling base of bored listeners, and a toxic message board losing relevance, respect, and cache. Verily, you fiddle while the Paracast burns.

**Steinberg: You can say whatever you want about David Jacobs or anyone else.**

Lehmberg: That's right! I'm relieved we can agree about something!

**Steinberg: But do me a favor and stop lying about me in public. Just don't mention my name, and, please, get some help. Your online behavior isn't doing you or anyone else any good.**

Lehmberg: Where was that idiosyncratic credit required for favors coming from, then? Considering your wholly idiotic, uninformed, and slanderous admonishment for Woods to "get some help," I must conclude that you don't really *want* any favors, eh? Gene Steinberg of Paracastia: Ye have sown, good Sir! Now reap! Enjoy! Closing, let me admonish YOU, GENE STEINBERG of the PARACAST that Emma Woods' online behavior has done *much* good, not only for herself, but for the safety and sensibility of research subjects across the board! I applaud the woman's courage, tenacity and composure. She was emotionally raped, professionally betrayed, unfairly marginalized when she protested, and slandered or humiliated when she stood firm.

**Steinberg: And this message is for you only. It is not for publication, and not to be distributed to anyone else, per U.S. and international law.**

Lehmberg: This last thing is the stupidest thing I've ever heard from what is supposed to be a savvy techie. You have zero expectations of privacy. Along with your dictates above and in E-mail, the law is not made simply because you utter it. Along with Dr. Dave Jacobs, the nexus for all this nastiness? Step down. Step off. Step away.

Lehmberg: Say Hi to Don Ecker... he still owes me apologies for the slanders issued from YOUR smarmy board, Gene Steinberg!

alienview@roadrunner.com

> [www.AlienView.net](http://www.AlienView.net)

>> AVG Blog -- <http://alienviewgroup.blogspot.com/>

>>> U F O M a g a z i n e -- [www.ufomag.com](http://www.ufomag.com)

August 25, 2011 | [Lehmberg](#)

Page | [1](#) | [2](#) | [Next 25 Comments](#) | [Most Recent Comment](#) »

---

COPYRIGHT © 2004-2011 UFO GLOBAL MEDIA INC. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.