

Nicole Prause and Gary Wilson's ONLY email exchange (April, 2013). Prause initiated all contact with Gary Wilson. Prause's emails contains numerous falsehoods and legal threats.

PRAUSE'S INITIAL EMAIL TO GARY WILSON (Prause's UCLA email no longer in use)

[PT] Inquiry via Psychology Today



Psychology Today

Wed 4/10/2013 2:02 PM

You ✓

From:

Nicole Prause <[redacted]@mednet.ucla.edu>

Reason:

Other

Message:

Dear Mr. Wilson,

It is illegal for you to misrepresent our science having never even requested a copy of the manuscript. It will be treated as such. Our article actually is very balanced. Unlike you, I have peer-reviewed publications on both sides of this issue. You have attempted to discredit it by describing things that were not done. I am pursuing this with Psychology Today now, but I would advise you to remove the post yourself before I am forced to pursue further action.

You also do not have permission to quote any portion of this email. It is private communication.

Sell your books on your own merit. Don't try to make money off the backs of scientists doing their jobs. I can tell this study clearly panics you because the design and data are strong, but it is egregious to have not even asked for a copy of the manuscript and just make up content. Shame on you.

Nicole Prause, PhD
Research faculty
UCLA

Sender IP:

149.142.103.36

GARY WILSON REPLY TO PRAUSE'S INITIAL EMAIL

On Wed, Apr 10, 2013 at 3:14 PM, gary wilson <[REDACTED]@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hi Nicole,

I commented under your comment. Have a look.

We make no money on this. My website has no advertising and we accept no donations. We have no services to sell. I have no book to sell. My wife's book, which appears on PT, is not about porn.

If you want to be truly fair, **please send us the full study and give us permission to blog about it** - as you did with Dr. Ley.

I'll be anticipating your study,

Gary Wilson

[REDACTED] Ashland, OR 97520

> Reason:

> Other

>

> Message:

> Dear Mr. Wilson,

>

> It is illegal for you to misrepresent our science having never even requested
> a copy of the manuscript. It will be treated as such. Our article actually is
> very balanced. Unlike you, I have peer-reviewed publications on both sides of
> this issue. You have attempted to discredit it by describing things that were
> not done. I am pursuing this with Psychology Today now, but I would advise
> you to remove the post yourself before I am forced to pursue further action.

>

> You also do not have permission to quote any portion of this email. It is
> private communication.

>

> Sell your books on your own merit. Don't try to make money off the backs of
> scientists doing their jobs. I can tell this study clearly panics you because
> the design and data are strong, but it is egregious to have not even asked
> for a copy of the manuscript and just make up content. Shame on you.

>

> Nicole Prause, PhD

> Research faculty

> UCLA

A FEW HOURS LATER PRAUSE EMAILS PT

Fwd: Form submission from: Feedback

From: "Psychology Today" <no-reply@psychologytoday.com>

Date: April 10, 2013 5:13:30 PM EDT

To: blogs@psychologytoday.com

Subject: Form submission from: Feedback

Reply-To: no-reply@psychologytoday.com

Topic: Comment on the Blogs

From: Nicole Prause, PhD <nprause@mednet.ucla.edu>

Comments:

To whom it may concern:

I was surprised to see an article written about a study of mine by Gary Wilson on Psychology Today.

I have no problem with him representing his own views and interpretations of studies, but he does not and could not have had access to mine. It is under review and he never requested a copy from any of the authors. I notified him that it should be removed. He has not yet done so. Of course, once it is public record, he will have access to it and be able to represent it (hopefully) more accurately.

Of course, knowingly misrepresenting a person to denigrate them is illegal. I hope Psychology Today will take this matter seriously. I will contact other board members as well, in case your cue is full and may take longer to respond.

Thank you for your help in resolving this matter.

Sincerely,

Nicole Prause, PhD
Research Faculty
UCLA

Wednesday, April 10, 2013 - 2:13pm - 149.142.103.36 - Mozilla/5.0 (Windows NT 6.1; WOW64; rv:19.0) Gecko/20100101 Firefox/19.0

APRIL 12: PRAUSE THREATENS, WILSON REPLIES

On Fri, Apr 12, 2013 at 11:09 AM, gary wilson <[REDACTED]@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Nicole Prause,

Maybe you didn't know that my wife is a graduate of Yale law school. I said nothing libelous. In fact, my statements are quite accurate.

- 1) You have refused to hand over your unpublished study.
- 2) You were nasty and threatening, as you are now.
- 3) In addition, you falsely stated that I make money from guys struggling to recover from porn addiction.
- 4) You also mischaracterized my PT post, as it was a clear response to David Ley's description of your unpublished study. You chose not correct Ley's description or make the full study available to me, even when I asked about it in the comment section one month ago.

You have yet to answer my original questions:

- 1) Why did you release your study to only David Ley? As the author of the "Myth of Sex Addiction," and someone who claims porn addiction cannot exist, why was only he the only Chosen One?
- 2) Why haven't you corrected David Ley's interpretation of your study? It has been up for over a month, and you've commented twice on it in the last month.
- 3) You commented under Ley's post one month ago. I immediately posted a comment under you comment, with several specific questions directed to you about your study. That was your chance to both respond and offer the study. You did neither. Why?

I'm fine with making our exchange public.

Won't it be interesting when you file a lawsuit against a couple of PT bloggers who dare to take on your research?

Best,

Gary Wilson

From: [REDACTED]@mednet.ucla.edu

Date: Fri, 12 Apr 2013 10:22:53 -0700

Subject: Re: [PT] Inquiry via Psychology Today

To: palpateit@hotmail.com

Dear Mr. Wilson,

In your post:

<http://yourbrainrebalanced.com/index.php?topic=7522.50>

You falsely claim:

"I responded to her rather nasty emails with a request to see her study, and she refused."

This is libel. Please remove this post or I will follow up with legal action.

Nicole Prause

APRIL 12: PRAUSE REPLIES AGAIN (with more threats), WILSON REPLIES

From: [REDACTED]@mednet.ucla.edu
Date: Fri, 12 Apr 2013 15:01:09 -0700
Subject: Re: [PT] Inquiry via Psychology Today
To: palpateit@hotmail.com

Dear Gary,

This is to notify both you and your wife that your (both you and your wife's) contact is unwanted. Per stalking statutes in your home state (<http://courts.oregon.gov/Lane/Restraining.page>), any additional harassing contact will be interpreted as actionable harassment.

You do not have my permission to share this private communication in any forum.

Nicole Prause

On Fri, Apr 12, 2013 at 11:09 AM, gary wilson <[REDACTED]@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear Nicole Prause,

Maybe you didn't know that my wife is a graduate of Yale law school. I said nothing libelous. In fact, my statements are quite accurate.

- 1) You have refused to hand over your unpublished study.
- 2) You were nasty and threatening, as you are now.
- 3) In addition, you falsely stated that I make money from guys struggling to recover from porn addiction.
- 4) You also mischaracterized my PT post, as it was a clear response to David Ley's description of your unpublished study. You chose not correct Ley's description or make the full study available to me, even when I asked about it in the comment section one month ago.

You have yet to answer my original questions:

- 1) Why did you release your study to only David Ley? As the author of the "Myth of Sex Addiction," and someone who claims porn addiction cannot exist, why was only he the only Chosen One?
- 2) Why haven't you corrected David Ley's interpretation of your study? It has been up for over a month, and you've commented twice on it in the last month.
- 3) You commented under Ley's post one month ago. I immediately posted a comment under you comment, with several specific questions directed to you about your study. That was your chance to both respond and offer the study. You did neither. Why?

I'm fine with making our exchange public.

Won't it be interesting when you file a lawsuit against a couple of PT bloggers who dare to take on your research?

Best,
Gary Wilson

APRIL 12: FINAL REPLY BY WILSON

From: [REDACTED]@hotmail.com
To: [REDACTED]@mednet.ucla.edu
Subject: RE: [PT] Inquiry via Psychology Today
Date: Fri, 12 Apr 2013 15:44:12 -0700

Dear Nicole Prause,

Harassment? I have not initiated one email exchange with you, including this one.

The first, initiated by you on 4/10/13, where you had the last email. And the one below, where you are trying to create a false impression that someone is harassing you, when in fact you are threatening me for the second time.

You are also the one who contacted Psychology Today's editor to interfere with my blog post. My wife has had no contact with you whatsoever.

We do not need your permission.

Gary Wilson

From: [REDACTED]@mednet.ucla.edu
Date: Fri, 12 Apr 2013 15:01:09 -0700
Subject: Re: [PT] Inquiry via Psychology Today
To: palpateit@hotmail.com

Dear Gary,

This is to notify both you and your wife that your (both you and your wife's) contact is unwanted. Per stalking statutes in your home state (<http://courts.oregon.gov/Lane/Restraining.page>), any additional harassing contact will be interpreted as actionable harassment.

You do not have my permission to share this private communication in any forum.

Nicole Prause