***Read it. Here are my questions: It’s my understanding that when GoDaddy receives a complaint about “spam” i.e. “unsolicited email,” GoDaddy asks the accused to provide proof that the person who received the (from a GoDaddy domain) “opted in” to receive the email. Therefore, GoDaddy must provide to the accused with the email address where this “unsolicited email” or “spam” was received. So while GoDaddy won’t speak to the specifics of this case, the implication is that GoDaddy provided you with the email address sent in by the complaining party, so that you would have the opportunity to supply proof, if it existed, that the user of that email address “opted in.” Just trying to be clear here on what Jamie Bernstein says in her blog. If I’ve got any info in my questions wrong here, let me know.***

**Popkin, that question was answered on page 1, lines 21-22, of the word.doc containing my replies to Eadicicco.**

**You began this email by claiming that you read the word.doc containing Eadicicco's article and my replies. Yet your statement indicates that either you lied, forgot, or carelessly read the document. Whichever the case ...**

**you're not off to a very good start.**

***Is it or is it not true that GoDaddy supplied you with the email address of the person who complained about receiving an unsolicited email from your domain?***

**Popkin, see my last reply (first paragraph).**

***Is it true or not true that the email had enough information to connect it to Jamie Bernstein?***

**Which email?**

***Is it true or not true that you posted Jamie Bernstein’s photo on your website?***

**Popkin, you are asking a question to which you already know the answer. The stench of dishonesty from your email is wafting through my computer screen.**

**One thing that anyone who has been following this "event" can clearly see, is that ALL of the dishonesty is coming from one side.**

**Guess which side that is, Popkin?**

***If GoDaddy did not supply you with Jamie Bernstein’s information, how did you obtain enough information to find her name in an email directing recipients to the place where there’s a photo?***

**Popkin, I'm glad that question makes sense to you, but no matter how many times I read it ... I cannot figure out what the hell you are asking.**

**I'll give you credit for one thing:**

**Eadicicco was deceitful and underhanded in her approach -**

**at least you are upfront and open with your prejudice.**

**What you both share however, is that (just like dealing with Fox News Conservatives) "you people" have your minds already made up, and when the facts contradict the result you want, you simply ignore them.**

**I believe that is also a perfect description of how religion works.**

***Is it true or not true that prior to Jamie Bernstein’s blog post of earlier this week, you sent emails directing people to a website where Jamie’s photo and name appeared?***

**I haven't seen her blog posts, nor do I plan to read them.**

**If you had bothered to read the posts on my site, since Monday when this began, you would be able to answer that last part yourself.**

**Popkin, for a 'reporter' you sure seem lazy.**

***If not true, can you explain to me the specifics/supply evidence of how and where Jeff Wagg publicized Jamie Bernstein’s name first?***

**Popkin, see how easily you just trapped yourself?**

**No?**

**Let me help you out:**

**You asked if it were true that I directed people to a web site where Jamie's name appeared (That was false. Her name appeared nowhere on Monday's post. A fact that you would have known had you read the first post).**

**But as your last question proves, you DID already know that I exposed the fact that it was Wagg who first mentioned Bernstein's name.**

**Want to know why people like you are so easy to trap, Popkin?**

**Dishonesty. When you people resort to dishonesty, as you must in this case, you trap yourselves constantly - much like Wagg did when he hilariously allowed himself to be enticed into filing a complaint for Bernstein ... but forgot that HE initiated the email!**

**Wagg did a great impression of a Buddhist monk by incinerating himself in front of everyone on the internet.**

**I was informed that most of the GoDaddy Spam Abuse staff had to be taken into the ER for resuscitation from laughing so hard after Wagg's total humiliation.**

***Regarding your response to the Business Insider piece, did you send the emails to the web page with Jamie Bernstein’s photo using emails obtained from the Skepchick website?***

**Popkin, when you can figure out how to rewrite that into a coherent sentence, be sure to get back to me.**

***Are you willing to share the email from GoDaddy which states you are not guilty of spamming?***

**Popkin, I thought you people were furious at GoDaddy for releasing personal information?**

**Now, when you want information, you are all for it?**

**If either complaint had been valid ... I wouldn't still be in business.**

***Also, it’s my understanding that the right to confront ones accuser and the right to freedom of speech must be provided by the U.S. government but is not incumbent on private organizations and businesses. Is your understanding different?***

**Popkin, what makes you think that private organizations and businesses can operate in violation of U.S. government law?**

***Let me know.***

**Popkin, I thought you said you had to leave at 3pm EST?**

**I guess this must be pretty important to you to stay overtime, huh?**

**Is Jamie there with you, or just waiting for you to report back?**

**Oh, by the way Popkin, your email to me was unsolicited and unwanted. According to Bernstein that makes you a spammer.**

**How do you plead?**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Readers: Popkin will NEVER answer that question ... why?**

**Because if she pleads innocent ... then so am I**

**(something she would never admit to).**

**If she pleads guilty ... then the utter ridiculousness of her position, and Bernstein's, becomes obvious to everyone.**

**And because Popkin will never answer that question, that is the definitive proof that Bernstein's entire argument ... is dead wrong.**

**This never was about spamming. Bernstein used the spamming accusation as a distraction from the truth, which is ... that she overreacted with hate, and lashed out, by trying to shut down my freedom of speech. That is the ugly truth that Bernstein is doing everything in her power to hide.**

**I believe that is game ... set ... and match.**