

Subject: Re: Copy of Moulton Report
 From: John Ziegler
 Date: 21/08/2014 20:34
 To: john moody

On Aug 21, 2014, at 10:46 AM, john moody <john.atwell.moody@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi John, Well done with the direct letter to Eshbach! I thought a lot about Paskey's letter in response to the Moulton report. His letter makes it very clear that Jonelle's position is that any notion that she was not vigilant enough is wrong, she was absolutely vigilant in prosecuting Jerry. I thought a lot about this.

Paskey is being paid by Eshbach, but he interprets his responsibility not only to promote the interests of his client, but to represent her wishes while promoting the interests of justice. And the Moulton report goes into detail about trying to track anyone whom she previously prosecuted. Obviously she made a huge mistake. Paskey is (like McGettigan) on your side. I think also possibly Andronici, who is with Matt Sandusky on the board of Peaceful Hearts, is on Jerry's side too, as is Matt. Not that it is a conflict.

One of Matt's ideas is trying to just have a big heart. Another notion is Sara Ganim's notion of blaming the wrong person. Her articles originally suggested, hey why not blame the president (Spanier) of PSU! She was aware of the way Aaron was just blaming anyone he came into contact with. And, why not? The notion of innocent people being blamed...by someone who really was abused...is interesting. You are really on the forefront of that. Anyway, Paskey's response to you is what I would have expected, he attaches your letter because he wants it to be public.

Also think about Eshbach's emotions too, it must really hurt to become, unintentionally, a public villain when the aim was to be a saviour. Part of Matt's idea may be not explicitly laying too much blame. But there is also truth, and also a public who still thinks Jerry is guilty. I really pretty deeply want you to be the one who writes an article explaining all this, explaining that, look, it is obvious that Jerry is not guilty, and that although the general public does not understand it, most of what is being written like in the Moulton report is saying it, but in a language that may not be accessible to everyone. A sort of fair, deep, tentative language, not an accusing language. But it is not a language shared by the media.

The media went with the Freeh report executive summary, despite the fact that (intentionally) the executive summary stated the opposite of what the report found. A big difficulty is the media. you are sort of unique here, and are in a position to speak truthfully. One issue is, a lot of the high powered lawyers (like who put online Jerry's voicemail message asking Mayers to come forward) are being retained by people where the financial interest goes against truth. Paskey is one. I found my emails from Andreozzi, by the way. He had written to me, just wait until the trial is done, I'll learn everything then, I'll be surprised. I'm sure he thought Jerry would be found innocent. He definitely (Andreozzi) was working pro bono on Jerry's behalf. A lot of people were, just like you are. But, people like Andreozzi, McGettigan, Moulton, all are constrained in what they can say. They cannot state an opinion. Or, better, they cannot just say OK here is the plain truth of the matter. Jerry is obviously innocent and everyone already knows that; the issue is, what to do about it? Not what to do about releasing him, that will happen anyway, but what to do about the strange confusion of feelings that is out there, in the public mind, in the legal system.

John Atwell Moody

Thanks John, but your theory about Eshbach's lawyer and Mcgettigan being on my side sounds like a REAL¹ stretch, no?

Best
 JZ

Sent from my iPhone

1. R. Dedekind, *Continuity and rational numbers*, in *Essays on the theory of numbers*.

Subject: Re: Copy of Moulton Report
From: John Ziegler
Date: 22/08/2014 07:30
To: john.atwell.moody@gmail.com

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

From: john moody <john.atwell.moody@gmail.com>
To: John Ziegler <talktozig@aol.com>
Sent: Thu, Aug 21, 2014 11:22 pm
Subject: Re: Copy of Moulton Report

Actually now I see that my email was a bit thick, you mention Blehar saying Jonelle pushed the prosecution over the edge, and you say it's a crazy idea. But clearly you know that this is accurate. Now I'm beginning to question the supposed breakdown of trust between you and Blehar.

And more importantly, of course, a more careful reading of all the emails which Paskey attached, old emails, where you thank her for having been helpful, where she tells you she WILL talk to you off the record, but that ON THE RECORD her position is that she will NOT talk off the record. (!!!!)

Surely the accusation of harassment (against her family) is like a love letter of sorts. And of course your defensive reply to it, and putting it online too.

I guess it is simple that it is just hard to find the bad guy in all this.

Looking back at the presentment, Jonelle had written things like, Sandusky had committed oral sex hundreds of times with a victim during a particular 2 year time interval. And that even worse, in addition, he had once touched the victim with his hands through his clothing during that same time interval. That is, the presentment is written to be complete nonsense. Why would Eshbach do that? What was the pressure on her to make her do that?

You are really starting to confuse me but just to be clear, Blehar thought that Eshbach had purposely sabotaged the case without telling anyone so that some one like him could figure it. That of course is insane, especially coming from Blehar who is now lying about believing that Sandusky was obviously guilty.

thanks

John Ziegler
talktozig@aol.com