

Dear Jerry,

I've been paying attention to your case since I first learned about it, and have written at times to Joe Amendola and Sara Ganim, and more recently to John Ziegler.

I'm not sure exactly how to introduce myself to you, but let me start by saying that I am the person who wrote this paragraph in the Wikipedia article about Mike McQueary, and no-one has changed the paragraph for many years,

“Mike McQueary’s testimony for the preliminary perjury trial says that he heard ‘two or three’ slapping sounds before entering the locker room, and later saw Sandusky with his arms around the child’s waist while hearing ‘more than one’ of the showerheads running and saw that the child’s hair ‘was wet’; although he did not see any sexual contact of hands or genitals or any evidence of arousal, just from the positions of the bodies he knew it was ‘over the line’ and ‘extremely sexual’ and ‘some sort of intercourse’ was taking place, and that he tried to explain what he had seen to Coach Paterno by using the word ‘fondling.’ ”

I was then using my Wikipedia user name ‘createangelos’ as I’d just written an article about someone unfairly imprisoned called Weldon Angelos. At the time I never imagined what would happen to you.

The quote shows that nothing Mike saw in any way constituted a crime nor anything inappropriate.

Things like falling in love with a child, holding a child in a warm shower or in a warm bed, adopting a child not only on paper, not only in a contract, but in true intimacy, are never considered inappropriate in most other cultures.

Particularly what has rung true, for me, in accounts of your interaction with children, is stories of disabled children.

My first child Tilman was completely unresponsive, later diagnosed autistic, and at first the only interaction we had was when he once saw my face close to his, and scratched the cornea of my eye with his fingernail. But with much closeness and warmth, over his first seven years, this child became subtle and attentive, carefree, creative, curious, and intelligent. Here is a photo of Tilman putting on a pillowcase after his Mom and I had given him a bath



Although it sounds trivial, and was such a fixed routine, I just will say that the way most of our interactions would start is that we would be face to face, him on his back, maybe in a warm blanket, and he would be trying to pull my hair and laughing, and me trying to bite under his chin, and laughing.

The conversation would eventually become deeper and more contemplative, and he would tell me all about his day.

Sometimes he would pull my hair hard to make me look one way, and he would say "Ask Daddy," and then he would pull my hair to make me look the other way, and say "Show Daddy."

It was like he wanted to show me that he knew, this is what a conversation is like.

His teachers thought that he could not talk, because he would not answer when they would say, "What's your name?"

So I asked him "What's a name?" and he repeated the question back to me, so I could answer it. And I said, "A name is just a word." And he said to the chair next to the bed, "Your name is Chair."

And here is a photo after we were separated. The background of the photo is strange, he must have been visiting a museum or something, but the expression on his face is pretty much how he was like once we were separated.



And we have another photo, after he took his own life.

When the case first started, I found this video  
[urlhttps://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v53cAGkBl2o](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v53cAGkBl2o)

and just now I found this one

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-tWVp1HiQs>

showing in the first case family treatment and in the second case the recommended treatment of children like this, and it involves a lot of closeness that could look awkward to someone who doesn't understand what it is like.

Anyway, applied to every single one of the 'victims' except Aaron and v4 (I forget his name), and those who are quite obviously lying, one sees just appropriate closeness in your relationships.

The big issue is about Aaron and v4.

With Aaron, the Moulton report shows that for more than a year Aaron reported the same things that you said in your interview with Ms. Dershem, but eventually he would answer yes when asked if 'oral sex' developed from the game of raspberries on his stomach.

In the tape which Andreozzi made of Leiter's interview, the phrase 'oral sex' was fed to v4, but he interprets it differently, as something that developed during wrestling matches, when his face would be near your body (instead of the other way around).

So that Aaron and v4 imply a totally different meaning for what 'oral sex' actually would mean, but with only the words the same between the two of them.

In your trial, I don't know if you noticed, McGettigan said and did many things that should have lead the jury to understand that you're completely innocent, and also Sara Ganim too, in her writings. Also in the Freer report, and in the Moulton report. The most recent one which I noticed is re-reading his cross examination of Ms. Dershem, he asks, would just the closeness, or what McGettigan termed in, 'adolescent' relationship between you and Aaron, be enough to indicate paedophilia, and she answered 'yes.'

So that, it seems to me, the jury represents society condemning actual closeness between adults and children, at least, I have to confess, the only type of closeness I really can understand.

What should a Dad be like, then? I remember seeing an episode of 'Leave it to Beaver,' where Wally accidentally scratched his Dad's car. And the whole episode is about Wally's moral transgression, and waiting until Dad gets home, and he goes up to Wally's room to confront him.

And me waiting for some sort of laugh track to start or something. How was accidentally scratching the shiny paint on a car, a moral transgression? How did the Dad's vanity about the shininess of his car end up getting elevated into a moral code? Who was really the adolescent, here.

Truthfully, the role model of Wally and Beaver's dad, confronting his kid with a the moral equivalent of a beating because the paint on a car is scratched, was that the adolescent? Or is it someone like you who puts your heart and soul into repairing the damage in a young person, without really regard to your own vanity?

Anyway, I have written elsewhere that it seems obvious that you'll be exonerated and released, but that there may be more important issues somewhere, and I think of course the reason the story is a national news story is because of these more important issues.

The more important issues concern the actual definition of childhood, of love, of family. Things that are broken in American society.

But I can't think of any way of contributing more to the story in any important way than just trying to sort out the confusion about how you and Aaron and v4 tell different stories.

I am not sure what Matt is on about, I note that in the film 'Happy Valley,' his first quote is that he just thought that all the supposed victims would be proven to be lying. And on Oprah's show he said he had been given the words 'oral sex,' and he repeated some of the impossible quotes from the trial that he had 'never been penetrated anally' but he had been penetrated digitally. In an online paper I mentioned that the only sense I can make of that sentence is if it refers to holding hands, though there are other digital methods of communication too I guess. In the earlier tape of one of Matt's first interviews he said that he did not yet remember any instances of sexual contact but he was in counselling and he and his counsellor are hoping to start remembering some. Does that not make you laugh somehow? Is it possible that if Joe Amendola had let Matt testify for the prosecution, the jury would have started to realize how such accusations can be nothing but funny, nothing but jokes?

The quote which Matt gives on Oprah's show, about how he was happy until the start of nightfall, and then your two 'ritual would begin,' can be, in the mind of anyone who has had a happy childhood, nothing but a very gentle nostalgic reminder of what a close family is like, and the gentle mourning which every child has to be brought through, who has played happily in the sun all day, and now soon it will be time for bed.

Matt is a real poet, I even credit him as being a mathematician because of the precision of his words, too.

When I was writing to John Ziegler, I had some questions, and I was telling him, it is better to seek complete truth rather than try to take the position, 'Jerry is always right,' or 'Jerry is always truthful.' And so I actually did have some questions, and I don't know if you'll care to answer these because they are so trivial.

It is my guess that Aaron never meant to say that you did 'oral sex' on him in the way most people would interpret this. It may be impossible to get Aaron to be completely clear on this point, as we cannot ask him to incriminate himself for perjury, if he may have implied that this is the case.

In his book, Aaron does two interesting things. One is that he changes the number of occurrences of ‘oral sex’ from 40 to ‘hundreds.’ The other thing he does is, he describes in chapter 29, a meeting with who must be v4 in court.

Remember that Andreozzi quoted v4 many times saying that the only reason he was going to testify was not on his own behalf, but on behalf of the other victims. Implicitly the idea may be that although when you were wrestling with him, he kept his face clear of you, maybe there were other kids where they didn’t and then on their behalf it is morally right (as well as lucrative) to exaggerate his testimony and say that this happened to him too. Especially as he had been told that ‘oral sex’ had taken place with other victims, and didn’t know that this referred to a totally different scenario.

Whereas Aaron had said often, it is in Moulton’s report, that without supporting testimony he would threaten to withdraw his own.

In my understanding of it, Chapter 29 of Aaron’s book is the ‘oh sh\*t’ moment when each of Aaron and v4 say to the other, “I wouldn’t have testified except for the others.” That is, v4 says that, apologizes for it, for not acting sooner, and Aaron’s answer is that he would not have testified except for the fact that you were acting clingy.

Except for this weird issue between Aaron and v4, virtually all the other victims seem to be the same, they will describe a really nice, totally ordinary, intimate moment, and say, oh yeah, it was really abusive.

I really sometimes think that except Aaron and v4 (and whichever is the lying one), all the other victims, and also Dershem and McGettigan, and also Turchetta, are describing really appropriate moments. Like when Turchetta and you and Aaron talk about him falling off the climbing wall, and you trying to catch him, and you both falling on the floor laughing....

It is like some tremendous joke, being played on the American people, where scenes of healthy family intimacy are shown, and they express their hatred of it, their bitterness.

And, just to interject this, if it is a limitation that you cannot fall in love with a child easily, and it needs a shower of warm water, like a baptism, is this a crime? It is not a crime in other countries, in Japan, where neighbours and co-workers shower together like that.

Anyway, back to my questions.

- 1 In your phone interview with Costas, in answering his question, you said that you are not sexually attracted to young boys, but you have done things like to hug them and touch their leg. Well, I was going to ask why you did not include further specific details like cuddling together in a bed with a child or blowing raspberries on their stomach, or kissing the forehead and cheeks; things you had mentioned in the Dershem interview. My guess is that if the interview had gone on longer and Costas had asked a follow-up, specifying in a very legalistic way exactly what types of touching had ever taken place in your life with children, such a detailed answer would have been possible. Is that your rough impression, or would you have been embarrassed to list the more intimate types of contact in a nationally televised interview? Or felt like you were violating kids' privacy, like kids you adopted later etc.
2. In the Schreffler interview, I've always thought that the point of much of the media coverage of the quote 'I wish I were dead' is that you may have said something about his dad, like 'I wish he had a Dad,' or even 'I wish I were his Dad' or something along those lines. Is that possible? By the way, it is strange that no-one ever accused you of any type of abuse even at the time, re v6, so it is very strange how the Freeh report deals with this, basically proving that everyone is innocent, but the executive summary saying Penn State is guilty of a coverup. It seems that the point of the Freeh report is that executive summaries are nonsense.



3. What is the situation with how the cross-examination of Der-shem says that you had initially appealed against being ‘indicated’ regarding Aaron, and then withdrew the appeal. What is an ‘appeal’ against being ‘indicated.’ Did you make and then withdraw some tyhpe of appeal against being indicated?
4. It would be ideal if somehow you and Aaron could get exact agreement about every detail of your interaction. He said in court that you had pulled him ‘out of class’ many times, while you said you’d taken him out of an assembly only once. Maybe I should be asking Aaron this one, but what could account for this discrepancy in the stories?
5. To start with a comment, not really a question, but the story both in Ganim’s articles, and later in Aaron’s own book, of Aaron asking his mom Dawn if there is a website where he can look up to see if someone is a ‘weirdo,’ of course, that is not consistent with the notion that he had a consistent sexual relationship with that suspected ‘weirdo.’ In his book, he mentions the chain of reasoning that led him to want to look you up on the internet, and it is because of something he’d seen in a class. That is, both Aaron and Matt seem very consciously to be saying things that are in absolute contradiction to any notion that you had been abusing them. Is it a credible interpretation is that people like Aaron really feel horrible, and Matt has sort of dived in to try to save them?

6. Initially, I thought that the Paterno kids' statements (highlighted in the film 'Happy Valley'), that we must think first and foremost about the victims, that this was a sort of passive-aggressive appeal to the accusers. But I have started to see it a different way now. That it was the Paterno kids trying to cave in to an aggressive prosecutor. It is similar to Amanda Knox's accusation of Patrik Lumumba. If you think that a prosecutor is like a bull in a China shop, and is going to charge you unless you give it a red flag, then you give the prosecutor that red flag. To say 'think of the victims' is to say 'we are on the same side of the prosecutor, these are horrible crimes, which we agree absolutely did take place in just the way the prosecutors probably suspect. ' A tragedy is that then Joe Amendola's going with a local trial meant that all the people on the jury knew that the Paterno's agree that there are victims. And they are close to the situation, they must know! The same issue caused the notion of a coverup! If they know there are victims, that must mean that they witnessed the abuse and said nothing, did nothing.
  
7. The notion of a Penn State cover-up, and the notion that Gov. Corbett should be prosecuted for not acting sooner, of course these notions, mainly due to Ganim, are a way of rooting out innuendo. Ganim did not say to Corbett, "Why have you got a 1-800 tip line? Why so many investigators trying to dig up dirt?" She was clever enough to say to Corbett, "Yes, finally you're opposing paedophilia. But why were you supporting it for all those previous years, then?" This did lead to the Moulton report, which shows the extent of time when there were no accusers besides Aaron, and all the work to produce others.

8. The Dershem interview transcript says that you would kiss Aaron on the forehead and cheeks, never on the lips, and lie with him on you either transversely or lengthwise for intervals of around 5 minutes, never slept in the same bed, sometimes blow raspberries on his stomach, give him back rubs in which your hand may have gone below the waistband, but never kissed him below the waistband. Does that mean that when Aaron talked of 'oral sex' he must have been just induced by his interviewers to label a raspberry on the stomach as being 'oral sex?' It appears from what Matt said that at some point (after he was adopted perhaps) you did kiss Matt on the mouth sometimes, and it seems that this is what Matt (jokingly perhaps) labels as oral sex. Is this accurate, that you never kissed Aaron on the mouth, but as you became a closer parent to Matt you sometimes would do that? Is it believable that Matt is making a very clever joke, noticing that what Aaron means by 'oral sex,' that is, a raspberry on the child's stomach, is different than what v4 means (the child's face being dominated during wrestling), and so Matt introduces yet a third meaning: a parent's kiss? Would Matt be clever and gentle enough to make a joke like that, to try to lighten things up, and start to get Aaron and v4 out of trouble?

I don't know how you can answer my email, my questions aren't well thought-out, and I really only wrote to say 'hi.' My address here in England is

John Moody  
xxxxxxxxxxxx  
Coventry CV3 6GJ  
England

however it might be easier to just ask Dottie or someone to reply to me at

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx@gmail.com

and she could scan whatever brief note you have time to write for her if she has a scanner, and email it to me.

I will send the cost of overseas postage in case you choose the first option of replying by mail,

John M

John,

I apologize for not replying promptly. Your JPay is deeply appreciated. I did write a two page response to your questions. After sharing it with my attorney, it has been decided I shouldn't send it. Pennsylvania's revictimization law recently passed makes answering questions very difficult.

This opinion could change. Sometimes, I want to scream in response. Please feel free to stay in touch. I may be able, at least, to lead you to answers.

Thanks!

Jerry