

**I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Sunday, 22-Nov-98 01:11:36**

Message:

205.188.192.159 writes:

While in an antique store one day I read a collection of original newspaper articles on the Lindbergh Kidnapping from the beginning through the execution of Bruno Hauptmann. Not knowing more than the cursory history, I came away with the impression (just from newspaper accounts, mind you) that there was no real kidnapping but an accidental death and cover up.

When I later read encyclopedia entries stating that Hauptmann did it, with no mention of any other possible scenarios, I was amazed. I thought I had dreamed the whole thing up (and was angry I hadn't bought the collection of articles). I read The Crime of the Century, The Lindbergh Kidnapping Hoax, and with a background in law, law enforcement and human behavior, I am convinced that Lindbergh accidentally dropped the child while attempting (for the second time) a kidnapping prank. The book spells it all out quite well. It's so worth reading. Don't be fooled by A. Scott Berg's account--he's too enamored with his subject (and himself) to be taken seriously as an investigator or a biographer.

Lisa Holliday

**Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Sunday, 22-Nov-98 08:17:42**

207.220.150.75 writes:

With all due respect, Lisa, Algren & Monier are no less biased (and probably more so) than Scott Berg.

Their theory is based on speculation, conjecture and a dislike of Charles Lindbergh - nothing more.

Mjr

**Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Sunday, 22-Nov-98 09:14:19**

152.163.197.51 writes:

Sorry, MJR, the kind of "speculation" and "conjecture" that Ahlgren and Monier use in their analysis is the kind of excellent sleuthing that the Jersey cops failed to utilize 66 years ago when they allowed the baby's father to take over the case and mess it up forever. Hauptmann was sent to the chair on shakier circumstantial evidence than the more probable circumstantial evidence shown by Monier and Ahlgren. Regarding their "dislike" of Lindbergh I do not know how anyone CAN like that man at all - even Scott Berg sounds like he had to hold his nose while writing that book - and maybe it is your own idolatry of Lindbergh that prevents you from being skeptical, either of the "hero" himself, or those other "heros" the NJ Police and David Wilentz. I have often come across people who are enraged at me, not because I have dared to suggest Lindy did something bad, - it is very easy to detest Lindy no matter what you think about the case - but because I dared to say the NJ police and especially Wilentz - did something bad. Wilentz was some kind of a god himself in NJ and I get yelled at alot by his adorers.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Sunday, 22-Nov-98 20:29:09**

207.220.150.74 writes:

<<<<Sorry, MJR, the kind of "speculation" and "conjecture" that Ahlgren and Monier use in their analysis is the kind of excellent sleuthing that the Jersey cops failed to utilize 66 years ago when they allowed the baby's father to take over the case and mess it up forever.>>>>

You, yourself, admitted that there is no real evidence against Lindbergh. Just Algren/Monier's opinions about Lindbergh's personality and their opinions about how he acted. Do they (or can you) present anything else?

As for "excellent sleuthing" I'm sorry, but starting with a premise (that Lindbergh was guilty) and going from there is not sleuthing - excellent or otherwise. In fact, that is more or less what was done to Richard Hauptmann, wasn't it?

I don't see how you can "convict" or even accuse Lindbergh without something a little more solid than "it sure is strange that he did....blah, blah."

I would probably have a little more respect for their opinion of him had they not phrased and edited their stories about him in such a way that they misrepresented much about him.

In any event, what they, or you, or I, think of Lindbergh personally is irrelevant. I say again that it is a question of evidence (or rather the lack thereof.)

<<<<maybe it is your own idolatry of Lindbergh that prevents you from being skeptical, either of the "hero" himself>>>>

I don't idolize anyone - haven't for years. I am also a dyed-in-the-wool skeptic. I defend Lindbergh mainly because I think he didn't do anything.

<<in NJ and I get yelled at alot by his adorers.>>>

I may have to cut this out and send it to some people. Idolize David Wilentz, or the NJSP? That is the funniest thing anyone has suggested about me in ages. I have been arguing this case for a long time. I was arguing that Richard Hauptmann didn't do it long before Algren & Monier.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 02:43:18**

152.163.206.186 writes:

I never said any such thing! There is an enormous amount of evidence - circumstantial, of course - but good enough to make a more plausible case than a mafia gang, bootleggers, sister Elizabeth, the butler, the maid, an unidentified lucky baby snatcher who just happened to be passing by or anyone else that others have suggested. I think I have heard everything by now, including the Protocols of the Elders of Zion! Ahlgren and Monier's opinions are rooted in solid common sense and good police work and are not frivolous accusations as you continually try make it sound in your argument. There is no trace of hatred for Lindbergh in their book - only logical explanations for why Lindbergh behaved like a man who did not want to find his child or already knew that the boy was dead..

So, tell us MJR, who is it ? If you do believe that Hauptmann was framed then who is your suspect(s)?

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 07:13:19**

207.220.150.89 writes:

--- I never said any such thing---

Sorry, then. I thought it was you who made the comment about there being no "smoking gun" because the NJSP had destroyed it all.

---There is an enormous amount of evidence---

Let's hear some that does not involve interpreting Lindbergh's behavior. Show me, for example, where his statements and testimony are in conflict with the physical evidence.

---logical explanations for why Lindbergh behaved like a man who did not want to find his child or who already knew that the boy was dead---

Sorry, but I disagree. Lindbergh's behavior is only suspicious if you start with the presumption that he is guilty of something.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 11:06:37**

152.163.213.79 writes:

If you were a cop , today, investigating a missing child who would you be suspicious of? A gang? A lucky snatcher passing by in the night? A Satanic cult? the Mafia?

When most children are harmed by people they know rather than total strangers, though it isn't a theory to ignore completely, it certainly is inexcusably irresponsible for any law enforcement officer to ignore the odd behavior of a father who can read minds.

But if you are the skeptic you say you are why are you giving Lindbergh powers that do not belong to any human on earth?

Do you believe in mental telepathy? The father "knew" the child was kidnapped without even doing so much as to look under the crib! He already "knew" the child was in the hands of a gang (Anne THEY have kidnapped our baby) and he also knew that a plain white envelope with no writing on it whatsoever was a ransom note. He also knew it was going to say "we" have kidnapped your baby. How he

"knew" that the baby was wearing a one piece sleeping suit is also in question as well as the father's insistence that the Mafia took him and you call Ahlgren and Monier's attention to these FACTS out of order?

And his hearing! WOW! He had better hearing than Wahgoosh! The dog couldn't hear anything cause "he was in the other wing of the house" but Lindy heard a "crate breaking" outside the house in spite of the locked windows and a howling rainy, wind. What other supernatural powers would you like to lavish on this fake?

And speaking of hearing, Reeve reveals that her father was hard of hearing! So how in the world did he hear Hey Doc? or Ay Doc? or Hey Doktor? or.....he changed his testimony so many times it is hard to pin this daddy down. No human could pick a voice out of nowhere and put him in the electric chair but this privilege was given to a "hero" ! For this blatant lie alone Lindbergh ought to be despised and suspicion ought to properly fall upon him for ALL of his actions. There is no excuse that can ever be made for his fingerprinting lie and it brings into question all of his prior behavior.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 13:36:46**

207.220.150.119 writes:

---If you were a cop, today, investigating a missing child who would you be suspicious of?---

Everyone, of course, and I have no problem with the suggestion that everyone should be suspected. I'm only suggesting that before one labels Lindbergh (or anyone else) a murderer, there should be something more than suspicion.

--- The father "knew" the child was kidnapped without even doing so much as to look under the crib!---

You are aware, I'm sure, that kidnapping for ransom was not as unusual an occurrence as it is today. If you have read the newspapers of the time (which you indicated you have) then you should be aware of this. It was not yet a federal crime and in many places (including NJ) was not even a felony.

Since Lindbergh knew that neither Betty nor Anne had Charlie and it appeared he had not climbed out of the crib by himself, what was he to think?

---He already "knew" the child was in the hands of a gang (Anne THEY have kidnapped our baby) and he also knew a plain white envelope with no writing on it whatsoever was a ransom note. He also knew it was going to say "we" have kidnapped your baby. ---

A&M are the only students of this crime that I have ever met or read who do not understand that comment.

Who were 'they'? They were not a gang of kidnapers. They were the adoring public who did not give these people a moment of peace. They were the press who followed them wherever they went. The press who circled their boat for hours when they were on their honeymoon, trying to get them to come up on deck. The press who would later break into the morgue and pry open Charlie's coffin to take pictures of the body. THAT is who they were.

As for the envelope - if he thought the child was kidnapped, he probably did figure that for a ransom note.

--How he 'knew' that the baby was wearing a one piece sleeping suit as well as the father's insistence that the Mafia took him ---

How did he know what his son was wearing? Well, by the time he talked to the police, he had probably found that out from Betty and Anne.

Insistence that the Mafia took him? Lindbergh never insisted anything of the kind. He believed it was a gang, yes, but there is nothing to suggest that he believed it was the Mafia.

--- And his hearing!---

IF you accept that the sound was the sound of the ladder breaking, you would do well to consider that Lindbergh was much closer to that area of the house than Wagoosh.

OTOH, it may or may not have been the sound of the ladder breaking. It has always been assumed that it was for the simple reason that the movements of the people in the house that night (if none were involved) make that the most probable time of the crime.

There is no reason to be sure that it was not a tree limb breaking in the wind or the shutters on the windows blowing around. Or it may have been his imagination.

---The voice in the cemetery---

I will not argue with you that Lindbergh could not have identified the voice he heard. That doesn't mean that he didn't think he could.

BTW - while his story of what words that he heard changed - "ay doctor"(5-32) "hey doc"(10-34) "hey doctor"(1-35)- most of what he said about the voice remained consistent - including the fact that there was a heavy accent.

Also BTW, contrary to what A&M say (pg.147) Lindbergh did NOT tell the Grand Jury that he could not identify the voice. What he said was:

"Q: Do you think you would recognize that man's voice if you heard it again?

A: I can't say positively, I remember the voice very clearly I would recognize the voice to be identical with the one that I heard, it would be very difficult for me to sit here and say that I could pick a man by that voice."

(from the Grand Jury transcript)

Not quite the same, is it? I put this kind of writing in the same category I do Berg when he says that Hauptmann "admitted" writing the phone number in the closet - when in fact Hauptmann said he didn't remember but he must have because it was in his house.

**Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 03:40:23**

152.163.206.191 writes:

Well tell us then how do you begin the process of sleuthing if it is not to assess all factual observations and make sense out of them? You continually denigrate Ahlgren and Monier's methods as "opinions" and "suspicions" and "inuendos" as if there is something wrong with that! Isn't their professional "opinion" worth something when they claim that kidnappers do not typically leave ransom notes in window sills but rather inside the crib from which they just stole the baby so the parents might see it right away and get the loot? Isn't the rejection of bloodhounds, the FBI, and human chains of students a wonderment to law enforcement minded folks who ought to be having "suspicions" right away that this daddy doesn't really want his son back? And what about their "opinion" that a meticulous perfectionist was mysteriously late coming home and failed to remember his dinner engagement at the Waldorf on the night of this mysterious "kidnapping"? Or how about their opinion that fathers of missing babies shouldn't be conducting the police investigations? And the "inuendo" bothers you, I suppose, that the ladder rungs are 19 inches apart implying a very tall person used the thing. Or the other "inuendo" that the child's father was a sadistic prankster and hid "It" (his own name for his firstborn) in a trash bin 2 months earlier?

In fact, the most shocking aspect of A & M's book, at least for me, is that NO ONE noticed! 66 years! and everyone followed the original awe-stricken blunderers - the Jersey cops!

And, since I have a lot of respect for the good questions you always ask, I am surprised that you accuse A&M of doing to Lindy what was done to Hauptmann. There is not one false thing we say about the "hero" - his record of conduct is pretty much documented already. You just don't seem to like what they add up to.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 08:28:23

207.220.150.89 writes:

---how do you begin the process of sleuthing if it is not to assess all factual observations and make sense out of them?---

Of course that is how you BEGIN. My problem with Ahlgren and Monier is that they didn't take it much farther than that.

IMHO, the evidence indicates the participation of someone within the Lindbergh household. It also indicates the participation of MORE than one person in the kidnapping. Some of the same evidence that makes the "lone wolf" scenario as applied to Hauptmann unlikely also applies to the "Lindbergh did it" scenario.

--- Isn't the rejection of bloodhounds, the FBI and human chaims of students a wonderment to law enforcement minded folks who ought to be having "suspicious" right away that this daddy doesn't really want his son back?---

The woods surrounding the Lindbergh home were searched - several times - in the days after the kidnapping. So were the neighboring farms and homes. The fact that the police didn't find anything is one of the claims for the "Lindbergh baby is still alive" theory.

As for keeping out the FBI, that was more Norm and the NJSP than Lindbergh. The FBI (or BI as it was then known) investigated anyway. I think, too, that you give the FBI too much credit. They were not the formidable agency they are today. Besides, I doubt that Hauptmann would have fared any better with Thomas ("Mister, you stop lying. You're telling a story.")Sisk running things.

--- and failed to remember his dinner engagement ---

Why would he pick this night (of all available nights) to pull this "prank"? He could have done it anytime, couldn't he?

A lot of people make a big thing out of this but I think they are missing the real important part. Rather than this raising suspicions about Lindbergh, I am more interested in the fact that it was public knowledge that Lindbergh should not have been home that evening.

---- Or how about their opinion that fathers of missing babies shouldn't be conducting the police investigations? ---

I couldn't agree more that that was wrong. The fault for that, however, lies with Norm and the NJSP. That Lindbergh should want to be in control was very much in character for him. Being in control of a crisis situation had saved his life more than once. The fact that he may have been a fool to try it and the NJSP fools to allow it does not make him a killer.

--- snip tall person using ladder ---

This implicates Hauptmann too, right?

--- Or the other "inuendo" that the child's father was a sadistic prankster who hid "It" (his own name for his firstborn) in a trash bin 2 months earlier? ---

Trash bin? Source please, since everyone else - including Ahlgren and Monier - describe it as a closet.

BTW - According to Anne, he also called his son "buster".

--- There is not one false thing we say about the "hero" ---

I take this to refer to my comment that A&M edited and described things inaccurately thereby giving a false impression of Lindbergh. I stand by that. Take as an example their description of the incident where Lindbergh dripped water on Anne while she was talking to Amelia Earhart. They quote from Putnam's book on her. What possible reason could they have had for ending the quote where they did, rather than supplying the rest of the description?

mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 03:54:09**

152.163.206.181 writes:

<<<<I may have to cut this out and send it to some people. Idolize David Wilentz, or the NJSP? That is the funniest thing anyone has suggested about me in ages. I

have been arguing this case for a long time. I was arguing that Richard Hauptmann didn't do it long before Algren & Monier. >>>>

Sorry i made that remark but it happens to be true! People do attack me more often on behalf of Wilentz, or the Jersey cops. Anyway, if you were proclaiming Hauptmann's innocence long before A & M maybe you can tell me how Gov Florio looked Mrs Hauptmann in the eye when he refused her petition. With the NJ Supreme Court Chief being the son of the man who framed her husband wasn't there at least some sort of public outcry concerning this conflict of interest? Do you happen to know anything about this by any chance?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: I believe Ahlgren & Monier
Monday, 23-Nov-98 08:35:15

207.220.150.89 writes:

Forget looking Anna Hauptmann in the eye - I don't know how many of the people involved in this case ever slept a good night's sleep again.

As for various and assorted Governors I imagine it can be summed up as politics. I doubt any of them wanted to be the one to admit that NJ electrocuted an innocent man. Who wants to admit that the "trial of the century" was really the "travesty of the century"?

In regard to Justice Wilentz - I'm not sure that there was a conflict there. The court that denied Anna Hauptmann's claims was the U.S. District Court - not the NJ Supreme Court. (I know little about Wilentz the younger so I must give him the benefit of the doubt and say that he was not his father.)

Mjr

Look at the facts!
Monday, 18-Jan-99 23:43:24

Message:
155.135.1.35 writes:

You people are basing everything on circumstantial evidence! ... what if Lindbergh did it? What if the police planted the evidence? What if the man is innocent? Well, he is not. Anyone looking at the case should have known about Bruno's criminal history. He actually can be considered the Ladder Larcenist because he was caught before of using a ladder to get to a second story house, opening the window, and stealing money... remind you of anything? Also, the ladder was crude but professional, everyone makes mistakes. Jordan miss shots, and Bruno, using messed up wood, could have made a ladder than didn't support his weight. I don't see how a ladder drawing could have gotten in his book except by his own hands. What about the money? Every think why Bruno was living high even BEFORE he claimed he found the money left by the man he claimed left him the money? The handwriting is clearly his, because the defense couldn't hire reputable handwriting experts to back them up, because... surprise, they too saw that the handwriting is that of Bruno's. Did I mention that he himself said he lied on the stand? The facts just keep piling up. The Hoax Website does present a very interesting case that could be used against the prosecution's testimony.

Tassadar

Re: Look at the facts!
Wednesday, 20-Jan-99 11:49:01
205.188.197.163 writes:

;;;;;You people are basing everything on circumstantial evidence! ;;;;

I don't know who you are referring to by "you people" nor do I understand your objection to circumstantial evidence. Most trials are based upon it. Whenever you have no witness to the crime it is circumstantial evidence that convicts all sorts of criminals. OJ's case, for example, was entirely based upon circumstantial evidence. No one saw anything happen. Neither did anyone see a "kidnapping" on March 1, 1932. Anything involving the Lindbergh case is automatically "circumstantial evidence." Hauptmann went to his death on it.

;;;;;;;what if Lindbergh did it? What if the police planted the evidence? What if the man is innocent? Well, he is not. Anyone looking at the case should have known about Bruno's criminal history. He actually can be considered the Ladder Larcenist

because he was caught before of using a ladder to get to a second story house, opening the window, and stealing money... remind you of anything?;;;;;;

Anyone looking at the case also should have known that the father or mother of any missing child is supposed to be, by professional law enforcement standards of today, high on the list of early suspects. Not only was this father not suspected but was given charge of the entire investigation for 3 months and only when the child turned up dead (2 miles from his own crib!) the father was relieved of his charge but continued to be privy to all further police investigation.

Two months earlier the father of the "kidnapped" child hid his baby (whom he called "It") in a trash bin inside a trash closet and sent the household into hysteria by announcing "It" had been kidnapped. This sadistic and cruel hoaxster of a father stole the baby as a "joke."

The possibility of a cruel joke gone awry is entirely plausible based upon the father's peculiar behavior before and after the disappearance. His bizarre rejections of law enforcement techniques never resembled a distraught father looking for his child.

;;;;;using messed up wood, could have made a ladder than didn't support his weight. ;;;;

So if he made the ladder where were his prints? Hundreds of finger prints on the ladder revealed not even a smidgen of Hauptmann's anywhere! Did he wear gloves to build it? If he went through such contortions to hide his prints on the ladder why did he take a piece of his own house to complete it? There was a lumber yard nearby. And, we now know that Lindy built at least one ladder. (See "the Sirius" Ladder further down this message board.)

;;;;;;Every think why Bruno was living high even BEFORE he claimed he found the money left by the man he claimed left him the money;;;;;

It is possible that Hauptmann might have been involved in shady deals involving money but he did not kidnap and murder the Lindbergh child. If it had not been for Lt. Bornmann's fraudulent "discovery" of a missing floorboard in Hauptmann's attic (34 officers and FBI agents scoured that attic and saw nothing) there would have been nothing to extradite Hauptmann with. There simply was no evidence, circumstantial or otherwise, to prove he had even been in NJ that night. The cops were truly desperate to nail Hauptmann and they had nothing but liars for witnesses.

The money is not proof of a connection to the crime since 2 & 1/2 years had already passed from the payment of the ransom money - it could have gone through any number of money launderer's hands by then. It is not enough circumstantial evidence for an execution! Isidor Fisch paid for his steamship ticket to Austria partly with gold certificates from the ransom cache. Wilentz knew this during the trial and withheld the information from the defense and the public. Not only that, but the prosecution scammed the jurors with a fraudulent account of Hauptmann's

books. Read Scaduto on this and you will see that Hauptmann's finances were counted twice to accommodate the 50,000.00 cache amount. He never had 50,000. but they did a sleight of hand trick with Hauptmann's financial books to fit him into the electric chair.

;;;;;The handwriting is clearly his, ;;;;
I do not know what books you read on this subject but it is not "clearly his."

;;;;;;Did I mention that he himself said he lied on the stand? ;;;;
He answered truthfully that he had lied to police when first being arrested. He thought he had been arrested for possessing gold certificate bills that were supposed to have been turned into the bank by a certain date in accordance with FDR's removal of the gold standard. His lie was a cover up of the 14,600.00 in gold certificates hidden in his garage which he knew was illegal since no person was allowed to own more than 100. of these gold notes. Hauptmann was an illegal immigrant and was not about to tell the cops he had violated such a law. This was the only lie that Hauptmann acknowledged and it is entirely plausible. I am sorry that you , and others, think it is enough of a lie to electrocute someone for.

;;;;;The facts just keep piling up;;;;;

Yes, they do - towards a frameup.

;;;;;;The Hoax Website does present a very interesting case that could be used against the prosecution's testimony.

;;;;;;

Thanks. That is the purpose of the site - to question the unjust death of Richard Hauptmann in the hope that this will never happen again and that the death penalty be abolished. Unfortunately nothing but exposure to the sordid truth will ever stop this from happening again. The city of Chicago is boldly, unbelievably, putting on trial 3 of its prosecutors who are guilty of framing defendants. This is remarkable since no prosecutor has ever been punished for this crime.

ronelle

Re: Re: Look at the facts!
Wednesday, 20-Jan-99 14:35:34
205.183.31.67 writes:

RONDELLE, IM SORRY TO SAY YOU ARE OUT OF WHACK WITH THIS CASE.IVE NEVER IN ALL THE CASES I STUDIED THAT A PRIME CONVICTED SUSPECT GET SO MANY EXCUSES FOR, YOUR WHAT IFS DONT MAKE SENSE. MOST OF THE

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE WAS COLLECTED BEFORE HAUPTMAN WAS CAUGHT.JUST BECAUSE CHARLES LINDBERGH WAS A PRACTICAL JOKER, DOESNT MAKE HIM A MURDERER OF HIS OWN SON COMEON.HE JUST DIDNT LIE ON THE STAND, AT HIS INTORRIGATIONS IN THE BRONX HIS EXCUSES FOR THE MONEY AND HIS LYING OF HIS CRIMNAL RECORD IN GERMANY. THE GUY WAS A LYING BUM I COME TO THIS CONCLUSION HE WAS GUILTY AND NOBODY ON THIS WEBSITE WILL CONVINSE ME OTHER WISE. EVEN ON SHABBY EXCUSES AND WHAT IFS

STEVE ROMEO

**Re: Re: Re: Look at the facts!
Thursday, 21-Jan-99 11:19:16
152.163.206.199 writes:**

;;;;;;;YOUR WHAT IFS DONT MAKE SENSE. ;;;;;;;

All of my "what ifs" (otherwise known as "circumstantial evidence") do make sense because they are based upon irrefutable and documented evidence. It is not a "what if" that the father of a missing baby demanded immediate ownership of an investigation that rightfully belonged to law enforcement officials. He did exactly that! Also well-documented is the fact that the father of the missing child turned away the help of bloodhounds, the FBI, human search-chains, Gov. Moore's public offer of 35,000. reward money, and continued to reject all sorts of proven police investigative methods including Capt. Mulrooney's offer to stalk Brooklyn mailboxes to capture the "ransom note mailer" and was angry that the Treasury Dept wanted to record serial numbers on the ransom money to apprehend the "kidnappers." He also demanded that the cops not interfere with anything he was doing which included the ransom money delivery. Instead, the father of the missing baby resorted to advice and services from all sorts of kooks, mobsters, psychics, priests, millionairesses, and pompous-ass professors. He wasted no time in calling his personal lawyer only moments after the disappearance of his child and of all the household members involved in this case no one, to this day, can account for Charles Lindbergh's whereabouts on March 1, 1932! Not even Lindbergh himself when he was finally asked at Hauptmann's lynching.

So, Steve, "what if" it was your child? Is this description (everything in it is true) even a little bit "out of whack" with reality? Is it even a little bit "out of whack" with a father who desperately wants his child back? Or is it more on target with a father who is throwing red herrings to mislead, delay and avoid?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Look at the facts!
Thursday, 21-Jan-99 11:19:16
152.163.206.199 writes:

;;;;;;;;;YOUR WHAT IFS DONT MAKE SENSE. ;;;;;;;;;;

All of my "what ifs" (otherwise known as "circumstantial evidence") do make sense because they are based upon irrefutable and documented evidence. It is not a "what if" that the father of a missing baby demanded immediate ownership of an investigation that rightfully belonged to law enforcement officials. He did exactly that! Also well-documented is the fact that the father of the missing child turned away the help of bloodhounds, the FBI, human search-chains, Gov. Moore's public offer of 35,000. reward money, and continued to reject all sorts of proven police investigative methods including Capt. Mulrooney's offer to stalk Brooklyn mailboxes to capture the "ransom note mailer" and was angry that the Treasury Dept wanted to record serial numbers on the ransom money to apprehend the "kidnappers." He also demanded that the cops not interfere with anything he was doing which included the ransom money delivery. Instead, the father of the missing baby resorted to advice and services from all sorts of kooks, mobsters, psychics, priests, millionairesses, and pompous-ass professors. He wasted no time in calling his personal lawyer only moments after the disappearance of his child and of all the household members involved in this case no one, to this day, can account for Charles Lindbergh's whereabouts on March 1, 1932! Not even Lindbergh himself when he was finally asked at Hauptmann's lynching. So, Steve, "what if" it was your child? Is this description (everything in it is true) even a little bit "out of whack" with reality? Is it even a little bit "out of whack" with a father who desperately wants his child back? Or is it more on target with a father who is throwing red herrings to mislead, delay and avoid?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Look at the facts!
Thursday, 18-Feb-99 13:38:14
209.214.204.5 writes:

To Steve Romeo:
I agree with Ronelle on this one too. Lindbergh wasn't the run of the mill practical joker like most every family has, these jokers play these little jokes intended to make the family laugh. When it turns to abuse of wife, children or even friends, and it hurts this person mentally or causes injury to anyone, then it is not a practical joke! I have a son also, and if his father did even one of what you call Lindbergh's

practical jokes, he would be sorry for the rest of his life! Someone like Lindbergh starts out by hiding his child from Anne, then the "Kiddnapping" comes along, and even the death of an innocent man can't keep him from his "Practical Jokes!" Lindbergh was a cruel man to his wife, and the rest of his children. Today, he would have had a long history with the local law enforcement as an Abusive Man. It is a pity that the times were as they were, maybe if they had been different, Anne would have had the courage to file charges against him, if not for her sake, but for her children. Lindbergh did not know the meaning, "A child is a gift from God." He would never know this meaning because Lindbergh was wrapped up in being "Lindbergh, The Lone Eagle."
Heaven help us if we ever place someone like him on a pedestal again!

Karyn Von Eberhardt

Re: Look at the facts!
Thursday, 21-Jan-99 04:36:10
207.220.150.77 writes:

--- the ladder was crude but professional ---

Crude but professional? Koehler described it as very crude, with poor judgment as to the choice of lumber and poor workmanship. That doesn't sound like 'crude but professional'. It doesn't sound like the work of a trained, skilled carpenter.

--- The handwriting is clearly his... ---

Sorry to disagree. Much of the handwriting resembles his - even he acknowledged that. There are, however, numerous and significant dis-similarities between Hauptmann's writing and the writing in the notes.

--- because the defense couldn't hire reputable handwriting experts to back them up... ---

The one expert Reilly used (NOT the only one he had) was every bit as reputable as the witnesses for the State.

Do you suppose Osborn Sr. publicly stating that anyone who disagreed with him was either incompetent or dishonest had any effect on the Defense's ability to procure experts?

How about the fact that they couldn't pay them?

--- Did I mention that he himself said he lied on the stand? ---

Do you mean he admitted he committed perjury or that he lied to the police?

If the former please cite an example. The only one Wilentz (who claimed this over and over)ever actually came up with was the contradiction regarding the closet board. That is, Hauptmann "lied" when he said the writing on the board was his.

If the latter - yes he lied to the police about his record (no doubt he hoped they wouldn't find out) and he lied initially about having more gold notes (no doubt he hoped they wouldn't find the rest).

What he told the police about the money buried in his garage AFTER he learned that the charge against him was murder and not hoarding gold (and therefore learned the true nature of the money) casts a different light, however. He testified in NY and NJ that he told the police there was money buried in his garage. The State called former NY Police Commissioner John O'Ryan (the person Hauptmann claimed he told) as a rebuttal witness. Not only does O'Ryan not rebut Hauptmann's testimony, IMHO, he effectively corroborates it.

Hauptmann also admitted that even after telling the police about the money buried in the garage he failed to tell them about the money hidden in the board because he did not want them to find the gun.

Why do you suppose he made up such an elaborate lie about telling the police there was money buried in the garage and didn't just claim he told them about the money in the board,too?

Mjr