

Re: Re: Re: Re: "Someone had to know..."  
Friday, 16-Apr-1999 09:36:01  
209.12.168.207 writes:

OK, an even tone in response. Not having (or at this point wanting) to review the books:

we know on the day of the kidnapping that:

1. A note was left on the sill.
2. A ladder was left at the scene.
3. A chisel was left at the scene.
4. The scene was within driving radius of BRH (CAL returned from YN that evening)
5. Witness descriptions do not exclude BRH as being the one in the car. (Here one can digress into the ability of witnesses to describe versus the ability of witnesses to recognize--a common defense trick, for example, in impeaching a rape victim's description of her assailant although she had no trouble recognizing him later).

Subsequent evidence was obtained which must be assessed in light of the above evidence. While I feel BRH wrote the note, probably designed and constructed the ladder (the evidence doesn't exclude him); passed money in NY (evidence doesn't exclude him); spoke and wrote like the note (evidence doesn't exclude him); had the money hidden in several places under his control (evidence includes him), and there is more. The manner in which circumstantial evidence is assessed is actually geometrical rather than arithmetical. Just as population geneticists conclude paternity by multiplying the matching bands after electrophoresis, the same process is done with circumstantial evidence. It is not that he wrote like the note, that he talked like the note, etc., it is that he wrote ...AND talked ... AND had the money...AND had a design similar to the ladder AND was a carpenter AND had lumber matching rail 16 AND... etc. Every one who is excluded by a subsequent AND narrows the circumstantial probability. In the law this is referred to as the "doctrine of chances" and is a common sense tool engaged in by people every day. Jurors are not called upon to find guilt beyond all doubt, because then they would have to be witnesses to have that vantage point. Reasonable doubt is specifically defined as not including "capricious or speculative doubt" or as defined by the old trial lawyers as "what woulda, coulda, or shoulda been there". Based on the evidence presented by the state especially when compared with the tripe O'Reilly presented in what would now be determined to be "incompetency of counsel", the jurors had no difficulty in reaching their verdict. What fact about the day do you find which clearly exculpates BRH?

Your comments about car jacking are well taken, but jackers do engage in simple surveillance as many guilty plea colloquys show every day in court. They find places of opportunity by surveillance. My comment was that while you could assume they "must have known", I could just as easily assume that they "could have surveilled".

JM

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Someone had to know..."  
Saturday, 17-Apr-1999 09:16:51  
207.220.150.120 writes:**

**---...we know on the day of the kidnapping that:**

**1. A note was left on the sill.---**

**Agreed.**

**---2. A ladder was left at the scene.---**

**Agreed.**

**---3. A chisel was left at the scene.---**

**A chisel was found at the scene.**

**Although there was no evidence of its use in the crime, the police assumed the kidnappers brought it based on its location, the timing of its discovery and the fact that it did not come from the Lindbergh house. (A reasonable and valid assumption, I agree, but an assumption none the less, right?) :**

**---4.The scene was within driving radius of BRH---**

**Agreed. It was about 4 hours round trip.**

**---5. Witness descriptions do not exclude BRH as being the one in the car.---**

**Sorry, but I can't give you this one as it stands.**

**There were two people who came forward on March 2 to describe strangers they saw.**

**The first gave a description that is not very detailed. You are right, however, in saying that there is nothing in the description that excludes Hauptmann. The car he described (and he gave a significantly more detailed description of the car) is NOT Hauptmann's.**

**The second person who saw someone testified that Hauptmann was definitely not either of the two men he saw in the car that day.**

**So, of the two witnesses who came forward immediately, one excluded Hauptmann as the person seen and the other's description (such as it was) fits Hauptmann but makes clear that whoever the person was, the car he drove was not Hauptmann's car. (Any evidence that there was one stolen in Mercer County around that time?)**

**IMHO, you can't use Hochmuth (or other witnesses) and simply disregard the question of credibility. (What makes him more credible than the witness that came forward on March 2 and said Hauptmann was not one of the men he saw?)**

**---(Here one can digress into the ability of witnesses to describe versus the ability of witnesses to recognize--a common defense trick, for example, in impeaching a rape victim's description of her assailant although she had no trouble recognizing him later).---**

**I don't consider the question of a witness's ability to perceive, recall and relate what happened and what he saw (or facts questioning a witnesses veracity in general) a "digression". Like it or not, they go to the credibility of the witness and the accuracy of the testimony.**

**I did not, BTW, question Hochmuth's ability to 'describe or recognize'. I questioned 1) whether he actually saw anyone and 2) his ability to SEE the person he claimed he saw that day and especially his ability to see suspect he 'identified'.**

**Do I understand from you inclusion of only those 5 items that you are dismissing the other things the police found that night and the next day? How about the conclusions they drew from that evidence?**

**Do you also consider irrelevant the other things the police concluded based on the statements of those in the house, etc?**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Someone had to know..."**

**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 13:45:56**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**This one is getting to be too much trouble to scroll through. The real problem in evaluating witness credibility is that it is done by the jury within the context of the trial. That they found testimony credible in light of everything presented is their decision. They may have totally discounted Hochmuth for all we know despite the assertions that it was so damaging to BRH. I wouldn't be surprised if they relied more on the notes and their analysis; the money BRH had; and his manner and demeanor on the stand. Anyone who has debriefed jurors would be surprised (perhaps horrified is a better word) at how jurors arrive at their decisions. One only need look at the civil rights murders of the early 60's or the recent OJ verdict to question the aptness of the jury system. Now that it is a frequent occurrence to hire**

psychologists and para-linguistics experts to assist in the selection/deselection of juries in both civil and criminal cases, it can only get worse. In short the people I may find incredible which you find credible, and vice versa, is academic. These people were the finders of fact in that case, and in their opinions, they did.

JM

**Circumstantial evidence**

**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 07:25:56**

**207.220.150.54 writes:**

----The manner in which circumstantial evidence is assessed is actually geometrical rather than arithmetical. Just as population geneticists conclude paternity by multiplying the matching bands after electrophoresis, the same process is done with circumstantial evidence. It is not that he wrote like the note, that he talked like the note, etc., it is that he wrote...AND talked ... AND had the money...AND had a design similar to the ladder AND was a carpenter AND had lumber matching rail 16 AND... etc. Every one who is excluded by a subsequent AND narrows the circumstantial probability. In the law this is referred to as the "doctrine of chances" and is a common sense tool engaged in by people every day. Jurors are not called upon to find guilt beyond all doubt, because then they would have to be witnesses to have that vantage point. Reasonable doubt is specifically defined as not including "capricious or speculative doubt" or as defined by the old trial lawyers as "what woulda, coulda, or shoulda been there". ----

I am familiar with the manner in which circumstantial evidence is assessed. It is the fact that this was a circumstantial evidence case that makes it imperative that the finder of fact have all the relevant information - including that which impeaches the eyewitnesses and the experts and corroborates Hauptmann's claims. Including evidence that adds "but didn'ts" to that list of "ands".

--that he talked like the note,--

This one in particular interests me. After reading the notes, reading and listening to Hauptmann's testimony and reading the statements he gave, I suggest to you that Hauptmann had nowhere near the command of English that the note writer did. IMHO, the note writer's English skills are more consistent with what Condon described as an "occasional mis-pronunciation of the English language."

**---Based on the evidence presented by the state especially when compared with the tripe O'Reilly presented in what would now be determined to be "incompetency of counsel", the jurors had no difficulty in reaching their verdict.---**

**Based on the evidence presented by the State? Well, sure. I probably would have convicted him too if I didn't know some of the things the State kept from the jury. You cannot consider this case based on just the evidence presented by the State.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Circumstantial evidence  
Monday, 19-Apr-1999 17:25:44  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**You would add some interesting aspects to American criminal law. While I agree that there are discovery and production obligations on the prosecution, I am not as sure about the duty to add the "but didn't...". The dissenting opinion in United States v. Wade pretty well articulates that obligation as being on the defense attorney. Think of the "but didn't..." one could add to Milosovich (?) in Yugoslavia. He is charged with the deaths of thousands of Albanians, and now the prosecutors in the Hague would have to add "but didn't round any up personally; but didn't load any guns personally; but didn't shoot any guns personally; but didn't burn any houses personally. What "but didn't..." would you have the prosecution point out to the jury? It's an old saw, but for those of you who believe the State hid the ball, why didn't they add a confession or produce "fingerprints" or create a jailhouse snitch if they are bent on framing BRH? Should you apply the "but didn't..." test to your own sources? "This writer took part of this police report as true but didn't tell you all of it?". "This source claims this witness is unreliable, but didn't tell you about possible corroboration?" "This source gave you this version, but didn't tell you there is another explanation?". Perhaps your grievance is with the adversarial system itself. It doesn't always work given the many variables involved despite being touted as the best on earth. But then the Constitution doesn't guarantee a perfect trial and the Brady decision clarifying the obligations of the prosecutor had not been decided yet. I'm sorry if I spent time explaining something to you that you already knew. I rather like the anonymity of the board and detest the flood of junk email I get when any id information is released. I don't know what you know but for what is discussed here. Over the years I have gone from believing BRH was not guilty (never thought he was innocent since he was involved at least in extortion) to a conclusion that he was directly involved in the crime as a principal. The change came about as I read more about the case and began to fit the facts together. What I like about circumstantial evidence is that it doesn't forget, lie, or feel sympathy or prejudice. I have watched a number of trials, and I have yet to see one where someone wasn't lying--mostly in divorce cases. Was Anna Hauptmann lying when**

she said she never saw the box of money in the closet despite being a fastidious house cleaner and keeping things on that shelf herself? BRH admitted to lies "It was not the truth" I recall him saying, and I'm sure you're aware of what generally happens to defendants who admit lying or are caught in lies. There is generally not a favorable outcome.

JM

Re: Re: Circumstantial evidence  
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 04:07:57  
207.220.150.46 writes:

--Perhaps your grievance is with the adversarial system itself.--

No. I have tremendous respect for the adversarial system. Indeed, unlike many of the people here, I also have tremendous respect for both the abilities and integrity of the police and prosecutors. I think this case was different.

--You would add some interesting aspects to American criminal law.--

Discovery and disclosure are "adding" something to American criminal law? If so, then I guess I am.

--While I agree that there are discovery and production obligations on the prosecution, I am not as sure about the duty to add the "but didn't...".The dissenting opinion in *United States v. Wade* pretty well articulates that obligation as being on the defense attorney.--

I think you misunderstand me. I am not suggesting that the STATE had the burden of telling the jury all the evidence. Some of that burden rested with the defense. But how could the defense present evidence to the jury if the defense was not permitted to know it?

---It's an old saw, but for those of you who believe the State hid the ball, why didn't they add a confession or produce "fingerprints" or create a jailhouse snitch if they are bent on framing BRH?---

Again, I suggest that you misunderstand me. I don't think that David Wilentz and the State of New Jersey set about to 'frame' someone they KNEW was innocent. I think they were under pressure to solve this case and latched on to the first viable suspect they found. From that point they closed their eyes to anything that

contradicted the conclusion. More significantly, they did not disclose any of it to the defense and thereby kept it from the jury.

(I do have my doubts about a couple of items of evidence produced by the State, but I think that was more the actions of individuals - not some kind of organized conspiracy.)

--Should you apply the "but didn't..." test to your own sources? "This writer took part of this police report as true but didn't tell you all of it?". "This source claims this witness is unreliable, but didn't tell you about possible corroboration?" "This source gave you this version, but didn't tell you there is another explanation?".--

I am, and always have been, highly skeptical of what writers on this case produce, both theory and fact. That is the reason that most of the information I use comes not from writers but from police reports, the trial transcript, witness statements, etc. I reach my own conclusions and they don't always agree with those of the published writers.

---I have watched a number of trials, and I have yet to see one where someone wasn't lying--mostly in divorce cases.---

They will do that, won't they? Especially in divorce cases. But how often do you watch a trial where EVERY contested witness can be effectively challenged? If there were only one or two witnesses in this case whose credibility was questionable it wouldn't bother me. If there were only minor collateral challenges to the opinions of the experts it also wouldn't bother me. That is not the case here.

---BRH admitted to lies "It was not the truth" I recall him saying, and I'm sure you're aware of what generally happens to defendants who admit lying or are caught in lies. There is generally not a favorable outcome.---

The fact that he lied to the police damages his credibility - no question about it. It doesn't make him a killer. As I have said before, BTW, the extent and duration of his lies - at least in regard to the money - is debatable.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Circumstantial evidence

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 11:29:26

209.12.168.207 writes:

A number of well made points. It's no fun to debate someone who doesn't do it well. I suppose I may have misunderstood your position somewhat based on your replies. I wonder about your statement about every witness being effectively challenged. I don't quite see it that way. Every witness in every trial I have watched

was challenged, some more effectively than others. The balancing test conducted by juries at the direction of standard or pattern jury instructions provide a number of factors. Demeanor evidence is another field all by itself. One of the problems is that Wilentz was summing the case up for that jury instead of for the public at large. I suspect that it could be summarized much better by the prosecution by a better prosecutor. This was probably Wilentz' first big trial. It was more passion than summary. As to lying not making BRH a killer, people herein make a killer out of CAL on a lot less.

JM

Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates  
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 00:11:19  
38.14.58.188 writes:

Hey, let's push the "Lindy did it" theory aside for a minute. Let's assume he did NOT kill his son. Charles Lindbergh was a very cruel individual. The facts are there! I'm more than just an arm chair researcher. Will FBI documents be enough proof for you? Of course, JM, how could we ever expect you to open your mind to the possibility when your long list of book recommendations on this forum does not even include one book written by a woman. Oh sure, there's a brief mention of Anne Lindbergh's diaries... but have you actually read them? In fact, Berg's book alone gives enough of a psychological profile to raise one's eyebrows until they ache. So before you judge others for clinging to their own silly theories, you and the other Lindbergh apologist's might think of removing your rose colored airplane goggles long enough to look at Lindbergh, the MAN. If you're not willing to do this, your theory becomes just as flawed and narrow minded as the ones you criticize.

Melinda

Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates  
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 13:29:58  
209.12.168.207 writes:

My list is just of the books I personally have. I would not recommend a book I do not own or have otherwise read. You should notice that I have books from both sides of the issue of Hauptmann's guilt. I personally believe Anne Morrow Lindbergh was superior as a writer, and I find her prose to be quite good. As to whether my mind is open or not, I just think that we leap from allegation to conclusion too quickly. You seem to have judged me pretty quickly and your



**rhetoric has escalated somewhat. Why is that? If you are secure in your conviction, you should not shy away from academic debate on the evidence and the people. Just ask yourself about your evidence "can I back this up with facts, or is this a conclusion based on something else"? Is there something wrong with that approach?**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates  
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 19:18:10  
38.14.58.52 writes:**

**;;;;; My list is just of the books I personally have. I would not recommend a book I do not own or have otherwise read.;;;;;**

**That's exactly my point.**

**Melinda**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates  
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 10:02:08  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**I guess something is lost in the translation here. Must one cite every authority, article, news clipping each time? As I recall, some student asked for sources, and only one was offered--one which takes a definite position on the case. I think that was "an incomplete" offer. I provided a list which contained sources from both sides. There are many others, such as the bio of the defense attorney for the Scottsboro Boys who interviewed BRH in jail and concluded he was guilty; the bios of Adele Rogers St. Clair; and numbers of law review articles which comprise a list too long to put in an email. I entered the Lindbergh case with a suspicion about the verdict because BRH was a German caught so soon after WWI, and because of the fallout from the Sacco-Vanzetti case. The more I looked at all the information, the more I became convinced that BRH wrote the first note. If he wrote that first note, and if "others unknown" did the kidnapping, he is still guilty as a principal, which would mean that he would still have been executed.**

**I will change my mind if/when I find evidence to the contrary. Do you have evidence (not allegation or speculation) that he did not write the first note?**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates**

**Friday, 16-Apr-1999 02:06:48**

**152.163.206.183 writes:**

**;;;;;;. Do you have evidence (not allegation or speculation) that he did not write the first note?;;;;;;;**

**Yes, the original statements of both Osborns was that BRH did NOT write the note. They changed their minds only after the 14,000.00 was found in Hauptmann's garage. Science, just like justice, is supposed to be blind. The Osborns should not have been privy to any info about the defendant, or the case, in order to keep their findings fair according to the Scientific Method. Reilly was never informed of this fact.**

**And,just for the record, her name is Adela Rogers St. John (The Honeycomb) and Sam Leibowitz is the Scottsboro Boys' lawyer- just in case readers wish to look them up.**

**ronelle**

**Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 02:39:43**  
**205.188.197.151 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;". It is amazing to watch allegations of Lindbergh's practical jokes advance to the point that he is characterized as a "cruel" hoaxer without so much as any facts beyond the allegations to prove that;;;;;;;;;;;**

**So, JM, what do YOU call encouraging a butting ram to assault your 8-year-old son for a lengthy period in a lonely field while you, the dad, watch from behind a distant fence? (James Newton's memoir) What do you call twirling your infant son by his ankle around your head to "teach him a lesson"? (Nigel Nicolson - memoirs) What do you say of throwing sofa cushions at your toddler to knock him down and make him a man?( Will Rogers) Or publicly pouring ice water on the penis of a nine-year-old to make folks laugh after dinner? (Amelia Earhardt) How about throwing a tear-gas canister into a closet while your guest is changing into a bathing suit? (Reeve Lindbergh interview) Or changing the drinking water into kerosene so your friend will learn a lesson? (Bud Gurney) These cruelties are not enough for you to label Lindy a "cruel hoaxer"?**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 13:34:28**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**I would not condone any of this. But neither would I speculate that because of any of this that he killed his son as some seem so willing to do. If we can make this leap--CAL did these things in the past, so we can believe he killed his son; it should be much easier to conclude that because BRH was a burglar in the past he surely did the Lindbergh case. You wouldn't accept that, would you?**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 18:13:14**  
**205.188.199.179 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;If we can make this leap--CAL did these things in the past, so we can believe he killed his son; it should be much easier to conclude that because BRH was a**



does not IMHO match the seriousness and gravity of stealing a sleeping baby from its crib and murdering it. Burglary and kidnapping are not psychologically related crimes.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates  
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 15:34:43  
205.183.31.67 writes:

they said in germany he did similar burglary crimes not the exact one. your right its 2 differnt crimes. but his track record is not good. when he made sharp objects with a spoon in the bronx and hid it in the toilet. nobody but me brings that up, because if you read the statements his first lawyer made, that incident changed his defense he was going to use. he was planing a insanity charge, thats a fact

STEVE FOR RONELLE

Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame  
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 02:23:46  
205.188.197.151 writes:

;;;;;;;how could you recommend  
that other book you worship thats in my mind fictional ;;;;;;;

I recommend it because it is a spellbinding investigation that enthalls people when they hear about it. It is a very plausible theory considering that so many children are harmed by their own parents. Why should this father avoid suspicion? Because he was a hero? Because he is dead and gone? I don't think so.  
And, I am in a good position to recommend the book because, unlike you Steve, I have actually read it!

;;;;;;;on a theory no less;;;;;;  
So, what's wrong with a theory? All of science is made up of them. Remember those guys Newton and Einstein? How does civilization progress if not from the challenging of theories? And, more importantly, if Hauptmann didn't do it then who did?

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 08:17:56**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**jim fisher is a ex fbi agent and a historian on the fbis involvment in the case. so this so called fbi documents you have to clear hauptman let me know. me and jim want to see the smoking gun.as far as lindbergh doing it, its comical. people i know who believe hauptman was inocent thinks its a trshy theory. i dont know why your hung up on this to trah lindbergh and making hauptman a prominent citizen baffles me**

**steve for ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 13:43:34**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Interesting that you would bring in science. What were your comments about the National Academy of Forensic Sciences experts in the middle 80's when, using modern science, they looked at the evidence in this case and (all but one --Cyril Wecht, as I recall) concluded that Hauptmann did it? Their report was rather extensive.**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Friday, 16-Apr-1999 00:52:33**  
**152.163.206.214 writes:**

**I have no idea what "modern science " you are referring to. Do you mean the tree "experts"? Or the so-called handwriting "experts"? Or maybe you mean the voice "experts"? What kind of "science" ever proved Hauptmann was guilty? To me it is only the "science" of prejudice that did that.**

**ronelle**

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame  
Friday, 16-Apr-1999 09:19:27  
209.12.168.207 writes:

Probably the same scientists who belong to the associations your doctors, etc. belong to. As to tree scientists, botanic DNA, canine genome projects, binary analysts are routinely recognized in criminal courts to provide assessments of circumstantial evidents. Also forensic pedologists, anthropologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, pathologists, serologists, population geneticists, and many more. Of course, the problem for you with these people is that they deal with verifiable science and not speculation, so they may not corroborate your assertions. The prejudice in your analysis seems to come from your own hatred for Lindbergh. Perhaps, if you are called upon to serve on a jury and you are asked, "Can you decide this case on what happened out there on the street, and not who is involved in the case--whether they are rich or poor; male or female; black, white, brown, yellow; old or young..." you may appreciate facts over speculation. Those of us who believe BRH is guilty--that he was a common criminal and convicted burglar and robber before he participated in the death of CALjr--are not seeking to lionize CAL. We just ask you--what single fact presented at the trial exculpates BRH? As to the "tree experts", maybe the next time the expensive trees in your yard show signes of disease, you should call Anthony Scaduto or Ludovic Kennedy and get their opinion of what to do instead of the forensic botanists or pedologists you scorn so easily.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame  
Friday, 16-Apr-1999 13:08:48  
152.163.204.206 writes:

;;;;;;;;;Of course, the problem for you with these people is that they deal with verifiable science and not speculation, so they may not corroborate your assertions;;;;;;;;;;;

Verifiable science? Maybe there really is some form of objectively-attained "verifiable science" out there in the university labs of America but definitely NOT in our courtrooms. From what I have been seeing of American justice these past few years it looks to me like ANYTHING, no matter how ridiculous, could be "scientifically verifiable" in our courts - repressed memory, psychic phenomena, hypnosis and even lie detectors and now Matthew Epen is supposed to have been strangled in spite of the fracture in his skull! Roswell will surely be next! As long as the hired guns or "experts" get their exorbitant hourly fees "verifiable science" can easily be bought and you know it.

;;;;;;. The prejudice in your analysis seems to come from your own hatred for Lindbergh.;;;;;

My "hatred" for Lindbergh, which actually isn't as strong as you would like to portray it, comes from the prejudice in HIS analysis, not my own. If Lindbergh's pro - 3rd Reich ideology had prevailed I could never have been born and you would be heiling Hitler right now. Aside from his antisocial ideology he was not well liked by anyone who knew him and even Berg sounds like he had to hold his nose while writing that bio. But it is unfair of you to accuse me of being wrong about the scapegoating of BRH simply because I dislike Lindbergh. In fact, I could discredit your arguments by saying "the prejudice in your analysis seems to come from your hatred of BRH or your love of Lindbergh." It is just as easy to point a finger at Lindy admirers who cannot bring themselves to even think of such a "hero" being guilty of anything. But this form of attack serves no purpose and only lowers the standards of the debate.

;;;;;;;you are asked, "Can you decide this case on what happened out there on the street, and not who is involved in the case--whether they are rich or poor; male or female; black, white, brown, yellow; old or young..." you may appreciate facts over speculation. ;;;;;;

If you are telling me JM that you honestly believe this is what the jurors of BRH applied their minds to when they sat in judgement of him at Flemington then I am throwing my hands up in disgust! You have to be joking about this. Even Berg admits the blatant prejudice at that trial. And, if facts had ruled the day over speculation Hauptmann would never even have been extradited to NJ in the first place. Remember those headlines? "Lindbergh Baby Killer Arrested"

;;;;;;. We just ask you--what single fact presented at the trial exculpates BRH?

;;;;;;  
The "single" fact is that MANY facts - all exculpatory - were intentionally and criminally hidden from the defense, the public and the jurors by the prosecutor.

;;;;;;;maybe the next time the expensive trees in your yard show signes of disease, you should call Anthony Scaduto or Ludovic Kennedy ;;;

Scaduto and Kennedy, like the rest of us, have to rely on our sense of what is a scam and what is not a scam. When the "experts" do their job properly there should be no mixing of subjective information with their tests nor with their results. That is what science ought to be about - the search for truth. Too often "science" makes things "true" when they are not as Stephen Jay Gould illustrated in "The Mismeasure of Man." If scientists were advising me to destroy those trees in my back yard I would surely ask for a second opinion. A tree, like a human life, is definitely worth saving. But, maybe the "forensic botanist" gets a kickback from the tree cutters? Actually, it happens to be a common occurrence here in Florida. I joined the board of my condo and spent 3 years getting them to stop "hatracking"



perfectly good trees. As it turned out through my own investigation the landscapers were the only people profiting from this "scientific" advice and the gullible condo board members never questioned the destruction of their perfectly good trees. At Flemington there were too many who would profit from Hauptmann's predicament. It also offered the hope of reward money for all those lying rehabilitated witnesses.

ronelle

Response

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 16:35:04  
209.12.168.207 writes:

Most of the experts you discuss are defense experts offered to disprove relatively hard science. Chemistry, Physics, Botany, etc. tend to be verifiable. It is the soft sciences which cause the legal system trouble. Perhaps the recent crackdown on experts by the US Sup. Ct. can help with that.

I am not very fond of CAL the man, and I certainly cannot say I am fond of BRH the man. I find the latter a common criminal (verifiable) who was involved in the Lindbergh case (verifiable) who lied to the police during the investigation (verifiable) who kept a secret life from his wife (verifiable) who is being cannonized by members of this board (verifiable). I have seen a number of scientists testify in court, and I will admit I have seen charlatans, but they were usually caught in cross-examination. It's pretty hard to fake the formula for hydroplaning in accident cases. As for Hitler, even Einstein in "Einstein on Peace" cites Hitler as the reason he was not an absolute pacifist. And you are right that the law isn't always followed, and sometimes few argue when they should. The civil rights murders of the 60's is a good example, and maybe someone debates the ex post facto arrest, trial, and execution of Eichmann by a country which didn't politically exist when his crimes (massive crimes) were committed. I'm not a fan of Eichmann, he was dispicable and he deserved to die, and he did die.(I recall the testimony of Hans Frank at the Nuremburg Trials when asked by Justice Musmanno about whether Hitler was dead. Frank responded "He is dead, thank God, but he died too late". The same is true of Eichmann.) I think BRH was in on the crime; the crime was punishable by death; and by 1934 legal standards, he deserved to die. Armed robbers and rapists got the death penalty in the 30's, and it was only in the 60's that death was deemed "excessive" for rape. My comment about your trees was a cheap shot, but your observations about science in law seem to produce cheap shots also. I have seen science clear people of crimes just as well as convict them. As to the Epan child, the injuries to that child were so excessive it is difficult to believe that he could have lived for days as the defense claims in that condition. The jury didn't buy that claim and convicted the young woman.

JM

**Re: Response**

**Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 15:15:18**

**152.163.213.177 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;My comment about your trees was a cheap shot, but your observations about science in law seem to produce cheap shots also. I have seen science clear people of crimes just as well as convict them. ;;;;;;;;;;**

**If science sometimes clears innocent people it is still no reason NOT to be skeptical of its use in our courts. Because "science" can be applied to good, as well as evil, we better not unquestionably accept it before we test it in every case.**

**"Science" never cleared anyone without the concern of responsible professionals who cared enough to do the testing in the first place. Concern for the scientific method in determining the fairness of accusations, regardless of how unpopular a defendant may be, is the only safeguard any of us have to make sure it never happens to us. We'll never know the toll of innocent people wrongly accused, imprisoned, and put to death because of hate and prejudice and the "scientific" results of such bias.**

**More importantly, science clears only those who are remembered. Once they are forgotten or ignored the unpopular defendants, like Hauptmann, can be left, without mercy, to the whims of prejudice and the "science" that results from it. And Hauptmann's case proves, at least to me, that even tremendous public attention can easily degrade into public hysteria.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Response**

**Sunday, 25-Apr-1999 21:03:29**

**12.70.16.173 writes:**

**Well said, and at least you are qualifying some of your comments. There is a lot of science in cases: all radar cases involve Doppler radar concepts; DUI requires proof of alcohol intake; ATM camera evidence requires proof of the operation of the camera; search warrants for computers routinely request a computer expert to accompany the searching officers; and the list goes on and on. It is much easier now, however, to test the accuracy of "scientific test" and the credentials of the expert, but, none the less, jurors are instructed that they are free to disregard the testimony of any witness, in whole or in part, whose credibility they question.**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Friday, 16-Apr-1999 12:00:32**  
**205.183.31.66 writes:**

**come on ronelle, your talking yourself into a corner. we have to much on our side.this massive cover up theory and lindbergh doing it doesnt hold water. come to our side. jimfishers new book should clear things up for you**

**steve for ronelle**

**Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 02:03:09**  
**205.188.197.162 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;you would have said it was a great book. ;;;;;;;;;;;**  
**I couldn't have said that, Steve. If Berg had admitted serious doubts about Hauptmann's guilt or even proclaimed him innocent I could never have condoned his apologies for a blatant eugenicist (white supremecist) and anti-Semite. Berg is Jewish - for me that makes his betrayal worse.**  
**Also, I could never accept Berg's deviousness in hiding from all readers the one aspect of Lindbergh's nature that was most spoken of and written about by those who knew him best - his despicable "pranks." Berg's complete omission of these life-long pranks and child/spousal abuse is inexcusable.**  
**And BTW, I do not think Berg was able to exonerate Hauptmann even if he had sincerely wanted to. How would he have been able to write this bio without opening up a new can of worms for his hero? If Hauptmann was innocent then who, the readers will be forced to ask, really did it? Berg,IMHO, was not able to delve too deeply on this issue since he could not risk exposing his beloved hero to the scrutiny Ahlgren and Monier have now established.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame**  
**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 11:35:14**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**ronnelle, i just dont understand this lindbergh bashing with this prank theory.this white supremacist label on whoever you were talking about, berg or lindbergh? isgoing to far.your painting a picture of somebody with flimsy proof and im baffled**

as a lindbergh kidnapping reseacher. by the way my friend who does the bronx tour wanted me to go to flemington with him tomorrow, hes finishing filming his documentary on the crime. i cant get off from work. melindas all crazy with this prank theory. i dont know what to say. i never came across it in any of my studies. what does it have to do with the crime?explain

steve for ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame  
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 12:13:43  
152.163.206.203 writes:

;;;;;this white supremacist label on whoever you were talking about, berg or lindbergh?;;;;

Lindbergh was a EUGENICIST. Look it up (EUGENICS) in the dictionary. It is a pseudo science whose followers claim that people with low IQs, "inferior" genes, physical handicaps, or just plain unacceptable skin-color as well as Mediterranean, Asian, and African heritage ought to be prevented from "diluting" the "superior" white race. This would be accomplished by limiting procreation and the forced sterilization of patients with low IQs and handicaps in hospitals. You and I Steve, as well as Berg and so many others on this message board have already "diluted" the society Lindbergh believed was the most superior. Berg would never have been born if Lindbergh had his way and he certainly would have idolized Jack Kevorkian.

ronelle

**IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

**Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 20:56:13**

**Message:**

**38.14.58.127 writes:**

**One of the most interesting scientific documents on this case is research presented by Professor of Law and Forensic Sciences, James E. Starrs at the Annual Meeting of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences in February, 1983.**

**After you read "The Prosecution of Bruno Richard Hauptmann: An Imitation of Falconry" you will have a much clearer understanding of just how Wilentz and his boys used the law to weave together an elaborate frame-up. You also will find more than enough evidence that the prosecution and the judge were, themselves, not above breaking the law, which presents a strong case for a mistrial.**

**Reference: Starrs, J.E. "The Prosecution of Bruno Richard Hauptmann: An Imitation of Falconry," Journal of Forensic Sciences, JFSCA, Vol. 28. No. 4, Oct. 1983, pp. 1083-1107.**

**Note: For those of you doing school projects... and also for those of you who are able to see the bigger picture of this story and how it connects with current events, be sure to stay tuned to the trial taking place this week in Wheaton Illinois. Three ex-prosecutors and 4 others are on trial for lying to convict a totally innocent man. (The railroaded man spent nearly 10 years on death row!) In a recent article "legal experts said they cannot recall another trial in which prosecutors were charged with crimes with how they handled a case". This is a first! But what the experts don't tell you is that prosecutorial frame-ups are and always have been a serious problem in this country. Perhaps this trial will, at last, begin to scare the slimey snakes out from their historically comfortable pits.**

**Melinda**

**Re: IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

**Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 10:21:23**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**The prosecution of the Dupage County prosecutors in Illinois is a very serious matter. Criminals are criminals whether they are prosecutors, defense lawyers, or kidnapers. You should not overlook that these prosecutors are being prosecuted by a prosecutor--Bill Kunkle, who prosecuted and secured the execution of John Wayne Gacy for serial homicides in Chicago. You should be cheering prosecutors in this case instead of indicting all of them for the sins of several. The reason that this prosecution is "new" or "novel" is the issue of liability for acts in office, and the**

impact of suits or requested indictments against prosecutors for pending cases. If they are guilty, they should be convicted and sent to the penitentiary. I just hope that no one writes a book about the Dupage officials with the allegation that Anne Morrow Lindbergh actually did the frame-up.

J M

**Re: Re: IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

**Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 12:23:07**

**152.163.195.182 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;Criminals are criminals whether they are prosecutors, defense lawyers, or kidnappers. ;;;;;;;;;;**

**While we would all agree with your statement that criminals are criminals no matter what profession they may practice, your statement avoids the glaring fact that alleged kidnappers are ALWAYS put on trial in America but, until now, NO prosecutor ever has! Their ruthlessness has always been excused as the necessary evil for public "protection." The prosecution of prosecutors is such a rarity that we have to wonder why, with all the uncovered and proven injustices committed by them for decades and centuries, no prosecutor has ever had to pay for their misdeeds. Perhaps the good old boys club will someday come to an end and prosecutors can begin holding each other to a higher standard other than premeditated murder of innocent defendants.**

**;;;;;;;;;You should be cheering prosecutors in this case instead of indicting all of them for the sins of several. ;;;;;;;;;;**

**With your knowledge of the law and the justice system (BTW, are you a lawyer?) you ought to be cheering the skeptics like Melinda and worrying about the sins of the very many! Rigorous questioning of prosecutorial conduct is the ONLY safeguard any of us have against the horrors of false imprisonment and unjust verdicts. After the costly Inquisition this nation and its chosen president just suffered through many Americans are already beginning to question the prosecutorial system and its abuses.**

**;;;;;;;;;these prosecutors are being prosecuted by a prosecutor--Bill Kunkle, who prosecuted and secured the execution of John Wayne Gacy ;;;;;;;;;;**

**I am sure that lots of folks feel safe at night in their beds because Gacy was put away by a prosecutor but there is nothing like Richard Hauptmann's predicament - an innocent man facing the electric chair - to give any of us the most disturbing nightmares. So it does not make me feel safer to know that Gacy is dead because there are too many clones of David Wilentz lurking in the shadows.**

**I do not understand your last statement about Anne Morrow.No one is claiming she framed anyone.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS**

**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 13:32:47**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**It is not worth the digression to discuss why there is/has been a public policy against suing or prosecuting public officials for omissions or transgressions in the course of their official duties. Essentially it involves the chilling effect it would have were defendants routinely to appear before grand juries with allegations of wrongdoing in order to slow or impede their own criminal trials. The apparent break has been in the area of civil liability and the distinction between absolute and qualified immunity. This is not offered in defense of the DuPage people, only to show why there is not a string of cases. The recent cry against the Clinton investigation ("Let him get back to the business of the people") is the same thing. BTW, I don't have to be a lawyer any more than you have to be a homicide detective, do I?**

**:JM**

**Forensic Science**

**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 02:51:06**

**205.188.196.48 writes:**

**I have been unable to locate a copy of the journal entry suggested above by Melinda (and since I have no idea what falconry has to do with BRH) I am very curious to know what other forensic scientists have to say about this subject. I find it interesting, however, that JM, who claims to be knowledgeable about scientific matters in the courtroom, does not show any interest, at least not here on this message board, in this scientific paper. So far the arguers, including myself, on this thread have avoided Melinda's topic - the framing of an innocent man with the use of "science."**

**Although there is a raging debate going on at another message site on this forum, no one has paid attention to this one. Why? Is there something about the Starrs report that defeats the guilty verdict? Or, is everyone else, like me, unfamiliar with this journal report? How about you, JM?**

**ronelle**

**Re: Forensic Science**  
**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 07:14:08**  
**207.220.150.46 writes:**

**---I have been unable to locate a copy of the journal entry suggested above by Melinda...---**

**I don't know where you live, but any decent sized college library should have this publication. Try one that has a criminal justice program.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Forensic Science**  
**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 09:46:40**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Actually, I have read the series of reports by the Academy and suggest that the results be spread upon this board. I notice that there is a recent Academy article on the Lindbergh evidence, which I have not read. Since membership in the academy spans a number of professions, scientists are not the only ones eligible for admission. You might want to see whether the author of the article(s) flashed here is a scientist or just another lawyer. And there again, there are false prophets among the experts. One only need look at the "photographic expert" used by the defense in the O.J. civil trial to see that a claim of expertise might just be that: a claim. We are on much firmer ground debating the results of the scientific method than when we digress to our various agenda.**

**JM**

**Additional Source**  
**Friday, 23-Apr-1999 14:56:39**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**You may also want to check "Anatomy of the Lindbergh Kidnapping Case", Journal of Forensic Sciences, Vol 42, #3, May 1997, at page 368.**

**JM </HTML>**



**Guilty or Innocent**  
**Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 17:33:49**

**Message:**  
**204.170.64.32 writes:**

**I am growing tired of seeing too many references to seeing statements o the effect of - nothing you have said proves Hauptmann innocent..**

**Please let us at least try to begin on the right foot.**

**Hauptmann was innocent**  
**it was up to the prosecution to PROVE him Guilty**

**Please at least try to keep this in mind.**

**Philip**

**Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Friday, 16-Apr-1999 10:26:10**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**and they did overwhelmingly, im tired of this I .indbergh bashing and wilentz was this and that. god forbid hauptman did anything. this nonsense is going on to much on this website. they cant make up thier minds on who did it its comical. they worship that book that lindy did it i think its a tabloid special for the enquire newspaper**

**steve for phil**

**Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Friday, 16-Apr-1999 11:03:36**  
**206.58.182.99 writes:**

**inocent**

**elisha**

**Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 13:23:16**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Phillip: Actually, you have your law wrong. BRH was PRESUMED innocent rather than being innocent. This is a simple rule of evidence which requires one of the parties to the trial (here the prosecution) to carry the burden of proof (here "beyond a reasonable doubt"). As I recall from ALL the books on the subject whether they were written on the planet Mars or here on Earth, the prosecution did carry the burden of proof for the jury and Hauptmann was convicted. At that point, the law PRESUMES Hauptmann guilty, for appellate purposes. So, strictly following the law as you wish, and since the present state of the case is that Hauptmann is presumed guilty, the burden is now on you to prove otherwise. This is true in all criminal cases from Maine to Miami or Seattle to San Diego.**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 13:30:11**  
**204.170.64.20 writes:**

**Dear JM**

**Thank you for your brief, I understand that in a court of law Haupt was presumed innocent, I am referng to the dialogugue I am reading at various sites here on the message board.**

**By the way you mentioned you have read several books on the Lindbergh case which were published on Mars could you be more specific.**

**Philip for JM**

**Re: Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Monday, 19-Apr-1999 13:35:49**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**What timing! You are right about the court of law thing, but perhaps you shouldn't toss around terms like innocent or prosecutor or prove if you are limiting yourself to academic debate. As to the Mars comment, you are also right about that, I just assumed that books which leap from speculation to opinion without any grounding in common sense reality must have originated outside our system. Perhaps just a faulty assumption on my part. A little levity here might help some of the contributors.**

**JM**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent**  
**Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 11:50:46**  
**204.170.64.35 writes:**

**You make a good point, but what academic words would you consider appropriate yet retain the focus and immediacy of the point.**

**Too bad about Mars, we could possibly have invited Whitley Strieber and a few others and began another message board.**

**Where are you?**

**Philip for JM**

**Response**  
**Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 16:07:24**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**I would just as soon keep the anonymity as it is. Let's just say I'm not near Hopewell, NJ, or Hope, Arkansas, for that matter.**

**I see the debate as two issues which are often confused: (1) was BRH in on the crime and (2) was his trial fair by 1934 standards (this would include allegations about the extent to which the state "hid the ball" (if at all). When the debate becomes mired in whether he did it by means of a 1999 fair trial, we can get nowhere.**

**As to the academic debate (free from legal standards of burdens of proof, incompetency of counsel, etc.) one could begin with three issue theories: (1) was it an inside job, (2) was it an outside job, (3) was it a combination inside/outside job. The debate could proceed along building block methods: for example, take issue theory #1 (was it an inside job). The first question would be "when did it happen". If it happened the day before the "abduction", many people would have to be in on the conspiracy because their testimony is on record to the contrary. If it happened the day of the abduction, how quickly could the ladder, note, etc. be "assembled". And the questions go on as you search for facts which tend to prove one branch or another from the questions stemming from the issue theory. I would be interested to see some methodology like this done and see what points we could agree on so things aren't constantly in contention. I don't think the books do this very well.**

**JM**

**Re: Response**  
**Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 23:07:58**  
**204.170.64.25 writes:**

**Was Hauptmann involved ? Was he given fair trial?**

**To begin with I hope to learn just what took place? rather than attempting to fit in pieces I think it may be best to just try to understand the events as they unfolded.**

**I agree with your wish for a methodology. How would you approach this story.**

**Re: Response**  
**Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 12:08:39**  
**205.188.193.44 writes:**

**<>**

**WHAT? The issue is whether his trial was fair by 1934 standards? Hello? Never mind that he was tried in 1935. I thought the issue was what probably happened? Was there a stranger kidnapping? If so, did Hauptmann do it? Three hundred years ago a number of "witches" were put to death in Salem, Massachusetts. Their trials were VERY fair-by 17th century standards. They were afforded opportunities to address the charges, and each was convicted only after being accused by a witness and a corroborator. Well, I guess JM you think they were witches, alright. No wonder you think the Lindbergh baby really was kidnapped.**

**Ralph**

**Re: Re: Response**  
**Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 15:18:07**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**ralph, sorry to butt in with your debate with jm. idont think you can compare the salem witch trials with the lindbergh trial.i feel hauptman was guilty of the crime in some way shape or form.the evidence is strongly against him. a book was written**

that lindbergh did it, his sisterinlaw didit, and god knows what other shallow book will be written on it. at my point of view i cant debate this case on this website with these alligations of nonsense.

steve for ralph

**1934 Standards**

**Sunday, 25-Apr-1999 23:01:14**

**12.70.5.241 writes:**

Because the trial was in January and February of 1935, the only appellate court standards would be those which had come out by the end of 1934 or up to the beginning of the trial. While something could have developed and become of notice during the trial, it didn't. The "effective standards" were the same ones in effect for 1934. It was in this context that I used 1934 standards. I could have said "1935 standards" but since there were ten and a half more months in 1935 and since *Berger v. United States* was decided in 1935, it could easily be misunderstood. The same United States Supreme Court which decided there was prosecutorial misconduct in *Berger* looked at the arguments presented about misconduct in BRH's trial and declined to review it after they decided *Berger*.

I really don't think there were witches. I think that was a tragic moment in US history; just as I question the guilt of Vanzetti; and to some degree Ethel Rosenberg; and I don't believe the military tribunal had the jurisdiction to try the Lincoln conspirators even though I believe all of them guilty with the possible exception of Mary Surratt.

I believe BRH was in on the original kidnapping by writing the note, and perhaps making the ladder. I believe he was responsible as a principal (and thereby guilty of murder in the perpetration of a burglary) in CALjr's death. Because of my view, I hold BRH responsible for taking a 20 month old child from the security of his home, just as if he were the actual one going up the ladder. I am willing to read any thing referred to me by the pro-Bruno camp, and over the years have read most of the books cited here (and have most of them). I have tried to run down all the court decisions and reviews. I would not suggest that someone beginning a study of the case just read "one side" of the issue.

Actually the Salem trials were not fair by 17th century standards. Since the folly of the trial of Sir Philip Throckmorton in 1554, the English system made great improvements which did not carry over to the elite of Massachusetts in 1692. Much of the language used in the *Berger* decision finds it's roots in early American cases which can then be traced back to post 1554 cases in England.

Since you are interested in the case, I would suggest you read the opinion in Anna's case where her attorneys had a chance to raise (and did raise) every issue that has been written about by the pro-Bruno authors. And I urge you, as I do many on this board, to keep on reading. You will learn something from every book, article, or opinion.

Then I suggest you take three notebooks and label one of the "inside job"; one "outside job"; and one "combination inside/outside job". As you go through all the sources, make notes about things which prove or disprove aspects of each of these theories. As jurors are instructed to use their common sense in reaching verdicts, you should likewise use yours in determining what also had to be true alongside what your proof indicates. You may be surprised at how far you can actually go with this process.

You might also find out that, rather than flaming us who believe differently than you, you might find "testing your theories" to be an interesting thing. If they stand up, they become stronger. If they don't, maybe that tells you something.

You may recall all the flaming those who believed Alger Hiss was guilty received until the Soviet files showed he really was guilty of espionage.

JM

**KGB Standards?**  
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 01:42:31  
205.188.198.23 writes:

;;;;;;Soviet files showed he really was guilty of espionage.  
;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

**Soviet files! Are you kidding? They were the Most Supreme Masters of Falsified Docs that ever walked the face of this earth. No researcher, or historian, trusts Soviet files nor will they ever trust them. Even the Israelis would not convict Demanjiuk on such tainted information. If you have faith in the veracity of Soviet documents I have to wonder about your ability to question Anna Hauptmann's appeal and her husband's trial. I wish you would have told us earlier that you believe Soviet files because it would have enabled me to understand why you are so obsessed with flooding us with court papers and boring legal jargon. All of those papers, like the KGB docs you so admire, were nothing more than the unfair result of highly prejudiced legal tactics.**

ronelle