

**Re: Re: KGB Standards?
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 02:19:53
12.71.37.148 writes:**

You need to calm down, Ronelle. Have a glass of red wine or something.

**"Even the Israelis would not convict Demanjiuk on such tainted information".
Actually the United States Department of Justice extradited him to Israel and he
was put to trial on such "tainted information". Only when the Israeli court sent him
home, was it over. Remember the elderly witnesses pointing their fingers at him in
news accounts of the trial?**

**As to Alger Hiss and the exposure of him in the "KGB files", I think even Alan
Dershowitz would concede he is guilty now.**

**I could not find the part of my post where I said I admired the KGB documents. I am
only reciting what many who followed the Hiss case pointed out after the release of
these "KGB files" following the collapse of the U.S.S.R. and the emergence of
"Russia". Neither do I recall stating that I was obsessed with Soviet files. Is this
really necessary? My experience with people who research is that they consider
every source and its corroboration.**

What do you think, Carl. Do remarks like this add anything to the discourse?

JM

Re: Re: Re: KGB Standards?

Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 11:22:37

152.163.204.189 writes:

Sorry JM if my argument sounded too angry. At 2 a.m. I ought to be asleep instead of yelling at people online - at least that's what my husband keeps telling me but I think he is relieved that I am not yelling at him. I just recently graduated from Florida International University with a BA in International Relations which has absolutely nothing to do with anything on this board but I feel it entitles me to lots of opinions about current events and world history.

I really did not intend to argue Alger Hiss or Demanjiuk and the Israeli courts. I only meant to illustrate the relationship between your unquestioning acceptance of Soviet docs (untrustworthy to most historians) and your unquestioning acceptance of the NJ Appellate Court docs. Those legal documents that you have quoted here (denying Anna Hauptmann a retrial) are not falsified docs but they, IMHO, do not represent anything that resembles justice. Just like the Soviets, the NJ Courts didn't play fair either. Anna Hauptmann should have been given her day in court and no amount of legal docs you supply here will ever change my opinion on that. You can schlepp Alan Dershowitz into this argument if you want to but, although I admire him greatly, I would not agree with him either. I am not a Harvard law professor and you might say I have an unbelievable amount of chutzpah to argue with Dershowitz, or even yourself, especially about legal matters I know nothing about, but from my viewpoint "legal documents" and the twisted language they contain, have often been used to make "wrong" sound "right." The legality may appear to be perfectly correct but the outcome, IMHO, is nothing less than vicious. Anna Hauptmann must have felt as if her husband were being sentenced to death for a second time and what disturbs me about it all is that this kind of inhumane torture was probably completely legal - as you have pointed out.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: KGB Standards 2
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 12:01:44
152.163.204.189 writes:

And, since you seem to know words in other languages , you might have heard of this one - "rachmones."

ronelle

Untrustworthy Documents
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 16:20:33
209.12.168.207 writes:

Maybe as my Baptist grandmother used to say, "Not so much rachmones, just a little saichel".

Too bad you so distrust the old Soviet files. Opening them up was like a giant freedom of information act. I hear old people say that there is generally truth in records you keep for yourself, and these they kept for themselves. The law permits business records to be introduced as reliable under this theory.

JM

**Re earlier post
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 16:33:42
209.12.168.207 writes:**

Your elsewhere-on-the-board post about standing under the nursery window wondering how CALjr might have been injured reminded me of having done the very same thing. I looked at the first floor window ledge wondering if that were where he hit.

A&M say "If [the sleeping suit] had been worn when the child received the extensive head injury, the suit would have been soaked with blood." (Page 94). I have had the unfortunate experience of seeing a number of dead children with extensive head injuries where this was not true, thus some of my skepticism for A&M's experience and conclusions. Of course, anyone who can turn an English Terrier (A&M page 10) into a Boston Terrier (A&M page 14) may have more prowess that I realize.

JM

**Re: 1934 Standards
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 11:14:23
204.60.24.143 writes:**

You're right, the Salem trials weren't fair by 17th Century standards, they were much more open and considered and otherwise "fair" than the trials of the day. How many people were killed in the Salem Witch Trials, twenty or fewer? That same year in England over a hundred people were killed for the crime of witchcraft.

Now this is a case which it is absolutely impossible to get anyone to see both sides of. It's become such a catchphrase -- like "Puritan," another grossly distorted and willfully misunderstood people in American history -- that objective examination is simply impossible.

David

Re: Witchcraft

□

Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 22:34:59

□

204.60.25.84 writes:

□

□

Thanks, I'll look it up. The Salem coverage I've seen that's the most lucid and evenhanded is Perry Miller's scholarship in The New England Mind. Most anything else is pure worthless bunk.

David

Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 04:21:06

207.220.150.46 writes:

You stated earlier that the conduct of the prosecutor and the 'fairness' of the trial is not really relevant to any discussion of Hauptmann's guilt. I agree with that - except in this context. If the trial was not fairly conducted (and I don't believe it was) then you cannot rely on a verdict unfairly obtained to prove guilt or shift the burden of proof.

IMHO, the only way to really consider this case is to start from scratch - as a jury would - and reach a conclusion based on all the evidence, including that not heard by the jury in 1935.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 11:17:56

209.12.168.207 writes:

Isn't that what Anna Hauptmann did when she sued the State of NJ for the wrongful conviction and death of her husband before she died? She did not win the case. I agree that convictions obtained by direct and knowing use of tainted evidence are avoidable, and that is the purpose of post-conviction and habeas corpus litigation. IYHO, what are the fatal trial errors directly attributable to the prosecution which were more than "harmless beyond a reasonable doubt" and which directly contributed to the conviction? The last clause is probably unfair to you because we would be speculating on what the jury found to be significant.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 12:01:39
204.170.64.35 writes:

You must have read the appeal in Hauptmann's request to have the jury's verdict set aside.

Do you have any questions? doubts about the case?

Philip for JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Guilty or Innocent
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 15:36:51
209.12.168.207 writes:

I think BRH was in a conspiracy to kidnap the child, but I am not sure who was with him. I have doubts that he was the one on the ladder, but I don't have doubts that he aided in constructing the ladder, and I believe he wrote the notes. Conspiracy must be alleged to convict one of conspiracy, but it does not have to be alleged to convict of the underlying offense. I doubt Anna Hauptmann knew much about it, which is why there must have been some backup plan to keep the child unless they intended to kill it right away. The child was clearly alive when struck on the head (see autopsy for evidence of intercranial hemorrhage) but the fractures on both sides of the child's head could be indication of multiple blows--just can't tell from the autopsy. I don't think my doubts rise to the level of a "reasonable doubt" for purposes of finding him not guilty. We don't have a system of proving beyond all doubt.

JM

**Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 12:11:16
205.188.195.37 writes:**

;;;;;;;Isn't that what Anna Hauptmann did when she sued the State of NJ for the wrongful conviction and death of her husband before she died? She did not win the case. ;;;;;;;;

Excuse me for butting in here but Anna Hauptmann sued the State of New Jersey while the son of the man who framed her husband was the Chief Justice of the NJ Supreme Court! Could anyone win such a case?

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 15:45:48
209.12.168.207 writes:**

Is the force of your critique to make up for the lack of any basis for the claim?

JM

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 21:13:42
152.163.205.57 writes:**

**;;;;;;;Is the force of your critique to make up for the lack of any basis for the claim?
;;;;;;;**

My reminder, about who sat at the head of judicial authority in the State of NJ, was not intended to make up for anything. It was an appropriate comment intended to put Anna Hauptmann's hopeless plight into perspective. She certainly had an enormous basis for her claim and maybe the NJ court would have reopened the case but her lawyer, Robert Bryan (who has worked pro bono for many years) would not permit her to sign an affidavit releasing the state of NJ from financial responsibility. I cannot reveal my source but I was told that she wanted to do so and was prevented from signing the release by her lawyer.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz
Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 09:34:10
209.12.168.207 writes:

The lawyer is the agent of the client and must do the client's bidding unless that bidding is contra to the Model Rules of Professional Conduct or (perhaps as Al Gore might say)"prevailing law". If Anna only wanted vindication for BRH, she should have signed the affidavit (or whatever) or found a lawyer willing to do what she wanted. That there was no waiver of financial damages tells you something, doesn't it--the importance of the money! You understand that the Code of Judicial Ethics would mandate the recusal of any judge who has a blood or financial connection to the case. Your problem is that you use the issue of possible bias as an excuse for her losing the case instead of considering the merits of the issue. The appellate courts exercise some control over trial judges and lesser appellate judges, but you would probably find that there is no reluctance by trial judges to exercise their control over a case notwithstanding prevailing sentiment. It is easy for you to proclaim that she was denied her day in court because some other judge had a blood connection with the case. It is just as easy for me to proclaim that she lost her case because her common criminal husband was legally culpable in the kidnapping plot. Whoever the contributor is who uses IMHO as an abbreviation has the right idea. I suggest we begin using JMO (just my opinion) when we argue without sufficient factual basis for the allegation. That might save you significant typing time.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz
Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 15:31:49
204.60.23.209 writes:

It certainly shows the importance of money to the lawyer who'd been working pro bono up until now. I'm glad everything goes strictly perfectly by the book on that planet you're practicing law on, but down here on earth powerful men pull strings to keep things the way they like them. Arguing that Wilentz fils obviously couldn't have influenced the dismissal of Anna Hauptmann's case because there was no stated legal provision for him to do so is disingenuous in the extreme, yet just the sort of neat sophisticated sleight-of-hand lawyers resort to: "No, Ahmad, the night manager couldn't have been discriminating against you because of your religion, because he didn't have the authority to do so, see where it says not to do that right here in the company's official Manager's Manual?" Obviously whether or not Wilentz fils had any direct contact with the appeal's proceedings is irrelevant: the prospect of incurring the undying wrath of the Chief Justice of the New Jersey

Supreme Court, Wilentz fils, isn't worth opening a case that would acutely embarrass his family.

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz

□

**Friday, 23-Apr-1999 06:52:10
207.220.150.114 writes:**

---...the prospect of incurring the undying wrath of the Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court, Wilentz fils, isn't worth opening a case that would acutely embarrass his family.---

It has not been my experience that Federal Judges care very much about "incurring the undying wrath" of State Court Judges. (Even State Court Supreme Court Justices. Even Chief Justices.) They have been doing it for years.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: the other wilentz

**Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 02:40:44
205.188.195.31 writes:**

;;;;;;It has not been my experience that Federal Judges care very much about "incurring the undying wrath" of State Court Judges. (Even State Court Supreme Court Justices. Even Chief Justices.) They have been doing it for years.

;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

But I would be willing to bet no judge in your "experience" (and what does this mean MJR - are you a judge or do you drive too fast?) ever allowed any father of a Chief Justice to be investigated for failure to pay their water bill much less such serious allegations as framing an innocent defendant. Maybe the reason they don't mind "incurring the wrath" of their colleagues is that so many of them have been bought and paid for and enjoy privileged protection of another kind.

ronelle

Always read more...

Friday, 23-Apr-1999 12:00:57

209.12.168.207 writes:

MJR is correct in response to your message and covers one of the two mistaken assumptions in your message. One, you assume I "practice law" which is factually incorrect; and secondly you assume that the trial judge in Anna's case was under the dominion and influence of the Chief Justice of the NJ Supreme Court. For those students who don't understand MJR's assessment, Anna filed her case in FEDERAL court not STATE court. Rather than being given short shrift, there was a 40+ page opinion in the dismissal of her case (570 F Supp 351 (1983)[United States District Court for the District of New Jersey]; the case was appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit which affirmed the trial court's ruling (856 F.2d 183 (1988)). I found it interesting that the trial court chastised Anna's lawyer for appearing to make "personal hay" off Anna's case. Comments like this are rare in written opinions.

Instead of flaming you in return, I suggest that you continue to read the materials available before you rush to judgment. Federal judges are at the top of the power food chain in America (just ask President Clinton)and to suggest that one would fear retribution from a judge with significantly less power isn't reasonable. You perhaps might want to actually read the opinion before you conclude she didn't get a fair shake. Her claim was a difficult legal theory made more difficult by the passage of time; and she had the burden of proof in this claim. The Hauptmanns have not had much luck in the various courts they have been in--I count at least seven losses in reported decisions alone and this ranges over the entire period from the extradition proceedings to Anna's cases with many different judges in several different venues.

J:M

Re: Always read more...

Friday, 23-Apr-1999 13:56:32

204.60.23.62 writes:

No flame intended -- one of the distinct drawbacks to e-mail is the loss of what linguists say is about 80 percent of communication -- facial expression, vocal inflections and tone, stance, posture, gestures, context, et al. Sorry it came off that way. I actually enjoy reading your posts more than most.

Valid points you make, yet my central point holds: Rarely does any complex judicial proceeding culminate in a perfectly disinterested conclusion. People run the justice

system, people concerned about their careers, advancement, friends, family, enemies, saving face, setting precedents and future prospects. Were the entire proceeding run on strictly honest, by-the-book legal grounds, with all the intangibles -- extreme public pressure, disgusting "news" coverage, an extremely embarrassed police force desperate for a conviction, an overambitious prosecuting attorney -- excluded, he never would have been convicted. But hey, you say, American law has all those things. Yes, it does, and that's why Manfred Hauptmann grew up without a father. If you want to argue that the Lindbergh prosecution team knew how to play the game better, outwit Hauptmann's inept, undermanned, underfunded and hamstrung defense as in a chess game, outspend the defense, conceal evidence it wanted concealed and not share or acknowledge evidence that would have exculpated him, pay off a nearly-blind guy to say he "saw" Hauptmann at the scene, start from the conclusion they wanted to reach and work backwards from there -- all without so blatantly overstepping legal bounds that the decision would be reversed, then you're right, they were able to do all those things, and according to American justice, they "won," as did O.J. Simpson. As a German, Hauptmann was used to a nonadversarial justice system, where the facts are presented to a judge, attorneys don't have egos on the line causing them to force a "win" and knowingly distort their presentations, so he never really understood what was happening to him.

I think what this forum's trying to do is arrive at a nonlegal definition of "guilt" and "innocence," take a God's eye view, as it were, and just sit down as rational human beings imbued with a sense of right and wrong and say hey, wait a sec, this guy didn't really do it.

If a defensive back gets called for pass interference then that's that -- instant replay can show ad infinitum ad nauseum that he really didn't "do" it, but that's moot: The technical rules of the game are enforced, he is assessed the penalty for something he didn't do and the game goes on. Then a forum board is established to rehash the incident, with people saying "He didn't do it" and those saying "He was called for it," forever speaking at cross-purposes because both are right.

That's what happened to Hauptmann. The technical rules of the game at the time were followed tolerably enough, with the inevitable bends and breaks that happen in any legal proceeding, all of which went against Hauptmann, so being outspent, outfinagled, outfoxed, outglittered by the Lindbergh name and outpublic-opinioned, he lost. Everyone admits that. What we're doing here is engaging in instant replay, saying hey, wait a second, in the ideal world where the guilty are punished and the innocent go free Hauptmann would be a free man.

Nobody denies that the American judicial system, with all its flaws and imperfections, found Hauptmann guilty and killed him and refused to admit it had made a mistake -- we don't need to be walked through the minutiae of exactly how it happened. What we deny is that he actually kidnapped and killed the Lindbergh baby. A rational mind can admit that both of these can be true at the same time, just as we can say yes, the defensive back was called for interference and no, he didn't

actually commit the penalty. Certainly nobody believes conviction in an American court of law is tautological with objective guilt.

But I apologize for what must have seemed my most greivous insult to you -- calling you a lawyer. That must have hurt.

David Sims

Re: Re: Always read more...

□

Friday, 23-Apr-1999 14:43:41

□

209.12.168.207 writes:

Thanks for the response. In addition to reading more, one must read very carefully...

I suppose that in the trials and dockets I have watched I have seen more of the impartial aspects of the system, and those I have watched have ranged from very small jurisdictions to urban jurisdictions. I have had the opportunity to watch it from both sides on both civil and criminal, and while I have cringed on some things, there were many, many where I found that it worked. There are "yardstick" cases such as Hauptmann, Vanzetti, Ethel Rosenberg, Mary Surratt, etc which give people pause. (Yardstick being a term meaning that a particular office, court, or the entire system is measured by that case). There is a huge paper trail in the Hauptmann case. I have tried to use the paper trail to run down leads on all the allegations made on both sides of the case, as I think we all should. We certainly owe a debt of gratitude to the keeper of this board in that respect. I have found many of the allegations to be only that: allegations. There are others which simply cannot be answered, and many times the wrong question is asked. For example, given the ring comparisons on rail 16 and the board from the attic, did they come from the same tree rather than do they align on the attic floor; was the money bundled in wrappers and the denominations of each bundle recorded so you could tell which bundle was being distributed? I have lots of questions, but I realize that many cannot be answered in 1999.

I don't know that it furthers the dialogue to find out more about each other. Whether I teach civics, am a "professional investigator"; or a "master carpenter" shouldn't add anything to the dialogue. As to being scornful for being called a lawyer, I will admit to being interested in the law, and I have had, as a result of several jobs, the opportunity to watch a lot of trials. While my faith in the system ebbs and flows, I suppose I come out more on the side that most of the participants take their jobs seriously--from the assistant public defender to the assistant prosecuting attorney

to the civil lawyer to the judge. There are, given the thousands involved, exceptions.

As to reading carefully, my response was that it was factually incorrect that I "practice law" and that is the truth. One can serve as one's own lawyer, and I don't think it is necessary for a Supreme Court Justice to be a lawyer. In a number of states, one can be a [magistrate level] judge without a law license. And one can read cases, watch trials, and engage in email debate without being a lawyer.

I, too, enjoy your posts because they are generally inquisitive or explanatory rather than full of quick fired flame. I didn't get upset when Ralph ended a message with "Game, Set, Match...". He simply did not understand the present status of threshold admissibility of expert testimony, and he is not alone in this regard. You don't yell at those people, you explain.

JM

The Hoax Theory

Friday, 16-Apr-1999 19:11:46

Message:
12.79.175.227 writes:

The problem with any theory based on conjecture and speculation, is that it can be refuted by conjecture and speculation.

Having said that, I confess to a temptation to buy into the hoax theory because, if true, it could answer a nagging question which has bothered me ever since I became a Linbergh freak many years ago--a question which no one, pro or anti Hauptmann--has ever answered to my satisfaction.

That has to do with Jafsie, aka Dr. Condon. The alleged kidnapping took place in Hopewell Township, NJ, about 50 miles from New York. The kidnapers could have come from anywhere, but Dr. Condon, a Bronx resident, sent a letter to the Bronx Home News in which he offered to be a ransom intermediary. Hauptmann, also a Bronx resident who lived about two miles from Dr. Condon's home, responded and the protracted ransom negotiations ensued. Why the Bronx Home News, and why not a mass circulation newspaper? During the ransom negotiations, why didn't Lindbergh insist upon some concrete evidence that the child was alive and well? Finally, why did Lindbergh at the last moment decide to hold back \$20,000 of the originally agreed amount of \$70,000, an act which could have endangered his son's life?

The hoax theory, if true, would mean that the ransom was a scam, a scam which could have been orchestrated by Condon and Hauptmann, a scam which Hauptmann paid for with his life, and a scam which Linbergh was all-too-willing to go along with because it diverted suspicion away from him.

As I said at the outset, fascinating speculation but speculation nonetheless.

Al Berkowitz

Re: The Hoax Theory
Saturday, 17-Apr-1999 02:42:25
216.192.30.76 writes:

I HAVE A FRIEND WHO'S FRIEND IS ENGAGED TO CHARLES LINDBERGH'S SECOND SON. IT IS OUR THEORY THAT LINDBERGH WAS A RAT AND THAT HE CAUSED AN INNOCENT MAN TO DIE.

Re: The Hoax Theory
Saturday, 17-Apr-1999 09:23:06
207.220.150.120 writes:

---...why did Lindbergh at the last moment decide to hold back \$20,000 of the originally agreed amount of \$70,000, an act which could have endangered his son's life?---

He didn't. Condon did that. Condon said that he talked John into taking the reduced amount and then told Lindbergh about it. Lindbergh was prepared to pay it all.

Mjr

Re: Re: The Hoax Theory
Saturday, 17-Apr-1999 10:50:29
12.79.177.140 writes:

I wasn't aware that it was Condon's decision to hold back \$20,000, but that raises questions which, in a sense, could reinforce the ransom scam theory.

Why would Condon, an outsider, take it upon himself to do that? Possibly, he knew that there was no further risk of endangerment to the Lindbergh child, or he knew it was a scam and did it to cover himself should the scam backfire.

As for Lindbergh, he didn't complain about Condon's decision, so that suggests that he could have known it was a scam, too.

AB

Al Berkowitz

Re: Re: Re: The Hoax Theory
Monday, 19-Apr-1999 06:46:01
207.220.150.54 writes:

--- Why would Condon, an outsider, take it upon himself to do that? Possibly, he knew that there was no further risk of endangerment to the Lindbergh child, or he knew it was a scam and did it to cover himself should the scam backfire.

As for Lindbergh, he didn't complain about Condon's decision, so that suggests that he could have known it was a scam, too.---

The story, as told by Condon and Lindbergh, was that Condon went into St. Raymond's to meet with John. There, he told John some tale about how Lindbergh couldn't raise the entire 70,000 and asked them to take the original 50,000. John agreed and Condon returned to the car and got the money. Only then did he tell Lindbergh what he had done.

Was it a risky, even stupid thing for Condon to do? Yes, because you are right, it could have backfired. But then Condon was a strange man. One need only read his statements to the police and his 1932 Grand Jury testimony to see that.

As for Lindbergh - he didn't know anything about Condon talking John into the lesser amount until Condon came back to the car and told him it was done. Condon said they were satisfied with that amount. What was Lindbergh supposed to do? Insist they take it all? Condon was the 'negotiator' and negotiated them down.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: The Hoax Theory
Monday, 19-Apr-1999 11:30:17
192.60.36.248 writes:

My point about Lindbergh was that he could have expressed some concern Condon making a unilateral decision which could have impacted his son's well-being. From what we know, he didn't and that's what I find disturbing.

Here's another slant on Condon and the ransom money: he had to have known that over ninety percent of the bills were gold notes which were due to become obsolete; if he was in on a ransom scam, he would have been aware that the money would have not cooled off in time for it have been of any use to the recipients; it's possible in holding out the \$20,000, he was trying to extricate himself from the conspiracy while ingratiating himself with Lindbergh who had been dubious about Condon's motives.

As you get deeper into this, Condon's role becomes curiozier and curiozier. Shortly after Hauptmann's arrest, Condon is purported to have told police that Cemetery John had a Scandinavian accent, was taller, and--this is odd--was "eleven years older" than Hauptmann. If true, it's strange that he would quantify an age difference so specifically.

Al Berkowitz

Bias

Sunday, 18-Apr-1999 14:10:36

Message:

12.8.229.1 writes:

You seem strangely infuriated with a trial that occurred many years ago.

ahodkin@hklaw.com

Re: Bias

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 14:40:14

205.183.31.67 writes:

its a very interesting case.i like to debate that hauptman was guilty, im not infuriated aout anything. its only a hobby of mine, and to some other people on this website.i just dont want peolpe to get angry with me for my beliefs in the case

STEVE

</HTML>

violet sharpe

Sunday, 18-Apr-1999 22:39:37

Message:

209.94.150.110 writes:

Regarding Violet Sharpe and her connection to the case, I have a copy of a magazine dated June 1935 called "Famous Detective Cases" which discusses the Lindbergh kidnapping case at length. It tells

how the leading officials of the investigation believed that Violet was the kidnapper's informant. This is not to infer that she was a participant in the kidnapping plot; but that she may have given information that the family was to be at Hopewell that night to members of a kidnapping gang during her visit to the speakeasy. Violet Sharpe was the first person apart from the Lindberghs themselves who knew the flier and his wife were to break their precedent and remain at their mountain estate on a Tuesday night.(She received the call from Mrs. Lindbergh

on the morning of March 1st saying that the baby had a cold and that they were going to be staying at Hopewell that night). Note: Mrs. Lindbergh herself did not know the family would be remaining at Hopewell until the morning of March 1. How could Hauptmann have known it? (Remember the Lindberghs had never spent more than the weekend at the place prior to the kidnapping.)

Violet later killed herself just before being questioned again by the police.

Here is more interesting information about Violet from the same source: The wife of a spiritualistic medium went to New Jersey a week after the kidnapping, that is, on March 6, 1932 and told the authorities that Baby Lindbergh was dead, and would be discovered on a certain height about Hopewell. Two months later the body was discovered very near the spot she described. She further prophesied that "Mr" Breckinridge would receive a ransom letter at his New York office. The next day such a note was received. Now, the remarkable fact about this prediction is that Violet Sharpe was a member of this spiritualist group, and its members believed in confessing, and did confess their sins to the spiritualist's wife.

Another strange coincidence is that the meeting of this spiritualistic group was located directly across the street from the home of Isador Fisch (the man from whom Hauptmann claimed to have received the ransom money), and only a block away from a speakeasy which a Morrow butler was known to frequent. Here indeed is a remarkable chain of circumstantial facts.

demiller.usa.net

Re: violet sharpe
Sunday, 18-Apr-1999 23:19:05
204.60.25.60 writes:

Good post. I'm enjoying reading Scaduto's Scapegoat. It has its theory -- Paul Wendel did it -- but I'm noticing in the books I've read so far -- Ahlgren and Monier, Behn, Scaduto, with The Airman And The Carpenter next up -- that they each require a Kierkegaardian leap of faith: They reason you to a misty chasm, on the other side of which is a silver chalice with TRVTH engraved on it, and you merely need to leap the chasm to get there:

Ahlgren and Monier would have you believe that Lindbergh would go through the time and effort of constructing a Rube Goldberg ladder to climb to the child's window when he had, by several accounts, a perfectly sturdy, serviceable ladder in his garage. As he wasn't counting on needing to throw police off his trail when he dreamed up his "prank," why not just grab the ladder out of the garage? This scenario doesn't give Lindbergh the time or privacy to hammer together a jerry-built ladder between when he drops the child and "arrives" home.

Behn asks you to believe that Elizabeth, brought in as a deus ex machina at the end, did the deed in a fit of rage, the Lindberghs and Morrows close ranks, yet -- maybe Melinda Rose addresses this in her upcoming book -- Anne maintains what seems to me as sisterly and cordial a correspondence with her after the death as before. The evidence for this? Oh, a janitor threw it away. Smacks of "Gee, I wonder what angle I can get a publisher to bite on."

And Scaduto's Wendel story would have you believe that he knew the Lindberghs would be there and knew where the child's bedroom was -- plausible if you accept his corollary that Violet Sharpe was a confederate, although I've seen no compelling reason why she would do such a thing -- and climbed the ladder; the rung breaks, so in mid-crime he blithely decides to wing it, and go out through the house instead of back down the ladder? And why at 9.30 at night, why not 3 in the morning? And why didn't he just bring a decent ladder himself, or have Violet swipe the one out of the garage?

I have yet to see a theory that satisfactorily accounts for the crude ladder. The "baby died on Sunday" theory is the only one that could answer this, since it's the only one that gives anyone three days to rustle up "evidence." Maybe Lindy, not Elizabeth, dropped the baby Sunday. I'd believe Lindy dropping the baby in a prank over Elizabeth killing the child, but I need to account for that danged ladder.

David Sims

Re: Re: violet sharpe

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 11:27:49
205.188.195.37 writes:

;;;I'd believe Lindy dropping the baby in a prank over Elizabeth killing the child, but I need to account for that danged ladder.;;;

Not a bad point on the ladder. Also, what you have pointed out is that the ladder is a problem for EVERY theory. Why did Hauptmann bring the jerry built ladder (no pun intended) when if he had cased the house he knew there was a perfectly good one in the garage? Why did the unnamed "Gang" bring a ladder when they would have known there was a perfectly good one in the garage? Why did Violet Sharp, Paul Wendel, the butler, or anyone else bring the ladder? The existance of the ladder is not just a problem for the "Lindy Did It" theorists. And obviously SOMEONE did bring the ladder. It is there.

Ralph

Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 13:08:55
204.60.23.69 writes:

I agree -- that the ladder scotches any purely outside job theories. It seems the only way to explain the presence of the ladder is as planted evidence, which points strongly to an inside job where the perpetrators had time and motive to manufacture smokescreens. Lindy may well have done it, but not using that ladder, which he could have thrown together to bolster the atmosphere of a kidnapping.

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 15:15:05
209.12.168.207 writes:

Scotch a theory? You underestimate the public. Consider the JonBenet case. The child was in the house; strangled with rope from the house; wrapped in a blanket from the house; the practice note was written in the house; the actual note was written in the house; the paper for the note came from the house; the pen used to write the note came from the house; the left justification of the note indicates it couldn't be written in the dark; the note(s) took a fair amount of time to write in the house, and the family claims "outside job". In the Lindbergh case the ladder came from outside; the note came from outside; the note was written from the outside (for those who think the same person wrote the subsequent notes);the chisel came from

outside; the baby was taken outside and found outside, and the theories are that it is an "inside" job. While this is not "conclusive" proof, there may be a pattern emerging.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 16:14:59
204.60.23.69 writes:

Nobody ever went broke underestimating the public. You may very well be correct about the JonBenet case, I have no knowledge whatsoever of the JonBenet case, nor have I interest in acquiring any, but, well, of course that's what the family's going to claim.

In the Lindbergh case it was made to look like an outside job to jibe with the family's claim in that case. It's not too extraordinary to imagine Lindbergh, Elizabeth or whoever killing the child -- purposefully or accidentally -- on Sunday, then getting things together to make it look like an outside job and have it all in place by Tuesday, when the police are summoned to survery the handiwork.

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 20:53:46
152.163.205.63 writes:

;;;;;;;;;make it look like an outside job and have it all in place by Tuesday;;;;;;;;;;
So how would Betty Gow's t shirt with the blue silk thread get onto the child's body if he died on Sunday? She wasn't even driven there until Tuesday and she sewed the shirt herself.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 09:03:54
204.60.24.151 writes:

Hi Ronelle. Is this a T-shirt she had sewn previously, that Charlie Jr. could have been dressed in Sunday? I'm not familiar with this piece of evidence: Are you

saying it's a shirt she was proven to have brought with her to the house on Tuesday?

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: violet sharpe
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 22:09:01
205.188.196.56 writes:

On Tuesday evening Betty made a little undershirt from her old flannel nightgown and edged the seams with silk blue thread all around as a decoration. The child threw up over his brand new sleeping suit (mother and nursemaid had given him a physic, according to their trial testimony, and he spit it all up soiling his bed clothes).

Betty was not driven to Hopewell until Tuesday and made the shirt that very evening so how did the corpse end up wearing it in the woods on Saturday? It makes Betty Gow (and the chauffeur) two more accomplices in a preposterous conspiracy theory (not A & M's) and many people - including Noel Behn and Wayne Jones - think the corpse was not the real Lindbergh baby anyway so they are not concerned with this conflict.

ronelle

Before this indents off the right side...
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 12:14:31
209.12.168.207 writes:

So, they have a dead baby on their hands for several days. They must now sit down and agree upon a story, produce the set pieces, get the time frames correct; and so forth. Because the wood in the ladder could be traced (and was) someone had to bring the lumber from NY; someone had to think to write a note in Anglo-German (did they hire BRH to do it since it matched his handwriting?); Breckenridge probably would have had to be in on it; why they waited to "announce it" on the day CAL comes back from NY is curious. So, our simple conspiracy now numbers ten or more confederates -- a rather elaborate scheme which depends on even the weakest individual involved keeping the faith. While this is "possible", courts caution jurors against speculation absent facts supporting allegation. I find this theory the most difficult to accept because of the immense involvement required.

JM

Re: Before this indents off the right side...

Monday, 03-May-1999 11:33:39

207.136.199.103 writes:

Accepting that theory, the weakest link was Violet Sharpe. Just because Betty Gow says she was at the house at this time, and checked the baby at that time, put the shirt on the baby on such-and-such a day, etc., doesn't mean a thing. O.J. was in the shower.

Bonney

</HTML>

The sticky point

Monday, 19-Apr-1999 09:13:52

Message:
204.60.24.97 writes:

I'm relatively new to the Lindbergh subculture, and am currently enjoying reading Scaduto's Scapegoat. It has its theory -- Paul Wendel did it -- but I'm noticing in the books I've read so far -- Ahlgren and Monier, Behn, Scaduto, with The Airman And The Carpenter next up -- that they each require a Kierkegaardian leap of faith: They reason you to a misty chasm, on the other side of which is a silver chalice with TRVTH engraved on it, and you merely need to leap the chasm to get there:

Ahlgren and Monier would have you believe that Lindbergh would go through the time and effort of constructing a Rube Goldberg ladder to climb to the child's window when he had, by several accounts, a perfectly sturdy, serviceable ladder in his garage. As he wasn't counting on needing to throw police off his trail when he dreamed up his "prank," why not just grab the ladder out of the garage? This scenario doesn't give Lindbergh the time or privacy to hammer together a jerry-built ladder between when he drops the child and "arrives" home.

Behn asks you to believe that Elizabeth, brought in as a deus ex machina at the end, did the deed in a fit of rage, the Lindberghs and Morrows close ranks, yet -- maybe Melinda Rose addresses this in her upcoming book -- Anne maintains what seems to me as sisterly and cordial a correspondence with her after the death as before. The evidence for this? Oh, a janitor threw it away. Smacks of "Gee, I wonder what angle I can get a publisher to bite on."

And Scaduto's Wendel story would have you believe that he knew the Lindberghs would be there and knew where the child's bedroom was -- plausible if you accept his corollary that Violet Sharpe was a confederate, although I've seen no compelling reason why she would do such a thing -- and climbed the ladder; the rung breaks, so in mid-crime he blithely decides to wing it, and go out through the house instead of back down the ladder? And why at 9.30 at night, why not 3 in the morning? And why didn't he just bring a decent ladder himself, or have Violet swipe the one out of the

garage?

I have yet to see a theory that satisfactorily accounts for the crude ladder. The "baby died on Sunday" theory is the only one that could answer this, since it's the only one that gives anyone three days to rustle up "evidence." Maybe Lindy, not Elizabeth, dropped the baby Sunday. I'd believe Lindy dropping the baby in a prank over Elizabeth killing the child, but I need to account for that danged ladder.

David Sims

Re: The sticky point
Monday, 19-Apr-1999 22:49:47
209.94.153.45 writes:

Welcome to the world of Lindbergh kidnapping theorizing. I have been deeply fascinated by this case for 4+ years and have read all those books that you mentioned. I must admit though that Kennedy's "Airman and the Carpenter" although not providing an answer to who was responsible for the dastardly deed, gave enough evidence to convince me that Hauptmann was as innocent as anyone could be. He certainly ended up with some ransom money, but why would he go all over the Bronx spending this money if he indeed was aware that it was "hot" and then telling the filling station attendant that he had more like it at home. I think poor Hauptmann may have been guilty of nothing more than being a little bit greedy.

Concerning the ladder, according to the testimony of Lieutenant John Sweeney, the top of the kidnap ladder rested thirty inches below the nursery window sill. Now, the kidnapper could not have stood on the top rung of this ladder because this top rung rested flush against the side of the house thus giving no foothold. The kidnapper, then must have stood on the second rung of the ladder, making the distance to the window sill a full 42". To have stepped from this second rung and placed his foot over the window sill on to the suitcase as the Attorney General claimed the kidnapper did, the criminal would have had to stretch his leg upward approximately 65", a physical impossibility. Even had the kidnapper been able to balance himself on the top rung of the ladder, the distance would still have been too great for him to have lifted his leg over the window sill. Then to make it back down 42" to the 2nd ladder rung carrying a 36 lb child would be even more impossible to believe.

At the trial the State claimed to have found no fingerprints at all in the baby's nursery or on the ladder. Police officials testified to their failure to find any fingerprints of any kind.

The testimony of these witnesses, however was refuted by Doctor Hudson, an unbiased and unprejudiced man. He showed that he had found five hundred fingerprint marks on the ladder alone, and none of them was Hauptmann's.

The other problem is that except for one footprint the only footprints found outside the window where the ladder rested were made by Anne Morrow Lindbergh. If Mrs. Lindbergh who weighed 98 lbs was heavy enough to leave deep prints in the mud, why didn't a man with a baby, falling from a breaking ladder leave some mark? There was one footprint of a man's foot, but the State of New Jersey admitted that this print was not made by the kidnapper.

You can draw your own conclusions from this but it appears to me that the ladder was never used in the kidnapping at all. Perhaps it was placed there only as a prop to distract the investigators from the fact that it was an inside job????

demiller@usa.net

Re: Re: The sticky point
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 09:11:56
204.60.23.69 writes:

Thanks for the reply. The more I read and think about it, the more I'm becoming convinced that the ladder had to be simply manufactured evidence by Lindbergh, since nobody in their cunning, scheming, right minds would use such a piece of junk to pull off such a delicate job. I guess Lindbergh had about as much contempt for people's intelligence as he did for them in general.

Wondering: I finished Scaduto's Scapegoat last night, and he brings in this fellow, Olsen, who claims to have been Lindbergh's child: Anything to that, in your opinion? If, as seems a strong possibility, someone in the household accidentally killed the child, there wouldn't be a surviving son, no matter who that decomposed corpse found in the woods was, and this guy's a loony. But he doesn't come off that way. Also, I note parenthetically, he lived (lives?) just down the road here in Westport, Conn. and that's where Anne Morrow moved, and presumably still lives.

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: The sticky point
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 11:12:04
209.12.168.207 writes:

Interesting theories on the ladder. There are several pictures in the books showing the ladder extended to the window sill, and in one, rising above mid point of the second floor window. The initial police report on the scene by Cpl Wolf describes the ladder as being in three sections, each measuring 80 1/2 inches (6.7 feet) meaning the overall length would be over 20 feet. One photograph shows the "tree expert" holding one section of the ladder which is considerably taller than he. As to the lack of fingerprints, if we credit the police theory after looking at the "footprints" at the base of the ladder as being made by shoes covered with cloth, it is doubtful that BRH or his confederates would cover their feet but not their hands. Of course, this latter statement is conclusion. That the ladder easily reaches the window is fact.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 13:04:54
204.60.23.69 writes:

Thanks for your post, JM. The ladder's one of those acid tests for kidnapper theories -- see how the theory explains the ladder -- much as a good acid test for literary critical theories is to see how they explain Finnegans Wake. The theory that it was a purely outside job, in my estimation, can't pass this test -- I can't envision a plausible scenario where someone would use that piece of junk instead of a real ladder (assuming he had been physically capable of actually using the ladder, which given its construction is unlikely), especially a skilled carpenter. The only reason for its existence, it seems, is to look like evidence, which points to an inside job where the perpetrator had time and motive to plant "evidence."
"So why the split towards the bottom, implying it was actually used?"
Good question.

David Sims

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 15:01:43
209.12.168.207 writes:

You have to be careful of your assumptions. By whose proof is BRH a "skilled" carpenter? Do we have something (other than the ladder) known to be made by him where we can judge his ability. That he worked as a carpenter is no proof, just look at the houses being built by carpenters today. The ladder is very similar to the plan found among his papers, and perhaps extension ladders were not prevalent then. They're still pretty expensive, and if he were an "independent contractor" or day carpenter, ladders would have been furnished by the contractor. The extension design was so that it would fit in a car. Interesting that it was almost seven feet

when closed up, so it had to be a large car. (It's interesting to note the people who exclude BRH because the car and the tag don't match his as if he would drive his own car over to kidnap the most famous child in the country). Of course, that's just an assumption on my part.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point

Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 18:12:15

38.14.58.67 writes:

Hauptmann was more than just a "skilled" carpenter, he was a MASTER carpenter. Today, 64 years later, there are some very fine examples of his work. To suggest that Bruno Richard Hauptmann constructed that ladder is downright laughable.

Onward and upward, David! Watch out for the loose rungs.

Melinda

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point

Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 08:09:35

205.183.31.67 writes:

melinda, he made the ladder fast. they didnt find blueprints only a little sketch in his little book. it had to be fast or he wouldnt have took a piece from the attic. the lumberyard wasnt as near to his house like some people claim. you will see that at the bronx tour

STEVE FOR MELINDA

Master carpenter?

Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 16:23:25

209.12.168.207 writes:

I suppose you must have seen some of these things or at least been referenced to them. It would be nice to have those references included in your email. He became a master carpenter rather quickly when you discount the time he was in the army in WWI (through 1918); the time in jail and so forth in Germany; his being a dishwasher, a mechanic, and a dyer's helper (From Fisher p. 187). It appears BRH and Anna bought most of their furniture. According to the time records for his

employment, he is just one of ten carpenters on one of the construction crews (week ending April 15) and one of six (week ending March 31). But perhaps he could be promoted to "master carpenter", after all, Gregory Ahlgren (a defense attorney) and Stephen Monier (chief of police) were promoted to "professional investigators". Since the Ahlgren and Monier jacket cover says Monier was also the prosecutor, and since he doesn't have a law degree, that must mean his city is too small to justify even a part time lawyer/prosecutor in the court where they were "frequent courtroom adversaries". I wonder how many homicides or kidnappings Monier investigated in his career? I guess that would make Jim Fisher, a Vanderbilt Univ. lawyer and former Special Agent for the FBI a "Master Investigator", don't you agree?

JM

Re: Master carpenter?
Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 03:58:20
205.188.195.54 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;". I wonder how many homicides or kidnappings Monier investigated in his career? I guess that would make Jim Fisher, a Vanderbilt Univ. lawyer and former Special Agent for the FBI a "Master Investigator", don't you agree?

;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

JM you have outdone yourself this time. Your diatribe about Monier and Ahlgren's credentials has nothing to do with Melinda's argument about Hauptmann's expertise as a skilled carpenter. Your anger sounds just too much like Jim Fisher's tantrum! He attacks Ahlgren and Monier personally, instead of their theories. Are you sure you aren't Jim Fisher? You sound just like him.

;;;;;;;;;;I guess that would make Jim Fisher, a Vanderbilt Univ. lawyer and former Special Agent for the FBI a "Master Investigator", don't you agree?

;;;

It might make Jim Fisher a Master something, but I doubt it would be legal expert. The last I knew Jim Fisher never passed a bar exam.

ronelle

Bar exams
Sunday, 25-Apr-1999 22:23:16
12.70.16.173 writes:

I don't know Jim Fisher, and I don't know whether he is licensed to practice or not. During JE Hoover's term, FBI agents were generally required to have either an accounting or legal background. If he wanted to be and FBI agent he had to produce one or the other. He certainly chose an expensive law school, didn't he?

Maybe I'm wrong about Monier, also. Maybe, Chiefs of Police of jurisdictions where murders and aggravated kidnappings are rare are just as good as FBI agents at investigating them. Do you find that experience doesn't count for much in your antiques and book review business?

JM

Re: Bar exams
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 01:02:09
205.188.198.52 writes:

;;;;;;;Maybe I'm wrong about Monier, also. Maybe, Chiefs of Police of jurisdictions where murders and aggravated kidnappings are rare are just as good as FBI agents at investigating them. ;;;;;;;;;;

You sure are wrong. "Small town" Chiefs of Police obviously ARE just as good as FBI agents and Monier has certainly proved that. None of Hoover's guys ever figured out which way was up. If they did, they surely lacked the courage and honesty it would have taken to come forward with a demand to scrutinize the baby's "heroic" father as Monier, a proper Police Chief, would have. After all, as a law enforcement officer he has risked alot by blowing the whistle on other officers of the law, not to mention the family of an extremely powerful politician as well as the Lindbergh family and their "friends"! Not exactly Serpico stuff but probably a dangerous position to be in nonetheless. Nope, IMHO, Monier (whom I have never met) is not "just as good" as an FBI agent but even better.

;;;;;;; Do you find that experience doesn't count for much in your antiques and book review business; ;;;;;;;;;;

Yes, experience is always necessary in any business - so tell me, JM, since you seem obsessed with it, what "experience" did Charles Lindbergh ever have in criminal investigations?

Or Schwarzkopf for that matter?

ronelle

Re: Re: Bar exams
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 13:39:36
205.183.31.67 writes:

my lips are sealed until i read that book.no comment on anything you said. you must be there biggest supporter, just like i support jims book

steve for ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 21:22:26
205.188.196.26 writes:**

;;;;;;;;;;You have to be careful of your assumptions. By whose proof is BRH a "skilled" carpenter? Do we have something (other than the ladder) known to be made by him where we can judge his ability. ;;;;;;;;;;

Some of the "proof" of Hauptmann's skill is at <http://majestic.nyrealty.com/> It is a 29 story luxury building (4 bedroom apts. start at 7,500,000.00)called The Majestic. Even in the 1930s you had to be a millionaire to live inside. Did they hire slipshod carpenters to build such a dwelling? I doubt it!

ronelle

**This is proof??
Friday, 23-Apr-1999 12:16:18
209.12.168.207 writes:**

You provide an advertising web site as proof of BRH's talent as a carpenter. By your comments he was a "master carpenter" and should have been one of the most cherished employees on the Furcht crew. Why is it then that he wasn't so indispensable to Furcht? "It will be recalled that Mr. Joseph Furcht, the construction supervisor at the Majestic Apartments, had to shift Hauptmann from the skilled carpentry work which he had been promised on to maintenance work, having a full quota of skilled men". (Airman, p128). Maintenance man? Just how much "master carpenter" work by BRH went in to the Majestic? Any? Think maybe he "couldn't make the team?"

JM

**Re: Re: Re: Re: The sticky point
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 13:41:32
205.183.31.66 writes:**

jm ,i have a dittoed document from the police archives, that a policeman was brought to englewood to measure the babys room window from the ground up. the report says that the ladder would not have reached the room and the kidnapping wouldnt have taken pplace there. jim fisher a friend of mind an a author of a book on the case had it measured and had differnt outcome. jims theory is hauptman was going to kidnap the baby there, thats why there was an extra extention on the ladder when they found it

steve for jm

For Steve

**Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 15:06:50
209.12.168.207 writes:**

The issue may be the placement of the legs of the ladder at the scene (the angle to the window) and whether it would be stable if fully extended. I was only responding to the the statement that it would not reach the window. Ingress via the ladder would explain the presence of mud in the room near the window. The problem with the ladder placement is one of the reasons that police today specialize and why we see an increase in criminalists such as blood spatter physicists, etc. to try to eliminate such confusion.

JM

Re: For Steve

**Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 15:29:14
205.183.31.66 writes:**

jm, i see some of the hauptman supporters are going after you full blast. im not budging from my belief that hauptman was guilty. i wll never believe that lindbergh did it or his sisterinlaw. i found not a shread of evidence that thier was a massive coverup in that respect.i thought the evidence presented in the court room pointed to hauptman, in actions in germany as a convicted felon and a escapee from a german prison means nothing to some people on this website. in the bronx jailcell he made a knife out of his spoon an hid it in the bottom of his toilet is not talked about on this site. i think that was a turning point for his first lawyer. it took the sails out of his defensive plan. he started talking about a insanity plea in his interviews with the papers. flimsy alibis right through his arrest an on the stand.the fisch story is on shaky waters after witnesses told of a differnt time of hauptman meeting him. this is what i look at.

steve for jm

Re: For Steve

Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 15:29:21

205.183.31.67 writes:

jm, i see some of the hauptman supporters are going after you full blast. im not budging from my belief that hauptman was guilty. i will never believe that lindbergh did it or his sister-in-law. i found not a shred of evidence that there was a massive coverup in that respect. i thought the evidence presented in the court room pointed to hauptman, in actions in germany as a convicted felon and a escapee from a german prison means nothing to some people on this website. in the bronx jailcell he made a knife out of his spoon and hid it in the bottom of his toilet is not talked about on this site. i think that was a turning point for his first lawyer. it took the sails out of his defensive plan. he started talking about a insanity plea in his interviews with the papers. flimsy alibis right through his arrest and on the stand. the fish story is on shaky waters after witnesses told of a different time of hauptman meeting him. this is what i look at.

steve for jm

Back to Steve

Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 16:42:14

209.12.168.207 writes:

Full blast? Perhaps, but I love the smell of napalm in the morning. Insanity would not have flown for BRH at this trial because there was not enough evidence that he was (as they say today) "out of touch with reality". Besides, any good defense attorney will tell you insanity rarely works. I agree that there is a dearth of comment about BRH being a common criminal, but that shouldn't matter. The "CAL-did-its" know when they don't put facts in their allegations. Keep the faith. Maybe we can tag-team.

JM

Use of the Ladder

Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 07:52:46

207.220.150.151 writes:

1) The ladder was not found in three separate sections. The bottom two sections, still connected, were found about 65 feet from the house to the southeast. (No one measured it -sheesh- but estimates ranged from 55 to 75 feet.) The third section, presumably the top section, was about 10 feet farther to the southeast.

2) Underneath the southeast corner window of the nursery, the police found indentations in the mud that they believed matched the bottom of the ladder.

3) When the police placed the ladder in those indentations, it fit. They placed the ladder (all three sections) against the side of the house. It came to a point beside and above the nursery window. When they used only the two bottom sections, it came to a point 6 inches to the right of, and 30 inches below, the windowsill.

4) At the point where the top of the ladder (two sections only) reached the house, they found 'markings', on the side of the house that were the width of the ladder rails. Use of a magnifying glass revealed the presence of "small splinters of wood" in the 'markings'.

5) They found no such marks on the side of the house at the point where the ladder hit the house with all three sections used.

6) On the top rails of the ladder (using two sections) they found a white substance which may have been whitewash from the side of the house.

7) The police found the nursery window closed but not locked, the right hand shutter open and the left closed. (That is the left looking out - the shutter on the side where the 'marks' were found.)

8) The police conducted 'tests' to determine whether the ladder could have served as the means of access to the house. They placed against the house another ladder, the top rung of which reached the same height as the one found (using the two sections). John Sweeney of the Newark, New Jersey PD stated that he climbed that ladder and entered the nursery, then exited again and came back down the ladder. He did so in daylight, with the shutters and the window already open and with the assistance of other officers. He did not attempt to close the window or the one shutter the police found closed. Nor did he attempt to exit the window and climb down the ladder carrying anything to simulate Charlie. He stated that he required both hands to execute the maneuvers necessary to exit the window and reach the ladder and that he could not have climbed out the window and reached the top of the ladder carrying something. He indicated that he would have had to "put the package down" on the windowsill.

9) There were footprints leading from the house to the ladder. Trooper Wolf describes what he believed was "two sets of fresh footprints leading off in a southeast direction". The ladder was parallel to the footprints.

10) In the nursery, the police found mud between the southeast corner window and the crib. The 'trail', as it was described, was not sufficiently distinct to be conclusively identified as footprints, nor, if they were footprints, was it possible to determine the direction in which the person was walking.

11) Witnesses expressed the 'opinion' that the ladder found would have supported about 180 lbs. but I don't believe there were any kind of conclusive tests conducted (certainly no one climbed it).

Mjr

Re: Use of the Ladder
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 08:57:26
204.60.24.151 writes:

Many thanks for your excellent review here. When you say in 9) that "[t]here were footprints leading from the house to the ladder", do you mean that there were footprints suggesting somebody came out of the house to the ladder, as if to climb it? All the other particulars -- the indentations in the mud, whitewash on the tips, footprints, etc. are consonant with Lindy setting it up himself.

It strikes me that it would be most helpful were there some sort of compendium printed that categorized Lindy evidence into such categories as "Unquestioned," "Highly Doubtful," "Proven False," "Disputed," "Manufactured," "Nobody But Wilentz Really Believes This." That way we could all quote chapter and verse when using "facts" in these discussions.

Thanks again for your careful work.

David

I believe we can pretty safely consign most anything prosecution witnesses said after their names to the "highly suspect at best" bin. Are these details you give -- which I've never seen in one place like this, thanks for pulling it all together -- culled from trial transcripts, or from original police documents? There is a substantial difference.

David Sims

Re: Re: Use of the Ladder
Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 07:31:43
207.220.150.46 writes:

---When you say in 9) that "[t]here were footprints leading from the house to the ladder", do you mean that there were footprints suggesting somebody came out of the house to the ladder, as if to climb it?---

Wolf said:

"The ground on the east side of the house was muddy and showed the imprint of the base of the ladder when placed against the wall also apparently two sets of fresh foot prints leading off in a southeast direction. The three sections of the ladder were lying about 75 feet from the house, parallel with the foot prints."

Wolf's report makes clear that he believed more than one person approached the house and that the entry was through the nursery window.

---All the other particulars -- the indentations in the mud, whitewash on the tips, footprints, etc. are consonant with Lindy setting it up himself.---

The particulars - the marks, the imprints, etc. and especially the mud in the room, IMHO, are consistent with the idea that someone put the ladder against the side of the house and entered the house that way - nothing more.

---Are these details you give culled from trial transcripts, or from original police documents? There is a substantial difference.---

Both. BTW, the differences between the initial reports and the testimony relate mostly to the evidence indicating the involvement of more than one person - which doesn't really help the "Lindbergh did it" theory.

Response

Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 09:39:49

209.12.168.207 writes:

You may be bringing too much logic to this board. Actually, you are beginning to do the critical assessment necessary in any resolution of a complex issue. It is fundamental detective work that in any crime scene, things are both brought to and taken from the crime scene. Reasonable inferences are drawn which are then compared with subsequent evidence. Some of the "theories" fail quickly in the light of this methodology. I look forward to further posts of yours.

JM