

**As I said, JM, the claim that he used false, misleading, perjured testimony and withheld evidence is the one most raised on this board. The others were, as I said, dismissed for a variety of reasons. Yes, the reasons included the statute of limitations; the failure to plead claims with sufficient specificity; failure to plead facts in support of the allegations; failure to plead specific injury and failure to plead facts connecting specific defendants to specific acts.**

**I didn't discuss these others for the simple reason that they were irrelevant to the claim about Wilentz and the false testimony - which is the claim raised here - and I didn't think anyone would really be interested in what would be a lengthy discussion of the rather technical decision.**

**If anyone is interested I will be happy to provide the details of the claims raised and why they were dismissed.**

**Mjr**

**OK**

**Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 14:34:09**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**The reason why "perjury, false and misleading testimony" is so widely discussed is that no will agree as to what that means. While perjury is relatively clear (one statement under oath opposite from a later statement under oath), false and misleading are conclusions. "Misleading" is objectionable under FRE 611a if it can be shown that it is in fact misleading, but may not be illegal. Whether something is "false" may be a question of fact and is a different aspect.**

**For example: Did Bruno commit perjury as to Condon's phone number on the door from the rendition hearing (under oath) to the trial (under oath). Probably not because he qualified his answers. However, it could be characterized as false or misleading depending who is interpreting the testimony. It then becomes an issue of credibility for the jury.**

**For Wilentz to "knowingly" present perjured testimony there would have (of necessity) to be an agreement with a witness who knows he/she is committing perjury (either by choice (conspiracy) or by intimidation). Agreed? Look at the witness Reilly put on who testified about an event only to be shown to have been somewhere else at the time in a accident (or something). The testimony was a lie. Does that prove Reilly "knowingly" offered perjurious testimony?**

**It is an ethical violation to present perjurious testimony, but many lawyers dodge this by saying "I'll just ask for a narrative response, so I won't know for sure" or "I didn't know he was going to say that". Indict them for perjury? Probably not.**

**My point on the Anna suit was that there was no proof of the "agreement or conspiracy" which would have had to have occurred before Wilentz could "knowingly" present perjurious testimony. Most of the allegations I have seen against Wilentz in books such as '23 Scaduto and the rest involve matters during the investigative phase, as in planting evidence later lied about in court or intimidating an identification witness at a lineup and later getting perjury in court, etc.**

**If Anna had alleged that Wilentz intimidated Perrone to lie at the lineup and later secured that lie as part of the testimony, the Judge would have held Wilentz absolutely immune for getting the lie in court, but would have looked at the lineup facts to see if a "known constitutional right of Bruno" had been violated. If the Judge had found that a "known constitutional right" had been violated, that allegation would not have been dismissed, and if later proved by a preponderance, could have cost Wilentz damages. Agreed?**

**So, the Judge looked at the actual trial and said for those things in the trial, even if what you say is true, Wilentz is immune. For those things you say which led up to the things you say occurred in the trial, even if true, there is no "known constitutional right" of Bruno's which has been violated either by the police or by Wilentz. For those other claims, either you waited too long to sue, or you can't show that you were hurt by it, or you don't allege enough information to make out a case, or you sued the wrong people. Is this a fair statement of the ruling?**

**Technical or not my reading of the opinion is that despite all the discovery and five shots at writing the lawsuit, Anna's lawyer could not identify any person or any event during the investigation of Bruno who/which caused a "violation of a known constitutional right" of Bruno's.**

**JM**

**Re: OK  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 08:04:44  
206.214.112.36 writes:**

**This discussion is going off on a real tangent, so I'm not going to respond to everything here. There are a couple of things, however, that I think need a reply.**

**---While perjury is relatively clear (one statement under oath opposite from a later statement under oath), ---**

**Perjury is knowingly making untrue statements under oath. The statements do not need to conflict with other 'under oath' statements.**

**(Witness testifies that he was in NYC on the day of the crime and saw Defendant commit it. IN FACT, Witness was incarcerated in Attica on the day of the crime and could not possibly have seen ANYONE commit it. Are you saying he has not committed perjury because only the statement about witnessing the crime was under oath?)**

**---For Wilentz to "knowingly" present perjured testimony there would have (of necessity) to be an agreement with a witness who knows he/she is committing perjury (either by choice (conspiracy) or by intimidation). Agreed?---**

**No, not agreed. You are confusing presenting perjured testimony with conspiracy to do so. There need not be any 'agreement' for a prosecutor to present perjured testimony.**

**Consider the example above. The DA knows that Witness was incarcerated and could not have seen the Defendant commit the crime. He has never discussed this with Witness (so there can be no agreement), but he has the prison records so he knows where Witness was. He ignores the fact that Witness is about to lie (or learns it later and fails to advise the Court). Has he not presented perjured testimony without any 'agreement' to do so?**

**Mjr**

**Not much practical application  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 12:55:38  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Ever try a perjury case? While it may seem rather easy to convict for perjury based on other unsworn testimony or acts, practically it is very difficult. The classic situation is where a witness offers sworn testimony which cannot be true when compared with the other one, and there must be corroboration for the one offered as the true version. You may begin to see why perjury charges and convictions are rare. Your Attica example was rather clear, I concede, and there was a witness in the Lindbergh who virtually fit that situation, but it was a defense witness who could be proved to be elsewhere instead of where he said he was. Did the blood-hungry police and Wilentz indict that witness for perjury? Would you say Reilly didn't know what that answer was going to be before he called that witness to the stand? Reilly could say "I believed him, I was wrong".**

**Which one of the clear cut examples from the trial do you say proves Wilentz knowingly presented perjured testimony without any agreement beforehand?**

**Your definition of perjury is wrong, also. ("Perjury is knowingly making untrue statements under oath"). Lying is knowingly making untrue statements under oath.**

**Perjury is knowingly making untrue statements about a material point under oath. Anybody with a television should know that one after this past year. We know Bruno committed perjury, however. Either the testimony in NY was a lie, or the testimony in NJ was a lie. Both were under oath. But you would say "while the NY testimony was untrue and under oath and about a material fact, it was only a mistake, not an intentional lie". So therefore, even though there are clearly opposite versions, both under oath, it's still not "perjury" even though it was about a material fact.**

**Your second example is a very poor one. If the DA didn't talk to the witness, how would the DA "know" what was going to be said by that witness, i.e., why would the DA call that witness? Secondly, if the DA only knew it was perjury after the testimony was given from the stand, it would not be "knowingly" offering perjury as Wilentz was charged with. It might be "concealment of perjury" and be a bar grievance but maybe not a criminal offense. But that wasn't the charge, was it. I don't think you could convict any lawyer for knowingly offering perjury unless you could prove that lawyer knew what the answer was going to be and framed the question to get that answer.**

**Tell me again how the DA can "know" in advance that there is going to be perjury without talking to the witness about what is going to be said and "agreeing" to go along with it or have the witness "agree" to go along with it?**

**JM**

**Re: Not much practical application  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 20:34:02  
206.214.112.146 writes:**

**The first question was whether perjury required conflicting statements both made under oath. It does not.**

**The other question was whether the presentation of perjured testimony NECESSARILY requires an agreement between the DA and the witness. It does not.**

**Mjr**

**MJR  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 15:13:59  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**We probably agree a lot more on things than we disagree. While in the law school arena where they debate ideas instead of working with real people with real**

problems, some of these ideas seem to work better. While I admit that theoretically it is possible for things to occur, some as you describe, I haven't seen many of them happen. Can you really imagine putting someone on the stand under those conditions and asking questions on material issues without discussing it pre-trial? I have seen exploratory questions in direct and cross, but rarely were they more than a factual predicate for the possibility of advancing a theory.

I appreciate your remarks in response to Carl's post. That I rather strongly believe Bruno is guilty and that perhaps you, not sure of your position, may just as strongly believe he was not guilty, shouldn't permit the debate to degenerate. I will confess to some impatience with posts which make vicious attacks based on things which simply cannot be true, but I should remember better than to debate with those persons anyway and just ignore that post.

I have truly been interested in this case (not so much for the parties involved) but because it is such a great example for learning the ins and outs of circumstantial evidence and using the facts to posit a theory. And it was one of the more interesting cases involving novel use of opinion testimony during this period.

Our exchanges about the Anna case show how ridiculous it can become when people must debate the meaning of one word in order to resolve months and years of conduct. What was the recent expression: it depends on what the meaning of "is" is?

I probably will leave the board for a while now that it seems that at least one other person will challenge some of these allegations. Your more middle ground approach is very valuable in keeping younger researchers looking for the truth instead of blindly going down any one trail.

Sorry for any testiness. I hope you have a great legal career. I suppose that a law practice would be interesting, but I probably would grow weary of people dumping their serious problems in my lap and leaving the office with a sigh of relief as I took over the worries.

JM

Re: MJR  
Saturday, 01-May-1999 14:01:34  
204.60.25.30 writes:

No doubt you'll drop in again from time to time to collect more risible material for your twee drinking parties.

David

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Read Any Good Books Lately?**

**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 12:29:59**

**205.183.31.66 writes:**

**im not going to worship a book with poor investigating practices, and a tabloid theory that was only assumed for making money. jim fishers book is far superior to that book and is well investigated. dont forget jim went into this case with a open mind to see in fact if hauptman was framed. not like some authors**

**steve**

**Re: Read Any Good Books Lately?**

**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 11:23:37**

**204.170.64.28 writes:**

**as an after thought you may want also to check some of these items, note they are NOT specifically about the Lindy Case, but can be of use in trying to ask the important questions.**

**The Trial by Franz Kafka**

**The Film : Chinatown**

**a biography about Sam Liebowitz,**

**Clarence Darrow**

**Theodore Dreiser: An American Tragedy**

**Philip for dave B </HTML>**

**The Majestic on Central Pk West  
Wednesday, 21-Apr-1999 22:50:24**

**Message:**

**205.188.196.56 writes:**

Here is the URL for the famous building in which Hauptmann had worked as a carpenter. For those sleuths who think Hauptmann could have built such a crude "kidnap" ladder as the one found at the Hopewell site, a look at this website might make you change your minds. Four bedroom apartments start at 7 million and even in the 30s you had to be a millionaire to live there as well. I doubt if the Chanins (prestigious real estate developers) were in the habit of hiring slipshod carpenters.

<http://majestic.nyrealty.com/>

ronelle

**Re: The Majestic on Central Pk West**

**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 12:22:58**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

I wonder if they would have permitted BRH to work there if they had known about his criminal record for burglary and robbery (the latter being a crime of violence)?

JM

**Re: The Majestic on Central Pk West**

**Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 14:45:23**

**192.60.36.248 writes:**

During the trial, when Wilentz confronted Hauptmann with the ladder, Hauptmann is reported to have haughtily replied, "I am a carpenter." He might have been a very good carpenter, I'll give you that. He might have been the greatest carpenter who ever lived (no Biblical symbolism intended), but that's of no evidentiary value whatsoever.

Al Berkowitz

**Re: Re: The Majestic on Central Pk West**

**Friday, 23-Apr-1999 00:40:24**

**205.188.193.181 writes:**

;;;;;;;;;;He might have been a very good carpenter, I'll give you that. He might have been the greatest carpenter who ever lived (no Biblical symbolism intended), but that's of no evidentiary value whatsoever;;;;;;;;;;

Al, I honestly do not know if my assertion would have "evidentiary value" in a court room, I am not a lawyer, but I do know that on this message board there has been alot of debate regarding the quality of Hauptmann's carpentry. Could BRH have made such a crude kidnap ladder, one that is laughable by any standard of carpentry work? The Majestic is definite proof of Hauptmann's carpentry skills. Too bad, JM, you had to divert the argument with a senseless remark about whether the Majestic would have hired him if they knew he had a police record.

ronelle

Ronelle  
Friday, 23-Apr-1999 12:04:08  
209.12.168.207 writes:

You're right. My comment about his criminal record had no more evidentiary value than your unsupported comment that he had master carpenter skills because his crew worked at the Majestic.

JM

Re: Ronelle  
Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 01:17:53  
205.188.195.32 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;You're right. My comment about his criminal record had no more evidentiary value than your unsupported comment that he had master carpenter skills because his crew worked at the Majestic;;;;;;;;;;

My comment was never meant to be anything more than a humble opinion after having spent more than 30 years in the antiques business. I have an opinion about the Majestic that IS supported by the fact that millionaires did not move into buildings constructed by any kind of unskilled laborer at all! Especially in the 1930s! It would not be until the post-war era that a guy named Levitt would have the chutzpah to employ unskilled laborers. That's what made Levittown so cheap and affordable for middle class folks - unskilled labor. But in the 30s nothing was built without skilled labor. (Source: David Halberstam "The Fifties" )  
To be honest, JM, your comment about BRH's criminal record really surprised me. I know that to become a lawyer a person has to pass the LSAT which tests law-



school applicants' ability to read complicated passages in a short amount of time while deducing the main theme and logic of what is being discussed. I don't know why it was so difficult for you to understand the theme of my post. I made it as simple as I could - was BRH good enough to work on such a prestigious building and if so the odds of him building such a crummy ladder are not very high. Also, I never once used the word "master" carpenter in referring to BRH so now I am wondering if you are a "skilled" or "unskilled" lawyer.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: The Majestic on Central Pk West  
Friday, 23-Apr-1999 14:42:51  
205.183.31.67 writes:

who really cares how good of a carpenter he was.they still proved he built it, even if he built the greatest ladder known to man.he measured a piece of wood from his attic that bit him on his rear end.he worked very little after the ransom was paid. he told police he spent his stock market earnings, but records show he was losing money in the stock market

steve

Re: The Majestic on Central Pk West  
Friday, 04-Jun-1999 09:33:24  
207.41.174.64 writes:

My grandfather employed Hauptmann in 1928 to help build his home in the Bronx (two blocks from the Rauch place). He also employed Hauptmann at the John Langenbacher Co. on E. 72d St., where he was foreman. Hauptmann was an excellent carpenter, accurate and fast, and could read drawings perfectly well. In the fall of 1931 Grandfather helped Hauptmann build the famous garage (see NY Daily News, 9/22/34), using lumber from the National Lumber & Millwork Corp.. Max Rauch, the landlord, paid the lumber company himself.

KT </HTML>

**Jafsie's testimony**

**Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 23:11:45**

**Message:**

**209.94.150.110 writes:**

**According to testimony from Jafsie himself the writer of the later ransom notes, who became the recipient of the blood money wrote a very poor imitation of the symbol on the original ransom note. Thus, he refuted the charge of the State of New Jersey that there was only one man concerned with the whole affair--that the man who killed was the man who wrote all the notes and received the money.**

**Jafsie also on many occasions following his payment of the ransom money described "Cemetery John" as a Scandinavian. He even went so far as to make a phonograph record imitating "Cemetery John" in scandinavian dialect for agents of the Department of Justice. The defense endeavored to get this record into the evidence but without success.**

**Interesting don't you think. wouldn't this prove the idea of the involvement of a gang and not a long kidnapper, killer. Why were these discrepancies then overlooked by the Jury?**

**Diane**

**two camps?**

**Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 17:36:43**

**Message:**

**152.163.204.186 writes:**

**I have been following this Board for some time. Although this Board has the potential to really serve as a forum for the debate of serious ideas in an effort to reach the truth(which I define as ascertaining what really happened on March 1, 1932) it appears that the participants have hardened into two camps.**

**1) There are those who believe that Bruno Richard Hauptmann was guilty of kidnapping and killing the Lindbergh baby, and 2) those who believe that he was innocent and the case remains unsolved. The latter seem to be pre-occupied with the issue of whether he was framed by the police, while the former seem to merely direct personal attacks on those who expouse his innocence, rather than attack the substance**

**of their theories. This seems to be a trend among those who believe him guilty, both on this Board and in the recent literature.**

**As for me, I would like to elevate the level of the debate. I have read, I think, all of the major books on the case, and, quite frankly, find none of them to be without flaws. Fisher's book is sloppily researched and contains glaring factual errors, his use of manufactured and recreated dialogue is self-serving, and he provides no analytical insight into the investigation or trial. It seems he just starts with the pre-supposition that Hauptmann was guilty because the jury said so, and then fits facts into his theory. His personal attacks on other writers which appears**

**in the recent edition removes any credibility from his work. Berg's book seems to just accept Fisher's scenario, again without any analysis. Behn's book seems lacking in any evidence to back up the theory of Anne's sister having done it. Although Ahlgren & Monier provide the best analysis and do challenge the traditional thinking that there was a stranger kidnapping, one has to question a theory which was never tested at trial, and which seems to have only been developed 60 years after the event.**

**As for this Board's participants, the "Lindy did it" theorists seem pre-occupied with the issue of whether Hauptmann was framed. So what if he was? I tend to think that probably some (alot?) of the evidence WAS tampered with and concocted by the police, but that does not mean that Hauptmann was innocent. If the cops can frame an innocent man why can't they frame a guilty one? As for the "Hauptmann is Guilty" theorits lets put aside the ad**

**ominum attacks on Melinda, Ronelle, Noel Behn, etc. and let's look at the facts. I challenge all of the Board's participants to address a number of specific issues which have troubled me**

**ever since I read Ahlgren & Monier's book. Let's brainstorm possible responses together to help us all better understand what might have happened on March 1, 1932. I invite EVERYONE**

on this Board to address six separate questions. Speculation is welcome. Let's assume Bruno did it.

1) If Bruno did the kidnapping what was his original plan? Was he going to have Anna Hauptmann watch the baby while he negotiated? Was Anna in on it? Was he going to watch the baby himself in an apartment he perhaps had rented under a fake name? Or, did he plan from the beginning to murder the child, hide the body, and negotiate?

2) Why did he go out there on a Tuesday since the parents were never there on a Tuesday and had only decided that day to stay over?

3) How did he know where the nursery was?

4) How did he know which window did not latch?

5) Why did he enter at 9:15 p.m. instead of in the early morning hours?

6) When was the note found? (This seems to be one of the few factual discrepancies between Berg and Fisher on the one hand and A&M on the other.)

Please answer these questions **WITHOUT** any personal comments about me or any other participant. I would just like six straight theories.

carl bowman

Re: two camps?  
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 18:05:42  
204.170.64.20 writes:

want a good idea of the Lindy case watch  
the Ludovick Kennedy documentary-, produced by the BBC, title: Crime of the  
Century, it was shown in America on PBS

philip

Re: two camps?  
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 18:05:50  
204.60.24.143 writes:

Welcome, Carl, always good to have new pundits here. I think all the questions you pose are answered on the site, by myself as well as others much more knowledgeable. And there's more elasticity among the "camps" here -- I, for instance, think it perfectly possible that Hauptmann had nothing to do with the child's disappearance but was mixed up in some way with the extortion of the ransom money, and that police were so tired of being criticized for finding nothing in two years that they put all their energies into pinning the whole thing on Hauptmann simply to close the book.

This is common police practice, unfortunately. It happens most often when some lowlife career criminal is caught for a, let's say, murder. Police "convince" him to "confess" to a few other unsolved murders in the area, or simply say "He's the guy who we believe committed these six other murders," to close the books on them and spiff up their closed/open crimes ratio. The NJSP was under a ton of pressure to solve the case, and was subjected to withering criticism. The temptation to slam this illegal German alien with all they could just to get everyone off their backs was too great to resist.

And Melinda and Ronelle happen to ENJOY "ad ominum" attacks.

David

Re: Re: two camps?  
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 18:30:44  
152.163.204.194 writes:

;;;;;;;And Melinda and Ronelle happen to ENJOY "ad ominum" attacks;;;;;;; David - I must confess that it was MY fault and not Carl's that hominum was not properly spelled. Carl emailed his message to Lindyhoax@aol.com because he was unable to post it himself due to computer glitches all over the country yesterday. I accidently eliminated the h from his original message when I tried to respace his words on the board. The reason I am announcing this to board readers is that there may be many people who would like to participate in this interesting debate but are not comfortable with the use of a message board. If anyone would like to say something and cannot post a message themselves, for whatever reason, I would gladly do it for them - no matter what side of the fence they are on. I receive alot of mail concerning the website itself and I always advise writers to post their thoughts and ideas here.

Otherwise, David, I agree with everything else in your posting.

ronelle

**Re: two camps?**

**Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 18:37:06**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**And there are those of us who believe he wrote the note, built the ladder, but may not have gone to the house with those who did.**

**1. Don't think there was an initial intent to kill the child so there had to be a backup plan. Obviously, Hauptmann, living in the largest city so close by, was not going to house the child. There must have been another plan. While the kidnapping was daring, I don't think any of them planned a murder. Doubt Anna was in on it. The reason I don't believe Bruno went up the ladder is that he had been caught in the act of doing that in Germany. While most criminals don't quarrel with successful operations, most don't try to repeat failures that much. He delegated this part of the operation.**

**2. Assumes more planning than there might have been. The NJ branch of the conspiracy may have been surveilling the house. The ladder could have been in their custody (as well as the note) for days. Obviously they knew it was on the second floor, that's why there was a ladder.**

**3. The plans of the house were published in news or magazine accounts according to some news reports; he could have met the "confederates" through the carpenter agency; the room could have been detected via surveillance. If Whited is correct that he saw a stranger coming out of the woods between the properties twice in February, surveillance is a distinct possibility.**

**4. Assumes they did know that. I believe that's why they had the chisel -- to pry open the window. Most burglars seem to have "burglarious instruments" of some kind.**

**5. Better chance not to be seen or confronted by the servant staff. Surveillance would have pretty well established the domestic schedule. They could detect occupancy of a room by whether the light was on and movement could be detected. Most burglars (and rapists for that matter) plan with an escape route in mind (often end apartments in complexes near a freeway).**

**6. Speculation only. Missed initially in the excitement as the focus was on the missing child and the ensuing search. Sometimes things in what we might assume was "plain vision" are overlooked. I believe Edgar Allan Poe wrote a story about that.**

**Follow up suggestion. Why not ask six similar questions about Lindbergh's plans, preparation, and execution of the plan, time frame, etc., if he did it?**

**My question on the ladder entry: If the ground was soft enough to permit footprints why wasn't there an indentation if the 30 pound baby fell in the burlap bag? If there was no indentation from the 30 pound package being dropped ten feet or more into soft ground, does that indicate that the child was "murdered" after the abduction rather than killed in the drop?**

**JM**

**Re: Re: two camps?  
Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 23:55:07  
205.188.199.158 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;My question on the ladder entry: If the ground was soft enough to permit footprints why wasn't there an indentation if the 30 pound baby fell in the burlap bag? If there was no indentation from the 30 pound package being dropped ten feet or more into soft ground, does that indicate that the child was "murdered" after the abduction rather than killed in the drop?;;;;;;;;;;**

**There is a logical explanation for the lack of indentation. The burlap bag probably never dropped at all. It is entirely possible that Lindbergh, while cluthching the 30 lb. sack accidentally swung it hard against the wall of the house when he lost his footing and the child's head was crushed, not against anything at the bottom of the ladder but against the side of the wall. Since the ladder is at an angle Lindbergh could have knocked the child's head against the wall as the sack hung from his hands, either by swinging the bag or crushing his own weight against it as he lost footing. When I was at the site last September I remember wondering about this since there is no cement ledge under the nursery window.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: two camps?  
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 02:39:05  
204.170.64.37 writes:**

**try taking this one step at a time.  
the original plan**

**also you may want to watch the bbc docu crime of  
century, Lud Kennedy's work done on PBS in the '80's**

**Philip**

Re: Re:Thank you JM, I like your theory  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 21:04:50  
205.188.197.158 writes:

Thank you JM for taking the time to answer the six questions. I was surprised that only one Board member responded. You have advanced an intriguing theory, one that I had not previously encountered, and I want to make sure I understand it exactly.

You believe that BRH conspired with at least two New Jersey residents to kidnap the LB and hold him for ransom. Anna Hauptmann was not involved. The plan was that BRH would build the ladder and write the ransom note, and that the two Jerseyites would hold both in New Jersey until needed, and that they would then put the snatch on the Eaglet. It might make sense for BRH to make the ladder as he may have been the only one with carpentry skills, regardless of whether it was as a master carpenter (Ronelle) or as a hacker. This is very plausible. But why have Bruno write the note? Did the gang choose Bruno because of his unique command of the English language? You criticize Ronelle for making Bruno a master carpenter. Have you made him a Master Linguist? Was stationery cheaper in the Apple than in the Garden State?

Or, perhaps, Bruno wrote "the note" because the gang did not want the handwriting traced back to them. But if that is the case why didn't they just invest in a pawn shop typewriter, bang out the "greetings" one key at a time, and then toss the typewriter into the Harlem River? Why not paste words from the newspaper? Perhaps too trite? Maybe. But why write the note longhand thereby subjecting the Master Carpenter, Master Linguist and Master Criminal to a handwriting trace? Bruno apparently knows enough to keep his fingerprints off of it, why does he longhand it? And why, for goodness sake, say "We have your child" (or some such) thereby identifying the snatcher as a gang? Did all the gang members nod approvingly when, looking over his shoulder, they saw him write those words? Ah shucks, maybe that doesn't matter. Maybe everyone would know anyways that the snatch had been by a gang. After all, Lindy himself knew immediately that a gang had done it ("Anne, they have stolen our baby.") before Anne even realized there had been a kidnapping.

He builds the ladder. Running one board short he does what any of us will do when, during the course of a leisurely carpentry project, we run out of wood. We go up into our attic and cut a floorboard from the middle of the floor and



pry it up VERY CAREFULLY (so as not to leave pry marks) and then bring it downstairs and, finding it too long do we cut off one end to make it the right length? Of course not, we trim both ends.

Anyways, with note and ladder in hand the gang plans the kidnapping. The gang has had the house under surveillance (Whited saw someone coming out of the woods on two occasions- it couldn't possibly have been a hunter or anyone else) and knows which room is the nursery. They learn that Lindy will be at the NYU bash on March 1 and figure it's the perfect time. Hauptmann will stay in the City. So what does Bruno do? Does he get himself a perfect chair-saving alibi? Does

he get drunk and go take a swing at a cop to make sure he gets pinched and is in the drunk tank at 9:00 p.m. (could any other alibi be better?) Nooo, he plans a quiet evening with

his wife and meets some casual acquaintances.

But undeterred the gang drives out to Hopewell on the fateful Tuesday. Although they have had the house under surveillance (Whited again) they apparently never realized

that every time they watched the family it happened to be on a weekend and that the family wasn't living there. They arrive after Lindy does (he arrives about 8:35p.m.) and the

Gang parks in the driveway. (The thumbguard.) They figure Lindy is talking at the dinner and they are safe to park there. They also figure that they will do the snatch at 9:15 p.m. when everyone is up in the house because they know where the servants are rather than wait until 2:00 a.m. when everyone will be asleep and too groggy to react even if they are woken up. Maybe the Gang wants to make sure that the

caper makes the morning papers, or maybe they want to give the family as much lead time as possible to raise the dough.

They take the ladder, the chisel, and the note, (carefully, don't touch it) and approach the house. But wait! Lindy is in his study downstairs below the nursery, not at NYU, and

placing the ladder against the house and climbing it will mean going past his study, past the one man they wanted to avoid. Remember, the lights are on in the study and the house has no curtains. Do they abandon the plan? No, of course not. Up the ladder one goes, with chisel and note.

Probably gloved, so as to not have touched the note. Oh lucky day! The shutter is not latched. and up the window goes. In, out...whoops! Let's not forget to wipe the room,

(Why?) and then the note is left by the window. The baby falls, and the gang begins carrying body and ladder back to the car. But 75 feet from the house they decide not to take the ladder with them after all (Why?) and bundle body into car and drive

off. They head away from New York City, perhaps towards the place where they were going to stash the baby, and then panic. They pull over, dump the body, and drive off. Once home they call Bruno and tell him the bad news. Not only don't they have the kid, he'll need another ladder for that home improvement proj....whoops!

Can't call

Bruno, he has no phone. The next day they drive in to see Bruno and give him the bad news.

But not all is lost! They come up with Plan B. Maybe they even occasionally drive by the dump spot to make sure no one else has found the body. Again, it is Bruno who writes

all the notes, goes to the cemetery...etc.

When given a chance to save himself if he'll spill the beans he refuses because the gang threatens him with harm to Anna if he blabs. Ahh,...one problem. After his arrest he

did not have free access to mail and visitors so how did they threaten him? Maybe they threatened Anna, but then why didn't she spill the beans to save Bruno? Slight problem.

But actually, JM, I like your theory. It is much better than Fisher's and much much better than Behn's. When's the book coming out?

Carl

Re: Re: Re: Thank you JM, I like your theory

Friday, 30-Apr-1999 07:30:35

206.214.112.143 writes:

An awfully sarcastic response from someone who made a point of asking for no personal attacks.

A few comments:

---After all, Lindy himself knew immediately that a gang had done it ("Anne, they have stolen our baby.") before Anne even realized there had been a kidnapping.---

Whether his comment was meant to suggest more than one person in the gang is questionable. Most of the people who have studied this case (and who have studied Lindbergh) agree that the "they" refers to the public and press that harassed the Lindberghs constantly. A "They don't leave us alone and now they have stolen our baby" kind of comment. IMHO, this makes sense. (I heard a lot like it after the death of Princess Diana. "The press harassed her to the point of frenzy and now they have killed her" type of comments.)

---Of course not, we trim both ends.---

Plane both edges, too. :)

---Lindy is in his study downstairs below the nursery, not at NYU, and placing the ladder against the house and climbing it will mean going past his study, past the one man they wanted to avoid. Remember, the lights are on in the study and the house has no curtains.---

Lindbergh was not in his study at 9:15. He was in the living room. He did not get to the study until about 9:30.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Thank you JM, I like your theory  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 09:28:31  
205.188.192.171 writes:

;;;;;;;Lindbergh was not in his study at 9:15. He was in the living room. He did not get to the study until about 9:30. ;;;;;;;;;;

Yes, he was in the living room where he "heard" wood breaking. The dog heard absolutely nothing and no one else heard anything either in that howling windy rain outside. Lindbergh must have been a supernatural being whose hearing was better than an animal. Amazing for someone who flew, without the aid of cotton in his ears, in open cockpit airplanes.

And, it has always puzzled me why Lindy, the perfectionist that he was, didn't go right out into the kitchen to investigate that "wood breaking" sound he claimed (and was the ONLY one who claimed ) to have heard.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Thank you JM, I like your theory  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 10:09:02  
204.60.25.66 writes:

I thought you were going to raise the level of the debate beyond sarcasm. Oh well.

I still don't see why anyone would need to construct a ladder when it's so easy to procure a decent one from almost anywhere. Ronelle's hint that Lindbergh had constructed a custom ladder-cum-gangplank gives the only plausible reason I've seen for why such a crudely-built, rather poor ladder would be brought into existence at all.

**You're right, though, the timing of the operation, to me, is a major monkey wrench in the outside job theory. It seems about the worst possible time to plan a snatching, when lights are on in the house and people are moving about. Sometimes we get so involved with the minutiae and arcane points of the entire thing that we don't stop to consider huge gaping holes in the competing theories: The timing only makes sense if it's an accidental occurrence, or an inside job. If it's an outside job the timing's a real headscratcher: No amount of surveillance or even familiarity with the household routine would establish that the child is never looked in on by mother, father or staff at a certain point in the evening, and that those couple minutes are "safe" to come through the window.**

**David**

**Gee, Carl  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 14:51:12  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**You added a bunch of stuff to my rather brief responses including a lot I didn't offer or say, but isn't that typical with the ABB's (Anybody but Bruno).**

**JM**

**Gee, Carl (2)  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 14:56:59  
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Actually, I was impressed with some of the regulars' responses to your message Carl, and I wish I had read them before posting Gee, Carl (1). I withdraw the comment about the ABBs, this time.**

**JM**

**Re: Re: two camps?  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 07:13:16  
206.214.112.143 writes:**

**---If Whited is correct that he saw a stranger coming out of the woods between the properties twice in February, surveillance is a distinct possibility.---**

**Was Whited lying in 1932 when he told the police he saw no one and knew nothing or was he lying NY and Flemington when he said he did?**

**Timing:**

---Better chance not to be seen or confronted by the servant staff. Surveillance would have pretty well established the domestic schedule. They could detect occupancy of a room by whether the light was on and movement could be detected. Most burglars (and rapists for that matter) plan with an escape route in mind (often end apartments in complexes near a freeway).---

**IMHO**, it is also significant that later in the evening, that crib was within in a few feet of the Lindberghs' room, too.

They watched the house sufficiently that they knew the family routine but not thoroughly enough to realize the family was not there on weeknights?

If they had a planned escape route, why leave the house going southeast (location of the ladder/footprints) if the car was parked on the drive or somewhere in that area (thumbguard)? Why not head straight for the car? If the car was not parked on the drive or in that area, how did the thumbguard get there?

Hauptmann wrote the notes being careful not to get his fingerprints on them, and then what? Someone else put them in the envelope, leaving prints?

**The finding of the note:**

---Missed initially in the excitement as the focus was on the missing child and the ensuing search. Sometimes things in what we might assume was "plain vision" are overlooked.---

Don't faint :) but I think we agree on this point.

---My question on the ladder entry: If the ground was soft enough to permit footprints why wasn't there an indentation if the 30 pound baby fell in the burlap bag? If there was no indentation from the 30 pound package being dropped ten feet or more into soft ground, does that indicate that the child was "murdered" after the abduction rather than killed in the drop?---

Good question. I have wondered about this myself. Maybe the baby hit the side of the house or the window sill of the first floor window. Maybe he hit the catwalk or even the ladder itself. (All just speculation, of course.)

**Mjr**

**Re: two camps?**  
**Tuesday, 27-Apr-1999 20:04:57**  
**38.14.58.189 writes:**

**Welcome Carl,**

**Is there a camp called "other"? Actually I'm in "writers" camp right now... also referred to as "writer's cramp" for those of you who can relate. Unfortunately my book-in-progress keeps me from participating very much in the forum these days. I do check in frequently, though, and if you listen really hard, off to the side of your screen you might just hear a gnashing and crunching sound, like someone chomping at the bit. That'll be me.**

**Melinda**

**Re: two camps?**  
**Thursday, 03-Jun-1999 16:47:45**  
**207.41.174.46 writes:**

**In answer to Mr. Bowman's six questions:**

**1) If Hauptmann's original plan had been to have Anna or some other person act as custodian for the baby, the logistics would have been much more complicated. Hauptmann could not have kept the child in his own apartment (because he had a landlord), but he might have made arrangements with his wife's niece, Maria Muller, and her husband, Hans, to care for the child. He could not likely have done this without disclosing his purpose, and this would have been risky unless they were willing accomplices.**

**It seems more likely that Hauptmann -- the "lone man" -- would have made the decision to murder the baby long in advance of the abduction. This begs the question of why he appears to have made no preparation for rapid and effective disposal of the body. If Millard Whited's identification of Hauptmann was correct, and he was indeed in the vicinity of the Lindbergh estate, why did Hauptmann not take that opportunity to locate a convenient place to sequester the body where it would not be discovered? He might have elected to weight the body with stones (in the burlap bag that was found nearby) and sink it in a nearby pond, or to bury the baby in a pre-dug grave. Yet, to all intents and purposes it appears (and the FBI and others argued) that Hauptmann's disposal of the corpse off the Hopewell-Princeton Road was unplanned and accomplished in the heat of flight.**

**The likelihood of the murder having been Hauptmann's original intent, coupled with the apparently unplanned disposal of the corpse, should raise an eyebrow, especially since Hauptmann is supposed to have pursued his ransom negotiations as if he were assured the body would not be discovered. The standard explanation, of course, is that Hauptmann had "delusions of omnipotence", and that his psyche**

was "dissociated" in some measure. Only then can one account for the actions of a criminal who is at once extremely crafty and cunning and at the same time careless and lacking in forethought.

2) To my knowledge, the prosecution at Hauptmann's trial advanced no theory of how the carpenter came to be aware of the baby's presence at Hopewell on Tuesday, March 1st. The closest thing to such a theory was expressed by Schwarzkopf and Walsh at the time of Violet Sharpe's death -- namely, that her suicide tended strongly to confirm that she had conveyed important knowledge of the Lindbergh family's whereabouts to unknown persons.

3) Floor plans of the Lindbergh home were published in several newspapers well before the kidnapping. I do not have exact dates.

4) The notion that the kidnapper had advance knowledge of the nonlatching shutter presumes a level of inside knowledge that was suggested but again never established.

5) Ahlgren and Monier's argument about the timing of the crime is highly persuasive. With or without field-glasses, the kidnapper could easily have seen that lights were on in the living areas of the house. Others have noted that the kidnap ladder was positioned right near the lower-floor library window where Lindbergh was sitting. This would appear to constitute a prohibitive risk for a cautious criminal. Again, Hauptmann's mental makeup is a useful crutch.

6) (defer)

KT

**MJR's analysis about the "closet trim"**  
**Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 02:03:22**

**Message:**  
**12.71.37.148 writes:**

**Sorry for departing from the sub-thread alignment, but the indentations were beginning to disappear off the right of my screen:**

**MJR, Quoting from your last post:**  
**-----Begin quotation-----**

**The quote is exactly what Hauptmann said in his September 25 statement to Foley so I suspect they read Hauptmann's September 25 statement into the record (as they did at the trial). It is in that same statement that Hauptmann says he did not remember writing it, and was giving the only explanation he could think of.**

**As I said when Hauptmann found out later just WHERE in the closet that writing was found he said he knew he didn't write it no matter how much it looked like his writing - he would not have written something in such a place.**

**(In response to a comment about BRH writing on the door)**  
**No. The other writing was on the inside of the door. THIS writing was on the inside trim of the closet.**

**----end quotation-----**

**You may not want to stand in front of a jury to argue this one, MJR. If we take it your way:**

**1. Foley hands Bruno the trim in the grand jury room. Bruno looks at the writing and admits it is his, but he does not recognize the difference between the trim and the actual door he wrote on? Bruno the carpenter who helped on the exotic Majestic as Ronelle says?**

**2. Bruno writes on the back of the closet door (surely he didn't write on the front of the door), but you think it would be inconceivable that he would write one to two inches to the left or right on the trim?**

**Think of a "video replay" of the closet door. It either opens in or out. If it opens in, the closet must be deep enough to permit the swing of the door. If it opens out into the bedroom, there still must be enough depth for storage of things in the closet. If the writing is on the immediate inside trim surrounding the closet door, it has to be**



within about 18 inches of the center of the closet door (and that's assuming a relatively standard 30 inch door, although many may be larger).

We know he admitted the writing on the door. You don't seem to contest this. We know the trim (by description as being door trim) was immediately around the inside of the closet door. (This is aided by at least four of the authors referring to writing being on the back of the door; Haring, 94; Fisher, 225; Kennedy, 204; Whipple, 39;). We know that Foley put the trim in his hands on the afternoon of Sept. 25. We know that Bruno looked at the trim and stated that the writing was his. We know that Bruno gave an explanation for why he wrote on the piece of trim which was placed in his hands on Sept. 25. We know he never categorically denied writing on the trim, either in the rendition hearing or at the actual trial. All of his answers and testimony was qualified in this respect.

Why would he write on the door, but not inches from the door?

I re-read the Rendition opinion as to whether the statement was read into evidence. This paragraph of the opinion covers a lot of ground. Without the actual transcript, it is difficult to tell, but there is no reference to a statement being read into evidence. The court does discuss Osborne and Whited testifying for the NY DA, but makes no mention of the grand jury clerk's minutes. Subject to seeing otherwise in the transcript, I believe it was offered as impeachment during cross-examination where it had logical relevance on credibility. It was not otherwise logically relevant to the issue of whether he was actually or constructively present in New Jersey at the time of the kidnapping (possibly conditionally relevant, but I doubt the court would permit conditionally relevant data like this at this point).

JM

Re: MJR's analysis about the "closet trim"  
Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 02:32:17  
204.170.64.37 writes:

Do you want a copy of the bx extradition transcript?

I have seen the trim , is there anything specifically about it you wish to know?

philip

**"closet trim"**

**Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 09:59:23**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**The question we had about the rendition hearing was whether there were "live" questions and answers of Bruno about the board or whether that evidence was "read into the record" from the earlier grand jury notes. Maybe you can answer that for us.**

**I frankly can't recall whether I saw the board or not, its been a while ago. Having seen it yourself, do you think Bruno would have been confused as to whether it had been part of his door?**

**JM**

**Re: MJR's analysis about the "closet trim"**

**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 07:48:08**

**206.214.112.36 writes:**

**---1. Foley hands Bruno the trim in the grand jury room. Bruno looks at the writing and admits it is his, but he does not recognize the difference between the trim and the actual door he wrote on? ---**

**You're going to have to give me the testimony on this one. Hauptmann didn't think this trim was actually the door. No one did.**

**---2. Bruno writes on the back of the closet door (surely he didn't write on the front of the door), but you think it would be inconceivable that he would write one to two inches to the left or right on the trim?---**

**The trim inside a closet only a foot deep - in a place even the police couldn't see it without backing into the closet.**

**---We know that Foley put the trim in his hands on the afternoon of Sept. 25. We know that Bruno looked at the trim and stated that the writing was his. We know that Bruno gave an explanation for why he wrote on the piece of trim which was placed in his hands on Sept. 25.---**

**Yes. Foley showed him a board, told him it came from a closet in his apartment - without telling him just where in the closet they found it - and asked if it was his handwriting. Hauptmann said it was. He also said he couldn't read it, did not remember writing it and was giving the only explanation he could for why it was there.**

**---We know he never categorically denied writing on the trim, either in the rendition hearing or at the actual trial. All of his answers and testimony was qualified in this respect.---**

**"Q [by Wilentz]: You don't know anything about [the crime] but you wrote Condon's name and address on this board..."**

**A: No, positively not.**

**Q: Positively not?**

**A: Positively not."**

**If that is not a categorical denial, I don't know what is. Not enough for a categorical denial? Add these:**

**"After I was thinking of it, this board, special from the place where they took them, and it is impossible I ever put it there."**

**Or**

**"I am positively sure I wouldn't write anything in the inside of a closet."**

**Or**

**"I wouldn't make any notice on the inside of a closet where you have no chance to stand to write or read, it is impossible."**

**Those answers are not 'qualified'. They are categorical: "I did not" and "I would not".**

**The answers that he "qualified" were ones about what statements he made to Foley and/or Wilentz at one time or another. "Didn't you tell Foley this on this date? Didn't he ask you this question at this time." Hauptmann kept saying he couldn't remember who asked what or what he said to the "hundreds of questions" asked of him. "I said I can't remember all them single questions, because there was so many questions at this time."**

**You really have to read the transcript to get the full impression. Wilentz was firing questions at him 2 and 3 at a time and then demanding (without pause) "Well, then, why don't you answer" When Hauptmann tried to answer, half the time Wilentz cut him off. "Either you did or you didn't." Hauptmann asked him to slow down and give him time to translate the questions and answers. "I am thinking in German and I have to translate it in American language, and it needs quite a bit of time; so excuse me." More than once, he tried to stop Wilentz to tell him he didn't understand the words he used (sometimes Wilentz 'translated' other times he did not and just kept going.)**

**Some will call it evasive. IMHO, it is just as likely that it was confusion.**

**---Without the actual transcript, it is difficult to tell, but there is no reference to a statement being read into evidence.---**

**Hauptmann may well have repeated at the hearing the things he said to Foley on September 25. Certainly, however, he did not say anything MORE incriminating because when Wilentz wanted to use it in his case-in-chief in Flemington, he used the statement to Foley not testimony from the Bronx.**

**---Subject to seeing otherwise in the transcript, I believe it was offered as impeachment during cross-examination where it had logical relevance on credibility. ---**

**If Hauptmann was saying the same thing in the hearing in the Bronx, there was no need to "impeach" him on the question.**

**---It was not otherwise logically relevant to the issue of whether he was actually or constructively present in New Jersey at the time of the kidnapping (possibly conditionally relevant, but I doubt the court would permit conditionally relevant data like this at this point).---**

**You forget that the State only placed Hauptmann in NJ through 'evidence' that he was involved in the rest of the plot. (Likewise Wilentz's statements that Osborn's opinion that Hauptmann wrote the notes constitutes Hauptmann's "admission" that he was in the Lindbergh nursery.)**

**Certainly at the hearing in the Bronx they had NO witness whatever who even attempted to put Hauptmann in NJ on March 1. In Flemington they produced only Hochmuth - and he did not appear until December.**

**Mjr**

**If I became a lawyer for a moment...**

**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 11:25:13**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**"Q [by Wilentz]: You don't know anything about [the crime] but you wrote Condon's name and address on this board...**

**A: No, positively not.**

**Q: Positively not?**

**A: Positively not."**

-----  
**How would one of you lawyers analyze this? "You don't know anything about the crime (Element) but you wrote Condon's name (element) and address (element) on this board..."**

**A compound element question followed by a single element answer.**

**Bruno's answer would be true if just one of the elements were false. If he didn't write Condon's NAME on the board, for example. Was Condon's name on the board, or was it just part of a street name and the phone number?**

**When confronted with the Board initially Bruno admitted it was his writing, made up an excuse for it, and never categorically denied any of this. When he got to the trial, and found the hook in his mouth he had placed there himself, he began to make denials. I realize this may be a rare occurrence in criminal trials but it could happen. What is it you say about this? "Were you lying then or are you lying now?". I have a picture from somewhere, I don't recall the source, but it is of a man carrying the door followed by someone holding the trim. It is a pretty wide door, certainly wide enough to stand in and write on the side of the wall easily. All he had to do was reach around the door frame and write the information. His hand may not have extended more than half the one foot depth of the closet. It is not "impossible" as Bruno claims. Try this simple test. If your desk doesn't sit against the wall, and if there is 6 inches or so space between it and the wall, see if you can reach around the side and write on your desk without having to stand between it and the wall.**

**What is harder to believe is that he would admit writing something he knew he didn't write. His answers, even the ones you cite from the trial transcript, are couched in terms of "I wouldn't have written it there" or "I couldn't have written it there". By categorical, I, perhaps unclearly, meant he didn't say "I am looking at this writing and what it says. This is not my handwriting, and I did not write these words".**

**As to the speed of the questions at trial, law schools teach that, don't they?**

**JM**

**Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 12:09:04  
204.60.23.37 writes:**

**"As to the speed of the questions at trial, law schools teach that, don't they?"**

**Sure, as an obfuscatory dodge to use when you want to baffle a jury rather than let them see the truth.**

**David**

**Obfuscatory Dodge**

**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 12:25:59**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Obfuscatory Dodge? Wasn't that the car Bruno had?**

**Actually, I understand that the reason offered by law schools as to the rate of cross-examination questions is that lying people wouldn't have time to manufacture consistent answers. You may recall that the writing samples the police made Bruno give were done very quickly so that the writing would be more from habit than from time to disguise. Somewhat the same principle.**

**JM**

**Re: Obfuscatory Dodge**

**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 13:01:28**

**204.60.23.37 writes:**

**"the reason offered by law schools"**

**Well, of course, what else are law schools going to call it? True, those lying probably wouldn't have time to "manufacture" answer, and neither would German-speaking immigrants have time to comprehend, think through and actually answer questions that are "asked" mainly for the benefit of the jurors' powers of implication.**

**David**

**Thanks**

**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 14:22:47**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Its a simple situation. A fact is offered; one interpretation is suggested; and you are free to choose another. I have no problem with that. I don't know about the jurors' ability for implication, however, I believe their ability for inference was quite good.**

**JM**

**Re: Obfuscatory Dodge**  
**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 17:01:21**  
**205.188.199.183 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;Actually, I understand that the reason offered by law schools as to the rate of cross-examination questions is that lying people wouldn't have time to manufacture consistent answers;;;;;;;;;;**  
**There you go again - JM - missing the point, as usual! The tactics of tripping up a lying witness usually requires that the questioner and the answerer actually have the same "mother tongue"! Sheesh! What's fair is fair!**  
**How would you like to receive a barrage of questions in a Turkish courtroom? Is your Turkish that good JM? Would you ask for a translation of everything before you answered? Even if it were only your drivers' license at stake I bet you would - so why is Hauptmann different with his life at stake?**

**ronelle**

**Turkish Courtrooms**  
**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 17:32:35**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Ah, yes, poor Bruno. Maybe he would have been better off continuing to commit his burglaries and robberies in a country where he could speak the language so he could better sort his lies out. It put him at a distinct disadvantage--having to lie and get around conspicuous admissions in another language.**

**JM**

**Re: Turkish Courtrooms**  
**Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 17:54:24**  
**204.60.23.37 writes:**

**That's right, the dirty little furriner's obviously guilty from the get-go, so why worry about a fair trial? Just get it over with and fry the lying wretch.**

**David**

**Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 20:25:29  
206.214.112.146 writes:**

**I love it. Hauptmann denied the writing on the board but he didn't mean ALL of the writing. He just meant he didn't write the NAME. He could do this because of Wilentz's several 'element' question. Come on. His denial was adamant. Try listening to him. (It is one of the newsreel clips that routinely appears in documentaries about the case.)**

**He said that when first shown the board and told it came from his apartment he thought the writing was his - although he did not remember writing it. When he learned the absurd place it was found, he knew it wasn't his because he wouldn't write something there. (And he did, BTW, say that the handwriting was not his.)**

**He said "I didn't" and "I wouldn't".**

**---All he had to do was reach around the door frame and write the information. His hand may not have extended more than half the one foot depth of the closet.---**

**Of course it wouldn't do him any good there, would it? Even the police officers who found it (and that is a whole other story) said you couldn't read it unless you stood in the closet - backwards - with the shelf, etc. removed.**

**--- If your desk doesn't sit against the wall, and if there is 6 inches or so space between it and the wall, see if you can reach around the side and write on your desk without having to stand between it and the wall.---**

**I would never write something in a place I couldn't read it. Would you?**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Thursday, 29-Apr-1999 20:46:08  
204.60.61.22 writes:**

**"I would never write something in a place I couldn't read it. Would you?"**

**Only if I wanted to make absolutely certain that nobody else would find it.**

**David**



**Re: Re: Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 07:38:35  
206.214.112.143 writes:**

**--- Only if I wanted to make absolutely certain that nobody else would find it. ---**

**Why would no one else find it? Because no one (including Hauptmann) could read it? So why write it there at all?**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Friday, 30-Apr-1999 10:17:53  
204.60.25.66 writes:**

**Really, if I know a certain phone number -- a girlfriend or a bookie's, say -- is written on the underside of a planking board here in my study, I can look it up any time I want and my wife won't ever accidentally find it. Sure it's a little trouble to get at, but I probably have the number memorized and don't need to pull the board up every time I make a call, but if it slips my mind I know where to find it -- yet no one else will. Scraps of paper get lost or stumbled across, numbers written in obscure yet findable places stay hidden. It's like putting a valuable ring in a safe-deposit box: Doesn't make sense if you use it every day, but if you just want to know it's safe in a place you can get at it if you really need to, it makes a lot of sense.**

**I'm not saying Hauptmann wrote the number there, I tend to think he didn't, but those who maintain he did aren't running afoul of common sense.**

**David**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: If I became a lawyer for a moment...  
Saturday, 01-May-1999 07:35:40  
206.214.112.44 writes:**

**---I can look it up any time---**

**My point, exactly - he couldn't look it up anytime. The police officers who found the writing said that it couldn't be seen unless one was standing IN the closet, with everything removed. That is THEIR analysis of Hauptmann's access to it, not mine.**

**Mjr**

**You just might...**

**Friday, 30-Apr-1999 12:35:55**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**I would never write something in a place I couldn't read it. Would you?**

**Unless, of course, you were a murderer and the writing would be evidence of guilt.**

**The "tortured multi-element" example was designed to reflect some of the absolutely bizarre reasoning employed by the ABBs ("anybody but Bruno). Especially the foolish notion that CAL and AML would carry a similar ladder on board the airplane on the trip.**

**JM**

## **Trial not the whole story**

**Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 12:55:35**

**Message:**

**152.163.201.193 writes:**

Obviously the trial is what ultimately got BRH convicted and executed. Yet why do we focus on it so much? Only a small part this story lies in the evidence presented in Flemington. Many books and other sources have been mentioned on this site. Anyone have an opinion about Loss of Eden by Joyce Milton? I haven't seen this one mentioned before. Check out the possible Charles Ellerson-Duane Baker links to the crime. As for Jafsie-Many people all over the country sent letters to their local paper offering to assist in any way. If the kidnapper(s) were based in, say, Philadelphia, they could have read about offers to act as an intermediary in smaller "local" papers similar to the Bronx Home News. This is why I don't find anything sinister in what Dr. Condon did-he never dreamed the kidnapper(s) would actually contact him. Why March 1? It was announced in the papers that very morning that Lindbergh Sr. wasn't going to be at home that evening. He was scheduled to speak at a fund-raising banquet in New York but a scheduling mix-up caused him to be a no-show. The kidnapper(s) didn't want to make their attempt with Dad around just in case they were found out and had to make a quick exit-possibly by force. Tens of thousands of dollars in ransom money not accounted for? What's the big deal? It was probably "laundered". Many bank robberies have been solved even though some or all of the money was never accounted for. Does every loose end have to be completely tied up? Lindbergh himself did it? OK, fine. So his wife knows he did it as well (how could she not know?) He gets her to go along with his cover-up and tells her he'll bury the body of their only child in a shallow grave a few miles from their home where it will be devoured by wild animals. She proceeds to have FIVE MORE CHILDREN with this man. Hard to swallow. No confession? Either BRH confesses to doing the deed by himself (which he knew would NOT GUARANTEE that his life would be spared) or he confesses to his role and also names his accomplices. These accomplices or some not-very-nice cohorts of theirs proceed to exact their revenge on Bruno by going after his wife and child. He leaves his wife with some small shred of dignity by not confessing-she can live out her life clinging to her belief that her husband really was innocent. Just a few of my thoughts on the case. Thanks for the chance to respond.

**Robin Haines**

**Re: Trial not the whole story**  
**Wednesday, 28-Apr-1999 19:32:46**  
**204.170.64.14 writes:**

**Joyce Milton is currently working on a book about Julius and Ethel Rosenberg.**