

Reeve's Doubts

Friday, 22-Jan-99 14:57:43

Message:
152.163.207.194 writes:

Here is an excerpt from The Bergen Record's article of November 12, 1997. Richard Cowen, staff writer, interviewed Reeve Lindbergh when she visited the school that was founded by her aunt Elizabeth in Englewood, NJ.

"Reeve Lindbergh has doubts whether Hauptmann was the killer, but she does think he was involved in the plot.

'I can't believe that he was entirely innocent,' she said. 'It's hard for me to believe that he wasn't involved in some way. But I have no idea who climbed up to that window and stole that baby.' "

ronelle

Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Sunday, 24-Jan-99 11:37:26
152.163.207.184 writes:

In an interview in 1994, regarding Ahlgren and Monier's book, she condemned their theory that her father accidentally killed her brother while playing a joke on her mother. She claimed Ahlgren and Monier didn't know what they were talking about because her father never stopped playing his "practical jokes" as the co-authors claimed he had done after Hauptmann's death. (In fact, this is one of the errors in their book.) As Reeve explained to the news reporter, a friend [Jim Newton] was trying to change into a bathing suit in the closet of her Darien house and she watched her father throw a canister of teargas into the closet as a joke! Her father always played jokes til the day he died said Reeve.

This teargas gag is typical of the kind of sadistic behavior that everyone mistakenly refers to as a "practical joke" when they try to gloss over Lindbergh's crude behavior.

I am sure Reeve had other condemnations for Ahlgren and Monier's book but how could anyone expect otherwise, she is Lindbergh's youngest daughter. It is understandable that she would be upset by their theories. I feel much sympathy for her. Her memoir, "Under A Wing" is a living nightmare - Stephen King should make

it into a movie. Scary stuff, living with a father whose personality resembled a storm trooper.

ronelle

Re: Reeve's Doubts
Sunday, 24-Jan-99 20:58:36
207.220.150.179 writes:

People who are really interested should read "Under a Wing" themselves. The book as a whole provides a very different impression of Lindbergh than is given here, and certainly a different one from that presented by A&M.

Mjr

Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Monday, 25-Jan-99 03:41:33
152.163.197.58 writes:

I honestly do not know how "Under A Wing" could be read without becoming aware of a seriously dysfunctional family in which Lindbergh cruelly terrorizes his children and wife. Maybe everyone has their own definition of child and spousal abuse but I do believe Lindbergh, with his twisted and grossly distorted ideas of manhood, husbandship and fatherhood, was as guilty as sin of abusing his wife and kids. Reeve's intention, though she has denied it, appears to have been to counter the unflattering stuff Berg (and so many others) presents in his book, yet her memoir is often worse. Reeve's book, rather than minimizing that reputation, only heightened it for me. Her father was hardly ever home and when he did show up they couldn't help wishing he would turn around and go out again. The mental and emotional torment she describes throughout her memoir is disturbing not only for the kids but for mom as well who thought of divorcing him more than once. Anne even had a sexual relationship with Dr.Dana Atchley in her husband's absence. But the real horror of Reeve's book, for me, was her description of her father's tolerant moments. All the more horrifying because the child, and the reader, understands that this moment is only a short reprieve from the storm. Living with an unpredictably disruptive personality is one of the scariest things anyone can endure growing up. Chares Lindbergh was unpredictable in his cruelty and drove his family into his self-imposed exile from the world. Imagine having to get up and

leave a restaurant at the mere recognition of Lindbergh by a diner at another table! Imagine your father pulling the cotton balls out of your ears cause he wants you to suffer the loud plane engines that are painful to you. In an attempt to excuse his intolerant methods of child-rearing his daughter tells us he really wasn't so bad - he was just hard of hearing! That's why he was so intolerant and relentless - he couldn't hear! All of those loud engines and no cotton balls I suppose. Was he already hard of hearing by April 2 1932 at the Bronx cemetery where he claimed, 2 years later, to have heard Hauptmann's voice? We will probably never know unless his medical records are revealed someday. But, from all accounts of Lindbergh's behavior, written not only by his daughter but others close to the family, Lindbergh would be considered , by today's standards, an abusive father and husband.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 03:31:57
152.163.197.191 writes:

I have just re-read "Under A Wing" and tried very hard to pretend that I knew nothing about Charles Lindbergh from any other source. Under those conditions Lindbergh appeared in his daughter's memoir simply as an unconventional father and practically harmless. However, there are many testimonials from eye witnesses - Amelia Earhardt, George Putnam, Harold and Nigel Nicolson, Will Rogers, Jim Newton, Anne Morrow, Betty Morrow, Betty Gow, etc. - revealing a very different father and husband. Cruel behavior that includes : the twirling of his baby Jon over his own head while holding him by the ankle to teach him a lesson, allowing a hyperactive butting ram to repeatedly "toughen up" his 8 year old boy in a sheep meadow while daddy watched from behind a fence until the ram got tired of butting his son, pouring ice water on the penis of a 9 year old boy in front of dinner guests, pouring a glass of water over his wife's head to humiliate her in front of new friends, throwing his kids into lakes to teach them how to swim, putting his baby in a homemade chicken coop for many hours in the freezing outdoors, purposely dropping his baby in the bathtub, repeatedly knocking his baby down by throwing couch cushions at him in order to make a man out of him while he learned how to walk, refusing to land the plane when he knew his wife , 7 months pregnant, was seriously ill and passing out from the high altitude and speed. Yes, this is the behavior of a sadist - not a hero.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Thursday, 28-Jan-99 07:06:54
207.220.150.120 writes:**

--- pouring a glass of water over his wife's head to humiliate her in front of new friends ---

--- repeatedly knocking his baby down by throwing couch cushions at him in order to make a man out of him while he learned how to walk ---

**--- refusing to land the plane when he knew his wife , 7 months pregnant, was seriously ill and passing out from the high altitude and speed. ---
I didn't take the time to look up the stories listed, however, I do know that at these three descriptions are inaccurate - at least according to the people who were there.**

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Thursday, 28-Jan-99 23:10:27
205.188.192.177 writes:**

;;;;;;I didn't take the time to look up the stories listed, however, I do know that at these three descriptions are inaccurate - at least according to the people who were there.

;;;

Amelia Earhart, James Newton and Will Rogers were the eyewitnesses to these 3 scenarios in which Lindbergh exhibited abusive and despicable behavior. They were only a few of many witnesses to his sadism. So what is it they all said that you have a problem with? Or, are they all lying about what they saw him do?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Friday, 29-Jan-99 05:59:23
207.220.150.48 writes:

Well, what did people say about these incidents:

--- pouring a glass of water over his wife's head to humiliate her in front of new friends ---

George Putnam (from his biography of Earhart):

"Anne, the Colonel and AE [Amelia Earhart] were fellow guests at the home of Jack Maddux in Hollywood. One night they were sitting about close to the icebox. Anne and AE were drinking buttermilk. Lindbergh, standing behind his wife munching a tomato sandwich, had the sudden impulse to let drops of water fall in a stream on his wife's shoulder from a glass in his hand.

(MY NOTE: NOTICE HE SAYS NOTHING ABOUT "POURING A GLASS OF WATER ON HER HEAD".)

"Anne was wearing a sweet dress of pale blue silk. Water spots silk. AE observed a growing unhappiness on Anne's part - but no move toward rebellion, not even any murmur of complaint. AE often said that Anne Lindbergh is the best sport in the world.

"Then Anne rose and stood by the door, with her back to the others, and her head resting on her arm. AE thought, with horror, that the impossible had come to pass, and that Anne was crying. But Anne was thinking out a solution to her problem, and the instant she thought it out, she acted on it. At once - and with surprising thoroughness.

"With one comprehensive movement she swung around and - quite simply - threw the contents of her glass straight over the Colonel's blue serge suit. It made a simply marvellous mess! Lindbergh's look of utter amazement changed into a tremendous grin, and he threw his head up and shouted with laughter. The joke, very practical, was on him!"

BTW - when A&M used this quote as an example of Lindbergh's personality, they did not include the last two sentences (the part about him laughing), why not, do you suppose? Could it be that it changed the impression one got of Lindbergh from the story?

--- repeatedly knocking his baby down by throwing couch cushions at him in order to make a man out of him while he learned how to walk ---

He may have done this on more than one occasion, I suppose, but here is Anne Lindbergh's description:

"They [Charles and Charles Jr.] had a pillow fight the other day, at least Charles threw pillows at the boy and knocked him down but he only laughed (which surprised Charles very much and he was quite proud of him) and picked up a pillow clumsily and tried to throw it at his father."

I'm sorry, Ronelle, but that does not sound like "repeatedly knocking his baby down by throwing couch cushions at him in order to make a man out of him while he learned how to walk". It sounds like horseplay. Too rough? Perhaps, but horseplay none the less.

--- refusing to land the plane when he knew his wife , 7 months pregnant, was seriously ill and passing out from the high altitude and speed. ---

Anne said later that she was sick, but she also said that she DID NOT tell Charles she was sick. Even A&M say THAT. How could he have "refused to land" knowing Anne was sick if she didn't tell him? Indeed, how could he have known she was?

BTW, which one of the people you listed - Earhart, Newton or Rogers was the "eyewitness" to this? Which one was in the plane with them? (That of, course, being what is required to make one an "eyewitness".)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Saturday, 30-Jan-99 05:36:01
205.188.192.172 writes:

;;;;;;;;;when A&M used this quote as an example of Lindbergh's personality, they did not include the last two sentences (the part about him laughing), why not, do you suppose? Could it be that it changed the impression one got of Lindbergh from the story?;;;;;;;;;;

First of all, the shoulder or the head makes no difference in respect to the despicable behavior of a husband humiliating his wife in front of friends. Also, Earhart noticed, Lindbergh was resentful about his wife's enthusiastic feminine conversation which is what prompted his behavior.

Second, I do not, as you suggest, "suppose" anything! I asked Gregory Ahlgren about that quote because this laughable criticism of their book appeared as one of the "errors" in a very bizarre list sent to me by Mark Falzini, archivist at the Trenton Museum (he has offered to rename that list with something other than "errors." I was astounded to find that the Police Museum spent its time adding such a pathetic item to its attack upon their book.)

However, Ahlgren told me they had to end the quote somewhere and that to argue this point is senseless since the longer version does not change a thing. And he is right. IMHO, Lindbergh is the same disgusting husband laughing as not laughing. What is the difference to you? I do not understand.

Did Lindbergh have any choice but to laugh? He was now being humiliated by his wife who wasn't gonna take it anymore! It is obvious that he did not expect to have buttermilk thrown in his face since his timid wife was always a good target for his sadistic "jokes." It is amazing to me that you can nitpick about whether it was her head or her shoulder that he poured his water over.

Third, You are guilty of the same thing you accuse A&M of. You didn't give us the next sentence of Earhart's story either. (we can go on and on forever but somewhere the quote must end eventually!) Here is the next sentence.

"AE always suspected that no more of Anne's wardrobe ever got spotted - at least in that way"

Dorothy Hermann's book *A Gift Of Life* (pages 61-62) clearly explains Earhart's (and Putnam's) disgust with Lindbergh's crudeness towards others, noting also, that Earhart reveled in this "joke" being turned against him unexpectedly. You bet he laughed!

AE and Putnam were also witnesses to his ice-water "trick" on the 9 year old Maddux boy's penis in front of dinner guests.

I mistakenly included Jim Newton in the list of eyewitnesses for the items you objected to. Newton was the eyewitness to the horrendous scene with the hyperactive ram and other cruel acts towards the Lindbergh kids. He had also been the butt of the teargas canister joke.

But the 14,000 mile flight in which Anne, 7 months pregnant, passed out and had to be hospitalized was, as you know, reported by many newspapers although Lindbergh denied it. Anne even made an excuse for him by later saying that she suffered in silence. Even though he sat in the front cockpit you cannot make me believe that a considerate (or just plain human) husband would not have found the time to turn his head around to look at his pregnant wife at least once in 14 hours! I have flown in open cockpit planes and I cannot imagine being 7 months pregnant and enduring such a trip. 14 hours is too long for him to be absolved of such cruelty.

And the "horseplay" you refer to (knocking down his toddler with couch cushions) is another sad indication of a cruel bully picking on people who were helpless. As for Anne's version of this, you really aren't naive enough to believe that she was allowed to reveal her husband's mean streak in her published memoirs, are you?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Saturday, 30-Jan-99 07:21:47
207.220.150.37 writes:

--- However, Ahlgren told me they had to end the quote somewhere ---

So they ended it in mid-paragraph?

--- and that to argue this point is senseless since the longer version does not change a thing. And he is right. ---

They may not think it does, and you may not think it does, but everyone else I know who read their version and then the correct one seems to think it does. Those people will be interested to know that A&M consider Lindbergh's reaction to the buttermilk on his suit (not in his face, by the way) irrelevant. If he had yelled at her (i.e. if his reaction had been negative), would they have considered that relevant?

--- It is amazing to me that you can nitpick about whether it was her head or her shoulder that he poured his water over. ---

I was merely pointing out that your depiction the incident - that he poured a glass of water over her head - was factually incorrect. Sorry if you consider that nitpicking. I do, however, think that the difference between the actual discription of the incident "let drops of water fall in a stream on [her]shoulder..." and your description that he "poured a glass of water on her head" (or A&M's word "dumped") is significant.

--- Third, You are guilty of the same thing you accuse A&M of. You didn't give us the next sentence of Earhart's story either. (we can go on and on forever but somewhere the quote must end eventually!)Here is the next sentence.

"AE always suspected that no more of Anne's wardrobe ever got spotted - at least in that way" ---

Like you said, the quote has to end somewhere. I ended it at the conclusion of the paragraph describing the incident, thereby including the entire incident - even Lindbergh's reaction. A&M chose to end it in mid-paragraph, thereby deleting Lindbergh's reaction.

If you want to carry it on to the next paragraph, however, that is fine. What about the incident do you feel that next paragraph changes?

--- But the 14,000 mile flight in which Anne, 7 months pregnant, passed out and had to be hospitalized was , as you know, reported by many newspapers although Lindbergh denied it. ---

I didn't dispute that Anne was sick. I disputed your claim that he "refused" to land the plane even though she was sick. BTW, she said she was sick, not that she passed out.

--- Anne even made an excuse for him by later saying that she suffered in silence. --
-

I see. Anne said she didn't tell him but she was lying.

--- As for Anne's version of this, you really aren't naive enough to believe that she was allowed to reveal her husband's mean streak in her published memoirs, are you? ---

Again, Anne said this but she was lying.

(BTW the quote is from a February 1932 letter to Charles's mother, not a later writing.)

Old Anne was quite a liar, wasn't she?

So why believe anything she says? (Like - "I didn't see a note". Or "we searched the room." Or that she initially thought it was one of Charles's jokes.) Why is she credible when she says something you like and not credible when she says something you don't like?

--- one of the "errors" in a very bizarre list sent to me by Mark Falzini, archivist at the Trenton Museum ---

Why not post the list and rebut them? It might go a long way toward convincing the people who also noticed the many "errors" in the book.

--- ...he has offered to rename that list with something other than "errors." ---

I'm sure he has.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Saturday, 30-Jan-99 12:29:19
152.163.197.61 writes:

;;;;;;A&M chose to end it in mid-paragraph, thereby deleting Lindbergh's reaction.
;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

Lindbergh's reaction to the buttermilk had nothing to do with his intended viciousness towards his wife, whose dress he had just soiled and whom he had just cruelly humiliated. His laughing reaction to the buttermilk was obviously his own embarrassment at having been hoist by his own petard and unexpectedly humiliated himself in front of Earhart and Putnam. Why are you making a federal case out of this? The anecdote in Ahlgren and Monier's book, based upon the eyewitness account that cannot be discredited, illustrates anti-social behavior. That is all A&M were trying to illustrate - anti-social behavior.

;;;;;What about the incident do you feel that next paragraph changes?
;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

It corroborates A&M's description of Lindbergh's probable motive for the water dripping. They attributed his behavior to his disapproval of his wife's enthusiasm for Earhart's feminist ideas - and Earhart was a real feminist, unlike Anne who allowed herself to be abused and pushed around by a pathetic bully. Earhart admired Anne for giving it back. As Dorothy Hermann explains in Gift For Life, Earhart and Putnam "took a dim view of the man." Lindbergh, "reveal[ed] hostility towards people- including those to whom he was closest." pages 61-62. Earhart reveled in the fact that Anne was able to turn the joke against her husband and so the last sentence is proof of Earhart's feminist support for Anne whom she considered a victim of her husband's adolescent cruelty. Whether it is shoulders or heads doesn't matter (and as he was standing above and behind his wife while

doing this he was actually pouring it over [above] her head)if you want to nitpick some more.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Saturday, 30-Jan-99 13:30:35
152.163.197.59 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;. I disputed your claim that he "refused" to land the plane even though she was sick. BTW, she said she was sick, not that she passed out;;;;;;;;;;

Yes, flying for 14 hours and knowing your wife is ill is , IMHO, the same as "refusing." What kind of human being endangers the lives of his firstborn child and his wife in order to set a speed record? This is one of the most contemptible acts of Lindbergh's life. And again, you are making a federal case by nitpicking over words cause you just don't like the images these descriptions portray - a heartless and repugnant man who thinks that every person ought to be a ruthless daredevil like himself. And, if, God forbid, they should resist the daredevilry and risk-taking that he valued so much, all the more reason to teach them a lesson. He treated Anne like a piece of garbage - and she backed him up in that effort all the way. A feminist indeed! I laugh every time I hear that from the mouth of Berg on his TV interviews. Anne had very low self-esteem -typical of spousal abuse.

;;;;;;;;;;Old Anne was quite a liar, wasn't she?

;;;;;;;;;;

Yes. And the lies she told were all to herself - the way most abused women operate in order to go on with their delusions of a happy marriage to a "hero" husband. I think Dorothy Hermann illustrates this aspect of Anne's mind in her book (Gift of Life) quite well.

;;;;;;;;;;So why believe anything she says? (Like - "I didn't see a note". Or "we searched the room." Or that she initially thought it was one of Charles's jokes.) Why is she credible when she says something you like and not credible when she says something you don't like

;;;;;;;;;;

Anne's "lies" were the most personal kind - to protect herself from reality and to protect them both from a bad public image. Abused wives typically cover up the horrors (embarrassments) of their marriage the way she did (and continues to do.)

There is no reason to believe Anne purposely lied about anything at the trial. (She was never even allowed to have any voice in her husband's investigation from its beginning, nor was she allowed to make the decision about the child's cremation at its end) I do not believe her excuses of him for the 14 hour flight nor do I believe her published memoirs are accurate descriptions of her suffering life under Lindbergh's tyranny. How can anyone believe he didn't know she was sick in that plane? She was 7 months pregnant. If she couldn't stand up or even get out of the plane and needed to be hospitalized after landing how could any symptoms leading to this kind of serious injury have gone unnoticed by him for over 14 hours? "Suffering in silence" is not a sufficient excuse and only highlights Lindbergh's inhumane and worthless character. Sorry for you if he is still your hero - he stinks.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Reeve's Doubts
Saturday, 30-Jan-99 13:49:49
152.163.197.59 writes:**

**;;;;;;-- one of the "errors" in a very bizarre list sent to me by Mark Falzini, archivist
at the Trenton Museum ---
;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;**

I had planned on adding The Police Museum's "errors" list of Ahlgren and Monier's book to the website but have not updated that site for several months now. Mark and I discussed the list and he agreed with me that a certain amount of "errors" were just interpretations of facts - not errors at all. And, some of the "errors" were actually erroneous. So he was going to rename the list and I have no idea what he calls it now. But the fact that someone - Mark says it was a volunteer - went through all the trouble to compile a list of what the NJ Police considered to be errors in A & M's book without doing such research on any other book is so blatantly unfair (not unlike the trial itself.) No book, it seems to me, is error-free. Mark asked me to announce that he would welcome such a list of "errors" by anyone willing to put in the effort - and it can even be Jim Fisher's book as well, which he said has numerous errors.

So, go to it, MJR! Falzini says he will welcome any volunteer effort to expose errors in any book.(Or are you the person who compiled the list of A & M's errors? Your objection to the buttermilk incident is one of the bizarre entries on that list.)

Don't worry , I will definitely offer the list on this message board but since it is 4 pages long and too unwieldy for one thread I will put it up piecemeal. Are you salivating yet?

ronelle

**Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Friday, 22-Jan-99 22:00:10**

**Message:
205.188.192.48 writes:**

Sorry about the length of this pathetic quote. It is from Berg's bio of Lindbergh and it sums up 10 years of his "research."

**.....
"In the 60 years since the "Lindbergh Case," countless theories suggesting Hauptmann's innocence have surfaced. There is room for such hypotheses because there was never any evidence placing Hauptmann on the Lindbergh property, either outside on the ladder or inside the baby's bedroom. But even if several witnesses had been coerced or had convinced themselves that Hauptmann was guilty and worth perjuring themselves for, even if evidence had been faked or tampered with, even if law enforcement agencies had botched their work, even if all the expert testimony from both sides nullified each other, even if Richard Hauptmann had been a more sympathetic witness, more at ease with the English language and less a target for a hostile press corps, even if the court had been biased against him - there remained a veritable mountain of undisputed evidence against him, a man so chronically secretive that his own wife declared she did not even know his first name was Bruno until the tabloids smeared it across their front pages."**

.....

**I do not know where the "veritable mountain of undisputed evidence" is (probably in Fisher's book) but according to Berg it was quite OK to put a man in the electric chair cause his wife didn't know his German name. Sounds like some of the arguments on this board.
ronelle**

**Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Sunday, 24-Jan-99 11:47:54
207.68.63.68 writes:**

**I think Hauptmann was not guilty because of a poor investigation an innocent man and a child had to die. I think Lindberg had something to do with it. Because if it was my child everyone would have been involed.
Virginia.**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Sunday, 07-Feb-99 00:41:23
152.163.204.181 writes:**

**;;;;;I SENSE HE DIDNT WANT TO BE IN THE CAT AND MOUSE GAME OF PROVING
HAUPTMANS INNOCENT OR GUILT.HE STATED HIS BELIEF AND THAT WAS
IT.;;;;;**

So, we should just take Berg's word that Hauptmann was guilty? When he goes around the country talking about his book he takes only 1 or 2 questions from the audience and never debates the issues of Hauptmann's guilt or innocence on any tv or radio program I have ever heard. He is the sneakiest of authors cause there are lots of folks out there who would love to confront him. He did the "research" for 10 years (he claims he set out to prove Hauptmann innocent yet!) and we should just accept Berg's verdict of the case even though he provides nothing in the way of proof. That pathetic paragraph I listed above is his summation of his research! The book is 625 pages and completely filled with stuff that anyone on this message board could have written after 10 years! There is nothing new in his book except for Anne Morrow's love affair with her doctor. His entire coverage of the case, from beginning to end, could have been taken out of the books already written years ago. I do not know what Scott Berg did for 10 years. He certainly has nothing new to say nor can he justify his "verdict."

**ronelle
Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Thursday, 18-Feb-99 13:10:06
209.214.204.5 writes:**

**Ronelle,
Very Good point! I did check this miserable book out recently, and what a load of nonsense it turned out to be!! You are most certainly correct,it could have been written by anyone who attends this forum. If the common people took time to read the true facts about Lindbergh, the status of "HERO" would turn into "Monster." I can not believe some of the things I have read on this forum, and most of all, the idiom of Steve Romeo. I have taught first year law students that present better points than this man,(how I would love to have him in a debate!) I applaud you on your firm standing, and your facts!
Michael Mc Masters**

Michael A. Mc Masters, Attorney At Law

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Sunday, 21-Feb-99 23:30:11
152.163.206.212 writes:

;;;;;;;;;I applaud you on your firm standing, and your facts!

;;;

Thanks for your encouragement Michael. Actually, I was thinking of taking the LSAT exam this year but haven't yet found the courage.I've been putting it off for 3 years already. (MJR is probably laughing.)

;;;;;;;;;;If the common people took time to read the true facts about Lindbergh, the status of "HERO" would turn into "Monster." ;;;;;;;;;;

This is why Spielberg's purchase of Berg's book is so disturbing to me - people do not question "Hollywood history." Once a movie is made about Lindbergh - and according to Berg's assessment he was simply "misunderstood" - the "monster" may possibly become an admired hero once more.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Monday, 22-Feb-99 11:14:15
205.183.31.67 writes:

IN WHAT WAY IS BERGS BOOK BAD ? I DONT UNDERSATAND THIS BASHING.YOU PEOPLE LOVE HAUPTMAN THAT MUCH? TO SAY HE IS A BETTER MAN THEN LINDBERGH? YOUR ALL NUTS.

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re: Re: Scott Berg's "even if" theory of guilt.
Friday, 12-Mar-99 14:41:21
204.170.64.63 writes:

Of the many facets of the Lindy case is the realization is the case against Haupty is only circumstantial and not rock solid.

We are use to the Occam Razor in argument, as long as it covers all the bases - the simpliest explanation is the best.

Try this one for the ladder:

It did come from Hauptmann's house. Either he built it or it was done by a previous tenant or even perhaps a "boarder" check the wording of page 417 of Waller's book: Kidnap- I had someone in the front room. Maybe a workman present when the house was built.

He denied it because he forgot, he was after all a carpenter. He may have built the larger section- which may explain rail #16, and either at work or home it was borrowed.

are the rails of all 3 sections taken from the same board? And the rungs are they from the same board ? maybe they were made by someone else. Was there any examination and COMPARISON of the ladder to any of Hauptmann's other carpentry work

there must have been something either side could have used?

The above did not take very long but with a little polishing by an experienced hand it could have been made to fit into the Lindy case.

Philip Migliore

Lindburgh kidnapping
Monday, 25-Jan-99 22:09:00

Message:
209.5.239.90 writes:

Awhile ago I heard a theory regarding Mrs. Lindburgh and her state of depression. It was offered, that she killed the baby, and that what followed was a coverup by Lindbergh and friends. Does anyone have a profile of Mrs. Lindbergh regarding her mental health?

Father Ted

Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 01:18:10
152.163.204.197 writes:

What you probably heard was a distortion of Noel Behn's book "Lindbergh:The Crime" written in 1995 and published by Atlantic Monthly Press but now is put out by Onyx in paperback.

Noel Behn beleved (he passed away in July '98) that it was Elizabeth Morrow , Anne Lindbergh's sister, who threw the baby out of the window in a jealous rage over her sister's marriage to Lindbergh. Elizabeth was supposed to marry the hero but her younger sister ended up being his wife instead. According to Behn, Elizabeth was mentally ill and Lindbergh covered up the murder to spare the Morrows from public scandal. Unless you really are certain that what you heard is a theory about Mrs. Lindbergh, this is most likely the theory. If it was about Anne Morrow, the mother of the baby, I have never heard that before.

ronelle

Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 08:39:56
205.183.31.67 writes:

COME ON, HOW STUPID DOES THAT SOUND? THATS WORSE THEN THE FATHER DOING THAT.YOU PEOPLE HAVE TO STOP THIS NONSENSE

STEVE ROMEO