

Re: Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 09:28:55
205.188.199.22 writes:

No, it might have made some sense cause mental illness did run in the Lindbergh family (although Elizabeth was suffering from heart disease not mental illness) and Lindbergh was supposed to marry Elizabeth originally and he married Anne instead. We will never know how Elizabeth really felt about this (she should have been relieved!). But the idea that Lindbergh had to cover up a family murder by pretending it was a kidnapping doesn't make sense for one basic reason - the family was so enormously wealthy that they could have had any one of a number of private doctors proclaim the child had only fallen from the window by accident or some other explanation. The baby's mother and grandmother surely would have wanted the baby buried properly and not left practically above ground for animals to eat! But Behn told me he didn't think the real Lindbergh child was the corpse found in the woods anyway. So, again, this is another theory with so many conspirators that it is not, in my opinion, believable. But I have never heard anyone even suggest that Anne Morrow ever had anything to do with her own child's death.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 12:07:06
205.183.31.67 writes:

RONELLE, THE FATHER POSITIVELY IDENTIFIED THE BABY AGAINST THE WISHES OF THE POLICE. BETTY GOW IDEIFIED THE BABY THE SLEEPING SUIT SHE MADE WAS ON THE BABY WITH THE BLUE THREAD.I BET CHARLES LINDBERGH WISHED IT WASNT HIS BABY WHEN HE WENT IN THE MORGUE

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 16:22:50
152.163.206.209 writes:

Yes I agree with you - the corpse found in the woods was Charles Jr. (Yet, as you know, lots of people still claim to be the "kidnapped" child or the son of the child! Lindbergh's immediate cremation of the baby's remains have caused lots of speculation. I wish the NJ Police would perform a DNA analysis on the pieces of hair and teeth remaining in the Museum at Trenton so all of the Lindbergh "babies" can finally be relieved.)

But, as for Anne Morrow's mental state, I am very interested in that subject. I have always believed that she was deeply depressed throughout her entire life. My interest in this case began with the question of how a woman from such enormous wealth and learning was able to remain married to an abusive and tyrannical husband without cracking up herself. But as for Anne Morrow killing her son from deep depression I cannot say it is impossible but again, as in the case of Elizabeth, the family would have had the resources to avoid any hint of scandal by having one of their doctors lie about the death. They would not have needed to create a kidnapping hoax. The only scenario that makes any sense to me is Lindbergh acting alone to prevent his wife and her relatives, from discovering his crude, despicable behavior.

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindburgh kidnapping
Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 12:36:04
205.183.31.67 writes:

RONELLE, HOW CAN YOU SAY THAT CHARLES LINDBURGH WAS ABUSIVE? YOU KNOW THERES NO PROOF OF THAT. WHY IS IT THAT EVERYBODY ON THIS WEBSITE MAKES BRUNO HAUPTMAN A BETTER PERSON THAN HIM. THERES NO COMPARISON

STEVE ROMEO

HEY..What did...
Tuesday, 26-Jan-99 16:49:32

Message:
12.74.5.67 writes:

What did Bruno lie about on the stand??? I read that he lied under oath..about what??

jrk

Re: HEY..What did...
Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 14:56:46
205.183.31.67 writes:

HE LIED WHEN FIRST ARRESTED, ABOUT HIS CRIMINAL RECORD IN GERMANY AND HE TOLD POLICE HE HAD NO MONEY WHEN IN FACT THEY FOUND IT HIDDEN IN HIS GARAGE.BUT THEPEOPLE ON THIS WEBSITE WILL FIND AN EXCUSE FOR HIM LIKE THEY DO AT ALL HIS MISLEADINGS

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Thursday, 28-Jan-99 07:14:44
207.220.150.120 writes:

jrk writes:

--- What did Bruno lie about on the stand??? I read that he lied under oath..about what?? ---

Steve responds:
--- HE LIED WHEN FIRST ARRESTED, ABOUT HIS CRIMINAL RECORD IN GERMANY AND HE TOLD POLICE HE HAD NO MONEY WHEN IN FACT THEY FOUND IT HIDDEN IN HIS GARAGE. ---

Since you apparently can't come up with any false statements from the stand Steve, can we take this as an acknowledgment that he testified truthfully?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Friday, 29-Jan-99 05:30:57
207.220.150.48 writes:

--- NO I CANT SORRY ---

Alas, more dashed hopes.

That being the case, how about trying to answer jrk's question and tell him (her) what part of Hauptmann's testimony was untrue. Where in his testimony did Hauptmann commit perjury? (And please don't give us "he lied about kidnapping the baby".)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Thursday, 04-Feb-99 13:49:02
205.183.31.66 writes:

WELL, IN THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS, HAUPTMAN HAD CONFLICTING STATEMENTS REGARDING HIS FINANCIAL STATUS DURING THE TIME OF THE RANSOM PAYOFF. HE WAS ASKED HOW HE SPELLED SIGNATURE AT HIS INNTORIGATIONS IN THE BRONX BY HIS OWN ATTORNEY. WILENTZ JUMPED ALL OVER HIM BECAUSE SIGNATURE WAS NEVER PART OF THE WRITING AT THE TIME

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Friday, 05-Feb-99 06:49:17
207.220.150.86 writes:

--- WELL, IN THE TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS, HAUPTMAN HAD CONFLICTING STATEMENTS REGARDING HIS FINANCIAL STATUS DURING THE TIME OF THE RANSOM PAYOFF. ---

No so. In fact, his testimony regarding his finances was remarkably consistent. (Certainly more consistent than I could ever be about if I were testifying only from memory about finances from 3 years ago.)

--- HE WAS ASKED HOW HE SPELLED SIGNATURE AT HIS INNTORIGATIONS IN THE BRONX BY HIS OWN ATTORNEY. WILENTZ JUMPED ALL OVER HIM BECAUSE SIGNATURE WAS NEVER PART OF THE WRITING AT THE TIME ---

Wasn't it? John Trendley, handwriting expert for the defense testified that that word DID appear among the requested writings he reviewed.

It doesn't surprise me at all that the word was there. The police had Hauptmann writing for hours. Do you really think that in all that time they NEVER asked him to write this word that was so distinctive? I, for one, would find it a little strange if they DIDN'T ask him to write it at least once.

Wouldn't you?

(Wilentz, who made such a big deal of Hauptmann's testimony about this in his closing, wasn't in Court the day Trendley testified so I guess he missed it.)

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Friday, 05-Feb-99 08:05:51
205.183.31.67 writes:**

NO IT WASNT IN THE BRONX WRITINGS HIS LAWYER MADE A MISTAKE THAT MADE HAUPTMAN LOOK BAD

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Friday, 05-Feb-99 19:20:25
207.220.150.176 writes:

--- NO IT WASNT IN THE BRONX WRITINGS HIS LAWYER MADE A MISTAKE THAT
MADE HAUPTMAN LOOK ---

Steve, it was John Trendley, handwriting expert for the defense, who testified to
seeing that word among the requested writings - not Hauptmann's attorney.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HEY..What did...
Monday, 08-Feb-99 08:19:55
205.183.31.66 writes:

I DIONT REMEMBER THAT I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK THAT UP. I HAVNT BEEN
KNEE DEEP IN THIS CASE IN A LONG TIME

STEVE

Fence sitter

Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 12:53:15

Message:

208.131.144.227 writes:

I have been curious about the Lindbergh kidnapping for many years. My mind is open to all possibilities.

I firmly believe whoever took the baby had to have some inside information regarding location of the babies room and that the family would be there during the week as they usually weren't.

I have difficulty believing that Lindbergh would attempt a second kidnapping joke. He had already gotten his jollies the first time and who would believe him the second time anyway?

Where would he hide the baby? Presumably somewhere outside since he was allegedly taking him down a ladder propped outside the window.

I'm sure there are other possible reasons he could have decided to take the baby or hire someone else to.

In looking at one picture I have seen of this baby there appears to be a large knot on the child's forehead. Has anyone else seen that or is it my imagination?

CF

Re: Fence sitter

Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 19:32:23

206.245.151.2 writes:

You pose some interesting questions.

I agree with you completely that it had to have been an inside job. At this point I can't even conceive of any other way this crime could have been committed.

As to whether Lindy would have had an interest in pulling the same type of practical joke, there's evidence that he was an "obsessive" practical joker and repeated many of his pranks. (We may only hear about it once because the second time it doesn't make good copy) Anne had to learn to cope with her husband's irritating behavior, including his obnoxious habit of knocking the hat off her head each and every time they walked into the house. Anne seemed to put a lot of work into "ignoring" this exceedingly immature man. Only one time, that I know of, did Anne retaliate by dousing him with a glass of buttermilk. But he seemed to love it!... which is probably why Anne decided that ignoring her husband's dispicable behavior was the only way to survive. Imagine how much anger she must have had tucked deep down inside.

I'm not sure which photo of the baby you are referring to, but everything I've read, including a statement by the woman who cut little Charlie's hair just prior to his abduction, tells me this child was normal, healthy... and very bright.

Melinda

Re: Re: Fence sitter

Wednesday, 27-Jan-99 22:31:10

205.188.192.21 writes:

I do not know if this is true but Cindy Adams (NY Post columnist) wrote a column a few years back (it coincided with the showing of Ludovic Kennedy's movie on HBO) in which she claimed that she had been told by the neice of Salvatore Spitale that the Lindbergh baby had Downe's Syndrome and the mobsters knew that Lindbergh had killed his child because of that defect. She also claimed that people with Down's Syndrome do not always have the "mongoloid" facial features typical of that defect. I have never heard that before and have tried to see any sign of it in photos but I doubt if it is possible to determine such a thing. Maybe if the child's hair and teeth were tested?

ronelle

Re: Fence sitter

Thursday, 28-Jan-99 00:11:04

208.152.130.113 writes:

I really appreciate you answering my post. I didn't realize how far in his joking he would go!

Sounds almost sick to me.

The picture I'm refering to is on the main hoax page where I found the link to this forum. It was with the picture of the baby after he was found and was placed next to that picture to show a comparison of the chin I think.

I'm also very curious about Violet Sharp. Her suicide has always led me to believe she must have either aided some way in the kidnapping or thought she in some way had inadvertently given the kidnapper some info and consequently suffered so much guilt that she just couldn't handle it.

I have read a couple of books on the kidnapping and neither mentioned that Charles Lindbergh got in the car after sending the butler for a flashlight. Was he known for being forgetful because I can't understand why it didn't raise any suspicion at the time that he missed that dinner or ceremony that night.

CF

Re: Re: Fence sitter

Thursday, 28-Jan-99 06:55:55

207.220.150.120 writes:

--- I'm also very curious about Violet Sharp. Her suicide has always led me to believe she must have either aided some way in the kidnapping or thought she in some way had inadvertently given the kidnapper some info and consequently suffered so much guilt that she just couldn't handle it. ---

I agree with Melinda that someone inside the Lindbergh household was involved. My opinion is based not only on the information the kidnappers had but on some of the logistics of the kidnapping itself.

Violet is a possibility for supplying information but remember that she did not work for the Lindberghs and was not at the house that night. She couldn't have actually helped in the commission of the crime.

The other possibility for her suicide is that there were things in her personal life she could not handle having disclosed. (Going to roadhouses with strangers, etc. The Morrrows were a pretty straight-laced bunch. Such activity might not have set very well with them. Not to mention that she was supposed to be engaged to the Morrow butler.) In addition, the police were concentrating on her as a suspect because of her inconsistent statements. They were coming down pretty hard. It is possible she simply couldn't handle the pressure.

--- I have read a couple of books on the kidnapping and neither mentioned that Charles Lindbergh got in the car after sending the butler for a flashlight. ---

As I recall, (and I don't remember where I saw this, so don't take it as gospel) he and Whateley might have tried to use the car headlights to light up the driveway looking for the kidnappers. In any event, when the first police officers arrived at the house Lindbergh met them at the door.

-- Was he known for being forgetful because I can't understand why it didn't raise any suspicion at the time that he missed that dinner or ceremony that night. ---

On the contrary, he was known for being compulsively organized and precise.

Why is it so suspicious that he missed the dinner? It is not as though his coming home was a surprise - at least not to Anne. If this in fact started out as a harmless prank, there is no reason for him to have missed an engagement to do it. He could have done it anytime he wanted.

IMHO, the missed dinner is more significant for another reason. That is the fact that it was public knowledge that he wouldn't be (or shouldn't have been)at home that evening. Generally, where he was and what he did was far from public knowledge (hence the inside information by the kidnappers).

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Thursday, 28-Jan-99 08:12:05
208.152.130.145 writes**

That is another strange thing - the time the baby was kidnapped. Why so early at night? Do you think it was because Charles wasn't supposed to be home at that time?

If he was so organized and precise did he deliberately miss the dinner in order to be home during the kidnapping so that he could then direct the investigation from the start? This would only need to happen if someone else was involved and there was a reason for the kidnapping to occur on that particular night.

Who do you think kidnapped the baby Mjr?

CF

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Friday, 29-Jan-99 05:24:25
207.220.150.48 writes:**

--- That is another strange thing - the time the baby was kidnapped. Why so early at night? Do you think it was because Charles wasn't supposed to be home at that time? ---

Lindbergh's anticipated absence at that time may have been a factor. I suggest, however, that the location of the nursery and the people in the house is the more likely reason.

Charlie's nursery was at the southeast corner of the house, on the second floor. To the west, separated from the nursery by a connecting bath, was the Lindberghs' room. To the north, just across a short hall, was Betty Gow's room. If the kidnapers had struck later in the evening when the household was asleep, they would have been within a few feet of three people. As it was, Charlie was alone on the second floor of the house. Striking earlier in the evening seems safer to me - especially if there was a servant there to make sure no one was around upstairs at the appropriate time.

**--- If he was so organized and precise did he deliberately miss the dinner in order to be home during the kidnapping so that he could then direct the investigation from the start? -
--**

There is no reason to think that his missing the dinner was "deliberate", nor is there any reason to think it had anything to do with wanting to be home during the kidnapping.

If Lindbergh missing that dinner "proves" anything, it proves only that he was human and therefore capable of error.

--- This would only need to happen if someone else was involved and there was a reason for the kidnapping to occur on that particular night. ---

Under the "Lindbergh did it theory", there is no reason the "crime" had to take place that night. He could have pulled his joke anytime. There was also no need for him to anticipate directing any investigation - after all if the joke had gone as planned, there wouldn't have been an investigation.

There is also no reason the crime had to be committed that particular night under the "Elisabeth Morrow Morgan did it" theory. According the Behn's source Charlie had already been dead for several days. Why do it that day? Why not earlier? There are, of course, other problems with that theory, too. For example: recall that Behn's source was repeating something he claimed to have seen 50 years before in an affidavit that no longer existed. Behn, himself, described his source as sometimes "pleading senility".

--- Who do you think kidnapped the baby Mjr? ---

As I have said here before, my interest in this case has always been more who didn't do it than who did. (The "who didn't", of course, being Richard Hauptmann.) I do, however, think the crime was exactly what it appeared to be - a kidnapping for ransom.

There are some things I think can be said with a degree of certainty - including that one or more of the servants were involved. Which one? Any answer I could give to that question would be based only on suspicion, speculation and some inexplicable inconsistencies. I don't think that is enough to try to name names.

Mjr

Re: Fence sitter
Friday, 29-Jan-99 14:53:50
206.245.151.2 writes:

Thanks for breathing some life into this forum, CF.

I tried to locate the quote that places Lindy in the car shortly after the "kidnapping", but still haven't found it. I'm positive this statement exists... but, I do tend to agree with MJR - Lindy was probably trying to use the headlights to search the grounds.

My take on Violet Sharpe: Violet was a high spirited, fun-loving woman who wore her emotions close to the sleeve. As far as Violet was concerned, the kidnapping could not have taken place at a worse time. When the rough and tumble military-style cops started interrogating her, Violet's nerves began to fray. She was concealing something all right... but it had nothing to do with the crime. The surgery she underwent in the middle of all that police questioning was not a tonsilectomy... but an abortion. Immediately after she was released from the hospital, while suffering greatly from post-abortion depression, she discovered incriminating evidence which had been planted in her room. A combination of these things sent Violet over the edge. In this whole sordid tale, it is my belief that Violet's death is one of three murders committed.

And, again, I agree with MJR, (Oh, dear me!... I'm agreeing twice in one post!) the straight-laced Morrow family would not have approved of some of the things coming out (both true and manufactured) about Violet's extra curricular activities. And one has to keep in mind that Charles Lindbergh was even MORE straight-laced. (Wouldn't be a bit surprised to find he wore his shoes so tight, it gave him hemorrhoids :-)

Melinda

**Re: Re: Fence sitter
Friday, 29-Jan-99 16:25:31
205.188.198.44 writes:**

;;;;;;;;;;The surgery she underwent in the middle of all that police questioning was not a tonsilectomy... but an abortion;;;;;;;;;;

**Any chance of the "father" having been Dwight Jr?
He was on the scene during her suicide and didn't he carry her upstairs to her room? I have often wondered about the possibility of a relationship between them.**

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Monday, 08-Feb-99 16:02:47
205.183.31.66 writes:**

AND ABORTION? YOU GOT TO BE KIDDING.WHERE DO YOU GET THIS JUNK FROM?

STEVE ROMEO

**Re: Re: Fence sitter
Friday, 29-Jan-99 18:09:04
207.220.150.115 writes:**

--- she discovered incriminating evidence which had been planted in her room. ---

Interesting. What was the evidence? Who do you think planted it?

--- I agree with MJR, (Oh, dear me!... I'm agreeing twice in one post!)---

Gee, Melinda, you don't have to sound so horrified about it. :)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter

Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 09:42:13

208.131.144.218 writes:

I have been thinking alot about your answers to my post. I thought back then that abortions were illegal and wouldn't be performed in a hospital. If there was an abortion, then her suicide could definitely be related.

Also, Mjr, your point about the location of the babies room is well taken. Unless a diagram or lay-out of the house were printed in the newspaper or unless Hauptman had worked on the house there is no way he could have known exactly where that room was without help from someone inside. He certainly wouldn't have known which shutter wouldn't lock or what time the baby was put to bed.

I had read that Hauptman occasionally relaxed at an island or beach that was popular with other

immigrants(I think Isador Fisch also went there).

What do you think of the possibility that he met one of the Lindbergh or Morrow servants there and started a friendship or partnership that enabled him to have the information he needed.

CF

Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter

Wednesday, 17-Feb-99 16:22:27

207.172.7.101 writes:

I know this question was adressed to MJR, but allow me to take a poke at it:

Isador Fisch was a charming man with a sense of humor and good command of the English language... important qualities for a successful con man. He met Hauptmann and friends on Hunter's Island in 1932. At the time, Fisch had quite a criminal record that extended back through the years.(BTW, the FBI wouldn't let me access it, and told me I may have to wait up to 2 years before it reaches the top of the pile. Ahh yes, within the doors of our beautiful bungling bureaucracy, our tax dollars at work)

When you realize all the rotten pies Fisch's insidious little fingers had plunged themselves into, you know this was a master con artist at work... one who had designs on Hauptmann and friends from the very beginning. (My husband, who is also an immigrant, tells me that con men often pray on their own kind because it is so much easier to win their trust)

When you begin to peel away a few layers and connect a few dots, Isador Fisch had much more in common... or shared a certain "mentality" with people like Harry Walsh, Frank Hague and even Jafsie Condon... but shared nothing (outside of nationality) in common with Hauptmann or his group. (for my note on Hauptmann's arrests in Germany, see a much earlier post from Karyn Von...oops, forgot her last name, sorry)

Something has always puzzled me; one of those big glaring questions I can't seem to let go of:

How can we possibly believe the family of this masterful con man, (after all his embezzling schemes), when they testified that Fisch died broke? And for that matter, why should we believe the guy actually died when the family said he did??? Sure, I've seen a copy of his death certificate. And, yes, he had quite a severe cough that hinted of T.B. So, what? He was, after all, a master con artist, wasn't he?

Just wondering...

Melinda

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter

Thursday, 18-Feb-99 04:23:06

207.220.150.56 writes:

---- How can we possibly believe the family of this masterful con man, (after all his embezzling schemes), when they testified that Fisch died broke? ---

Good question in light of the fact that apparently he was no more honest with them than he was with anyone else. Through an attorney in Germany, they were in the process of enlisting the services of a NY attorney to investigate and protect Fisch's "estate". This included his business in fur trading and stocks which he conducted with a friend, a fellow German. Among other things, they suspected this "fellow German" was keeping Fisch's \$10,000-plus assets. They believed Fisch was successful and fairly wealthy. It appears they didn't think he "died broke" until after Hauptmann's arrest.

The "fellow German" is not named in the letters between the attorneys (not that it would have made any difference) but what description there is of the business dealings mirrors what Hauptmann claimed.

--- At the time, Fisch had quite a criminal record that extended back through the years. ---

Interesting. Does what they did allow you to see give any indication what KIND of crimes were involved? (Violent crimes v. fraud, etc.)

--- (BTW, the FBI wouldn't let me access it, and told me I may have to wait up to 2 years before it reaches the top of the pile. Ahh yes, within the doors of our beautiful bungling bureaucracy, our tax dollars at work)---

Don't you just love it?

--- ...all the rotten pies Fisch's insidious little fingers had plunged themselves into...

Pies, Melinda? Please tell me this was unintentional and not a bad joke. :)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Thursday, 18-Feb-99 17:35:25
207.172.7.101 writes:

MJR, I can't quite figure out how to cut and paste parts of my posts without losing everything, so there's a chance I might be caught in an occasional misquote.

I've found nothing so far that indicates Fisch committed crimes other fraud... HOWEVER, the fact that his record is so difficult to obtain makes me very suspicious. I remember reading one handwriting expert's letter to the FBI, begging for a handwriting sample of Fisch. And, of course, the bureau never supplied anyone with anything, but forwarded select things onto the N.J. State police. Every once in a while I would see a glib remark about some of the people who were trying to help. They weren't blatant comments, but I could tell they were thought of as kooks, even though some of them had some very interesting ideas.

There's something that tells me Fisch may have played a bigger role in this story than we believe.

As for the statement about Fisch and "pies"... not to be confused with "Fisch Pie", which would be another putrid joke... okay, so you've probably guessed by now that I intentionally made a really rotten joke. But at least I'm finding out who's doing their homework. ;-)

Melinda

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Friday, 19-Feb-99 05:43:28
207.220.150.41 writes:

" There's something that tells me Fisch may have played a bigger role in this story than we believe. "

That wouldn't surprise me at all. Reading the descriptions given by various people over the course of this case there are many that look intriguingly like Fisch.

" But at least I'm finding out who's doing their homework. ;-) "

And doing a wonderful job of it, too - you have my compliments.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Saturday, 20-Feb-99 08:30:38
209.214.47.98 writes:

To Melinda:

From my German born grandfather, who left Germany in 1936, he said after the Treaty Of Versailles in 1919, there was much unrest in Germany. People were out of work, no money to be made, and the middle class and the lower class were starving, and many people turned to petty thief, breaking into houses to steal items they could turn a quick profit on, this is a deplorable act for anyone to do but to survive one has to eat, and if petty thief was the way to feed your family, or yourself, people turned to it. The other choice was to eat cats, dogs, & etc. Remember, Germany was destitute, they had waged a war under the Kaiser, and lost everything. The Treaty of Versailles, left Germany in its death, not just the Military, but the common people suffered more than anyone. My grandfather believed that if the World Powers had treated Germany more humane, there would not have been so much crime in Germany, and Hitler would never have rose to such power. Maybe Hauptmann was in trouble in Germany, doing some of these acts, but I don't believe he would kidnap a child here, and hold it for ransom. Hauptmann did have some money, didn't Fisch owe him several thousand dollars? I'm sure Hauptmann didn't do crimes here that would net him that kind of money.

Karyn Von Eberhardt

Karyn Von Eberhardt

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Wednesday, 24-Feb-99 14:19:08
205.183.31.66 writes:

more poor excuses for hauptman. should i get the crying towel out now or later? what nonsense about germany. he held up 2 women wheeling baby carrages with a gun,do you blame germany for that?

steve romeo for karyn

: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Wednesday, 24-Feb-99 15:52:39
209.214.47.84 writes:

To Steve Romeo:

What, you don't mean to tell me you don't believe that Germany was a disaster after WWI? Petty crimes were rampant there. I don't believe that you could shed a tear for anyone, least of all Hauptmann! So you will never need a "Crying Towel" The more facts that are brought to this forum the louder you shout about Hauptmann did it. I will never believe Hauptmann did it, but Lindbergh will never have to face it, but maybe when he died he had to face his God and explain why he accused Hauptmann in the first place!

Karyn Von Eberhardt

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Fence sitter
Thursday, 25-Feb-99 08:11:19
205.183.31.67 writes:

i understand what you said about germany. but i cant use that as an excuse for hauptmann. he was a criminal in germany with numerous crimes who escaped illegally to get here.i cant buy the germany excuse

steve