

**JON BENET RAMSEY**  
**Sunday, 31-Jan-99 17:25:48**

**Message:**  
**206.245.151.2 writes:**

**CHECK THIS OUT!**

**<http://joshua-7.com/mrsbrady/lindbergh.htm>**

**This is a 5 page letter to District Attorney Alex Hunter from New York Attorney Darnay Hoffman.**

**(I caught a few errors in this letter... and I'm sure you sharpies can find a few more. In any event, I'm curious to know what you think)**

**Melinda**

**Re:**  
**Monday, 01-Feb-99 01:19:35**  
**152.163.207.194 writes:**

**Melinda - the URL has a typo in it so I am reproducing the letter here in case readers get frustrated trying to find it.**

.....

**Letter to District Attorney Alex Hunter**

**From New York Attorney Darnay Hoffman**

**March 11, 1997**

**Re: The Lindbergh Kidnapping Case & JonBenet Ramsey**

**Dear Mr. Hunter:**

**I am a criminal and civil defense attorney in New York City. I recently defended "Subway Gunman" Bernhard Goetz in a civil trial in New York, and I am a former law student of Barry Scheck (Cardozo '82).**

**I have been following your investigation into the Ramsey case with great interest and I would like to bring certain similarities between the Lindbergh Kidnapping case and the Ramsey case to your attention:**

**First, and most important, every member of the Lindbergh household, with the exception of Charles and Anne, were under suspicion from the moment the police began their investigation. With what we know about infant homicides today, Lindbergh would have been a prime suspect himself. And for very good reasons:**

**1) When the Lindbergh baby was first discovered missing, both Anne Morrow Lindbergh, and the nursemaid Betty Gow, immediately suspected Charles Lindbergh. In fact, Betty Gow's first words to Lindbergh were "Colonel, do you have the baby? Please don't fool me!"**

**2) Anne Morrow Lindbergh, in her March 2, 1932 letter to her mother-in-law (a letter she prefaces with the warning that she "Better destroy after reading"), observes that "She (Betty Gow) thought C. (Charles Lindbergh) had taken the baby for a joke. I did (also), until I saw his face." (Lindbergh was never able to give police a complete account of his whereabouts on the day of the kidnapping. He mysteriously "forgot" to attend an dinner given by NYU with Lindbergh scheduled as a guest of honor, or why he arrived home "early" just prior to the time when his son was kidnapped. Lindbergh claimed, vaguely, that he "couldn't remember" the events of that day.)**

**3) Two months before the March 1st kidnapping, Charles Lindbergh had played a cruel practical joke on his wife, and the nursemaid, by hiding his son Charles Jr. in a closet for twenty minutes while announcing melodramatically that someone had kidnapped the baby. Lindbergh watched with silent glee at the sheer terror and panic as members of his household frantically tried to find the child. Finally, Lindbergh triumphantly produced the baby from it's hiding place.**

**4) Lindbergh, himself, was the one who discovered the ransom note, even though the place where he had "found" it -- on the window sill in the baby's bedroom -- had already been searched by his wife and the nursemaid.**

**5) Lindbergh inexplicably allowed the crime scene to become contaminated by both the press and the police by insisting they follow him around the grounds en masse, trampling all over footprints that had been left in the mud around the house. Remarkably, Lindbergh did this despite the great show he made of waiting patiently for nearly two hours for a police technician to arrive with fingerprint gear before opening the ransom note.**

**6) Lindbergh tried to prevent his household staff from being questioned by police or subjected to polygraphs.**

7) Upon discovering his son was "kidnapped," the first person Lindbergh called before calling the police was his lawyer.

8) Lindbergh tried to divert the police investigation by bringing in outside "investigators", while insisting that the kidnapping was the work of "outsiders," i.e., professional kidnapers. (Mob boss Frank Costello was so unimpressed with this theory that he advised Lindbergh to forget about paying any ransom money because, in his opinion, the child was "already dead" and that the kidnapping had all the ear-marks of an amateur at work.)

9) Lindbergh refused to allow the FBI to investigate the case, preferring, instead, to allow the inexperienced New Jersey State Police -- headed by Col. Norman Schwartzkopf (father of "Stormin' Norman) who had no prior police experience except as a floor walker at Bambergers department store (he was politically appointed to the New Jersey State troopers) -- to handle the investigation. Schwartzkopf made a mess of the investigation (which was the general idea).

10) J. Edgar Hoover, along with some of his agents, believed that Lindbergh was lying about what he knew about the circumstances surrounding his son's kidnapping. Later on, Hoover also came to believe that Lindbergh lied about his voice identification of Hauptmann as "cemetery John." Moreover, a Bronx grand juror hearing the case asked, rather incredulously, how it was possible for Lindbergh to be certain he could identify Hauptmann 's voice from hundreds of feet away and remember it two years later when Hauptmann was finally captured as the "kidnapper." Hoover was so frustrated by Lindbergh's "stonewalling" that he encouraged Congress to pass the Federal "Lindbergh" Kidnapping law so the FBI would have jurisdiction to investigate. (Hoover was so suspicious of Lindbergh and his lying that he opened an FBI surveillance file on him which he eventually shared with Franklin Roosevelt, who suspected Lindbergh of pro-Nazi sympathies.)

11) Lindbergh refused to allow the New Jersey State Police, or anyone from law enforcement, to listen in on any phone calls he received concerning the kidnapping that might contain clues.

12) Lindbergh tried to prevent the Treasury Department from recording and "marking" any of the kidnap ransom money so that it could not be traced afterward.

13) Lindbergh let members of the underworld have copies of the kidnap ransom note, even though the police wanted to hold back giving out the unique kidnapper's "signature", which, police knew, would be a vital clue in determining whether or not future communications from the kidnapper were legitimately from him, and not from the thousands of hoaxers plaguing the case.

14) When the Lindbergh baby was eventually found in May of 1932 (two months after the kidnapping), police discovered that someone had hurriedly dumped the body into a shallow ditch within sight of the Lindbergh home. Had Lindbergh not

prevented a ten mile search for his son by police bloodhounds when the child was first discovered missing, authorities would have known from the beginning that the baby had died within minutes of having been "kidnapped," and would have treated the matter as a homicide instead of as a "kidnapping." As result, Lindbergh would not have been an anxious parent hoping to effect the return of his son, but would, instead, have been the parent of a murder victim, and, therefore, unable to personally direct or control a police investigation into a homicide.

15) The initial autopsy of the Lindbergh baby was so sloppy that police could never really be sure of the cause of death. In fact, the child might have been suffocated first, and then hit on the head, in order to cover up the real cause of death. One recent theory of the kidnapping has Lindbergh repeating his "practical joke" of hiding the baby, only to have it go horribly wrong (the child suffocates and is then bashed in the head to look as if "accidentally" dropped out a window by an anxious

"kidnapper" making an all too hasty get-away on an awkwardly constructed ladder used to gain entrance to the second story bedroom window.)

16) Lindbergh immediately ordered the cremation of his son without any further tests or examinations by qualified forensic pathologists (remember how "careful" Lindbergh was with respect to fingerprints on the ransom note? Was that because Lindbergh knew there would be no fingerprints?) Michael Baden, in the October 1983 Journal of the Forensic Sciences, stated: "The fractured-skull diagnosis was wrong for two reasons: there was no fracture, just a separation of the unfused skull bones which is normal in all babies, and there was no brain damage. It's the brain damage, not the fracture, that would cause death. The baby was probably smothered at the time of the kidnapping to keep him from crying out and alerting the family and the nurse who were all in nearby rooms."

17) Whoever "kidnapped" the Lindbergh baby was intimately familiar with the large, rambling Lindbergh estate home. The kidnap ladder was placed directly under the child's second story bedroom window -- remarkably, there were no ladder marks under the other windows, which means the kidnapper was incredibly "lucky" to find the right window on the first try without trial and error, or he knew the right window from some prior knowledge. The shutters to the baby's bedroom windows, moreover, were the only ones that couldn't latch closed from the inside and therefore would not need to be forcibly opened.

18) Apparently, the kidnapper was not afraid of detection. What else could explain a "kidnapping" which took place sometime between 7:30 and 9:30 PM in a house full of people and servants, fully lit, with someone quite capable of walking in on the kidnapper at any given moment? The "kidnapper," furthermore, was not worried about the child screaming or making any noise (was that because the child would not cry if the "kidnapper" was someone it already knew?).

19) The Lindbergh family Boston terrier, Wahgoosh, was reported to be a neurotically nervous dog who barked at any strange sound or person -- that night, not a peep.

20) The Lindbergh family never stayed at their home during the weekdays, preferring, instead, to stay with Anne Morrow's parents, an hour away in Englewood New Jersey, which was closer to New York City where Charles worked during the week. The decision to remain at their home a day or two longer was made at the last minute and could only have been known by members of the immediate family and household staff. Professional kidnapers "staking out" the Lindberghs would have known from the meticulous routine kept by Charles that the family could be expected to be staying with Anne's family, and the country home where the baby was kidnapped. This was why the police insisted for over two years that the kidnapping was an "inside job." Even Hauptmann's defense attorneys argued that there was no way a Bronx carpenter could have known what the Lindberghs were doing, at the last minute, two hours away in the backwoods of New Jersey, to then rush out there and kidnap Charles Jr..

21) Police investigating the crime noted that there were no fingerprints of any kind in the baby's bedroom. None. Not even fingerprints normally associated with the baby, his mother, the nursemaid, household staff, or even Charles. One police officer remarked afterwards that it appeared to him as if someone had purposely wiped down the whole room to remove it of any fingerprints -- a task too dangerously time consuming for a stranger and would-be "kidnapper."

In short, the Lindbergh and Ramsey cases have one very important theme in common -- they are both kidnap "hoaxes" perpetrated by the parties really responsible, who must "hide in plain sight" in the hopes of throwing off the police. In the first case, involving Lindbergh, the hoax was successful; in the second, involving the Ramseys, only for a time. Yet, in each case, the "kidnapper" was able to successfully bring about a breakdown of normal police procedure into what should have been routine domestic homicide investigations. Instead, the police were tricked into believing the crime to be a kidnapping, instead of a murder, with devastating consequences for the destruction and contamination of potential crime scene evidence.

If you would like to consult with me further on this case I would be more than happy to speak to you. You are doing a very difficult investigation under nearly impossible circumstances. The fact that my former law professor Barry Scheck has agreed to consult with you makes me even more eager to help.

Good luck on this case.

Very truly yours,  
Darnay Hoffman

**Re: Re:**

**Sunday, 07-Feb-99 20:49:37**

**207.220.150.194 writes:**

**I am not going to reply to all the things in Ms. Brady's letter, however, I think one item needs clarifying. She states:**

**--- Michael Baden, in the October 1983 Journal of the Forensic Sciences, stated: The fractured-skull diagnosis was wrong for two reasons: there was no fracture, just a separation of the unfused skull bones which is normal in all babies, and there was no brain damage. It's the brain damage, not the fracture, that would cause death. The baby was probably smothered at the time of the kidnapping to keep him from crying out and alerting the family and the nurse who were all in nearby rooms." ---**

**As I type this, I have a copy of Baden's article before me. It does not contain the quote Ms. Brady provides. It does not contain the statements she attributes to Dr. Baden and does not contain the conclusions she states.**

**--- The fractured-skull diagnosis ---**

**Baden's objection was to Dr. Mitchell's listing of a 'fractured skull due to external violence' as the COD. Baden points out, as Ms. Brady states, that it is not the fracture of the skull that causes death, it is the brain damage that goes with the fracture.**

**--- there was no fracture just a separation of the unfused skull bones which is normal in all babies, ---**

**He pointed out that as the bodies of children decompose the natural suture lines may separate and give the appearance of fractures. He did NOT say that there was no skull fracture here, or that the natural suture lines here were mistaken for a fracture.**

**--- and there was no brain damage. ---**

**Baden made no such statement. He indicated that the brain was not described in the autopsy report and that Mitchell failed to characterize or document the hemorrhage he found on the inner surface of the skull at the point of fracture. Indeed, according to Baden, it was not confirmed to be a hemorrhage. His point was that there was insufficient documentation of the brain and any injury to it, and therefore insufficient 'proof'. He never said there was no injury to the brain.**

**--- The baby was probably smothered at the time of the kidnapping ---**

Again, Baden made no such comment. He said that the possibility could not be ruled out as the autopsy did not include an examination of the hyoid bone and laryngeal cartilages in the neck. He also said that Mitchell's determination that the baby had not choked based on inserting his fingers into the throat was not valid. Baden's comments were apparently, at least in part, based on his understanding that there were people in the adjacent rooms at the time of the kidnapping.

His conclusion:

"The precise cause of death is not as well established. The circumstances of death and the autopsy description are consistent with a baby having died from cranio-cerebral trauma, perhaps in a fall. However, the possibility that the child was intentionally murdered by suffocation or strangulation while still in his crib cannot be excluded." (Journal of Forensic Science, October, 1983.)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re:  
Monday, 08-Feb-99 15:55:25  
205.183.31.66 writes:

THATKS FOR THE INFO, I NEVER READ THAT REPORT.THE AUTOPSY WAS DONE BY HIS ASSISTANT AND WAS TALKED THROUGH IT BY THE EXAMINER

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re: Dr Baden  
Tuesday, 09-Feb-99 01:23:54  
205.188.192.48 writes:

;;;;;;The fractured-skull diagnosis was wrong for two reasons: there was no fracture, just a separation of the unfused skull bones which is normal in all babies, and there was no brain damage. It's the brain damage, not the fracture, that would cause death. The baby was probably smothered at the time of the kidnapping to keep him from crying out and alerting the family and the nurse who were all in nearby rooms." ;;;;;;;;;;

MJR - This is a direct quote from page 4 of Baden's 1989 book called UNNATURAL DEATH: CONFESSIONS OF A MEDICAL EXAMINER. This is the only statement

concerning the Lindbergh baby in the entire book and I am not familiar with the article you are reading from. (I have not looked at the Brady letter - do you mean Darnay Hoffman's letter? )

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Dr Baden  
Tuesday, 09-Feb-99 01:29:17  
205.188.192.48 writes:

;;;;;The baby was probably smothered at the time of the kidnapping to keep him from crying out and alerting the family and the nurse who were all in nearby rooms." ;;;;;

Or.....maybe the baby didn't cry out because he knew his abductor? Amazing to me that Dr Baden never thought of that.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Dr Baden  
Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 04:01:53  
207.220.150.37 writes:

--- Or.....maybe the baby didn't cry out because he knew his abductor? Amazing to me that Dr Baden never thought of that. ----

Knowing his abductor could have made the kidnapper one of several people.

OTOH, perhaps he didn't cry out because, like a lot of little kids, he may have slept like a brick. (My nephew slept through a 7 point earthquake that threw him out of his bed.)

Mjr



Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Dr Baden  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 15:35:21  
152.163.197.54 writes:

;;;;;;Knowing his abductor could have made the kidnapper one of several people.

.....

Absolutely logical. And it would also account for why Wagoosh didn't bark! So which one of the 5 people in that house do you consider suspect? The butler and maid whose involvement makes no sense and raises more questions than it answers? The mother of the baby? Betty Gow? Not one of these suspects makes any sense when compared to the mischievous, malicious and daredevil daddy who couldn't give a straight answer to where he had spent his day.

As for the child remaining asleep, I have often wondered if spoonfuls of Benadryl were given to youngsters back in those years as it is often administered today to children whose parents want them to remain asleep. The recent novel, Freedomland, (sorry, I forgot the author's name) is sort of based upon the Susan Smith case and reveals how common it is for mothers to use Benadryl to keep their kids asleep during the night. Does anyone happen to know if this was done in the 1930s? Betty and Anne both said they had given the child medicine which he spit it up (it was said to have been a physic) but after reading Freedomland I wonder if they could have given him Benadryl or something to keep him asleep. Lindbergh hated to hear his son crying and according to Berg's interview with Betty Gow, the nursemaid claimed that Lindbergh built the child a chicken coop and put him there to cry by himself for many hours. it is just one more thing the cremation deprived us of knowing.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Dr Baden  
Tuesday, 09-Feb-99 06:14:46  
207.220.150.39 writes:

---- (I have not looked at the Brady letter - do you mean Darnay Hoffman's letter? ) ----

Oops. You're right. The letter is by Hoffman. (I guess I got the name Brady from the site itself. Sorry.)

--- This is a direct quote from page 4 of Baden's 1989 book called UNNATURAL DEATH: CONFESSIONS OF A MEDICAL EXAMINER. This is the only statement concerning the Lindbergh baby in the entire book and I am not familiar with the article you are reading from. ---

The article I am reading from is the Article Ms. Hoffman (see I got the name right this time) cites as her source. That is, Baden's October, 1983 article in the Journal of Forensic Sciences. "The Lindbergh Kidnapping: Review of the Autopsy Evidence."

It is a mystery to me why Baden would say one thing in his article to the Journal and in his presentation to the Academy and say something entirely different in a book to the popular press - unless it had something to do with book sales. Drama does sell better.

Of the two, however, I tend to prefer his earlier statements to his fellow scientists.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re:  
Tuesday, 09-Feb-99 09:41:46  
205.188.200.42 writes:

;;;;;Brady states, that it is not the fracture of the skull that causes death, it is the brain damage that goes with the fracture;;;;;;;

This is also Cyril Wecht's explanation regarding the death of JonBenet Ramsey - she also had a fractured skull. (Who Killed JonBenet Ramsey by Cyril Wecht & Charles Bosworth)

Since Baden's scientific paper was written in 1983 and Baden's book (Unnatural Death) was published 6 years later, in 1989, Dr Baden may have changed his mind.

;;;;;;as the autopsy did not include an examination of the hyoid bone and laryngeal cartilages in the neck. He also said that Mitchell's determination that the baby had not choked based on inserting his fingers into the throat was not valid.;;;;;;;

This, and many other criticisms of the "autopsy," is the reason Ahlgren and Monier have stated that no real autopsy took place. This is one of the "errors" on the police museum's list of their book and it is unfair. No one can call this procedure a reliable autopsy. The coroner watched as an incompetent person did a shoddy inspection on the most important corpse of the century! And several hours later the father cremated the remains!

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 03:55:10  
207.220.150.37 writes:

I'm a little disappointed, Ronelle --

---- This, and many other criticisms of the "autopsy," is the reason Ahlgren and Monier have stated that no real autopsy took place. This is one of the "errors" on the police museum's list of their book and it is unfair. No one can call this procedure a reliable autopsy. ---

A&M did not say that no "real" or "reliable" autopsy took place. They said, not once but several times, that NO autopsy took place. They did not qualify it or clarify it with the claim that what procedure was done was inadequate. (An opinion with which I would have agreed.) They just say there was no autopsy - period, end of discussion.

Those statements (that no autopsy took place) are false. They are every bit as false as the testimony of any witness in Flemington - indeed, more false than some of it. If A&M said what they did because they considered the procedures that were performed inadequate, I'm sorry, but it does not excuse the use of false and misleading statements in order to try to 'prove' their case. It does not excuse giving their "opinion" of "facts" as the facts themselves. **THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT WAS DONE TO RICHARD HAUPTMANN.** There was no excuse for it then and there is no excuse for it now.

If your statement about A&M's motives for using those false and misleading statements suggests anything however, it suggests that A&M knew perfectly well when they wrote them that the statements were false, but that they went ahead and said them anyway. If that is the case then you are right, they don't belong on a list of "errors" because they are not "errors" - they are lies.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Thursday, 11-Feb-99 07:48:56  
207.220.150.41 writes:

---- **WHAT DO YOU MEAN A UNRELIABLE AUTOPSY? THE BODY WAS HALFMISSING AND BADLY DECOMPOSED. WHAT OUTCOME DID YOU WANT THE CORNERS TO SAY? ---**

**Mitchell (who was not a coroner, BTW) spent 'about an hour' examining the body, because he found the odor and appearance offensive. Many bodies are like that - medical examiners and pathologists examine them thoroughly anyway.**

**It would have been nice if Mitchell had photographed, x-rayed, fully described or otherwise documented the things he saw - but he didn't. It would have been nice if he had examined the bones in the throat, the condition of which are indicative of strangulation - but apparently he didn't. It would have been nice if he had described the condition of the brain in the autopsy report - but he didn't.**

**Baden said that what Mitchell described (and the circumstances of death) were consistent with an injury to the head - at least he did when he discussed the subject with his fellow scientists. In other words, he did not necessarily disagree with the ultimate finding that Charlie suffered a massive skull fracture that led to his death.**

**That doesn't change the fact that the autopsy conducted was seriously lacking in both thoroughness and documentation. If the "offensive" condition of the body kept Mitchell from doing a less than thorough examination, then he had no business trying to conduct an autopsy.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Thursday, 11-Feb-99 17:44:24  
207.172.7.100 writes:**

**Recently, I came upon this book title on Amazon.com:**

**DEATH SCENES; A HOMICIDE DETECTIVE'S SCRAPBOOK by Jack Huddleston.  
(Feral House Apr. '96)**

**According to the description, this author claims to have on-site forensic photos, mug shots and previously unreleased photos from murder cases of the '30's, including the Lindbergh kidnapping case. Are any of you familiar with this book? Apparently the photos are explicit and extremely grotesque, (just the kind of reading material we all need to put our minds at ease as we're nodding off late at night, right?) Personally, I'm reluctant to shell out money for this book if all I'm going to see is that same old photograph of the baby's decomposed body. I've tried e-mailing other reviewers on Amazon.com, but so far, no response. If one of you is courageous enough to buy this book, please let me know what you find out. (I won't call you a sicko, but you may call me a cheapo) In the meantime, good luck... and sweet dreams.**

**Melinda**

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 14:16:46  
152.163.197.56 writes:

;;;;;;;That doesn't change the fact that the autopsy conducted was seriously lacking in both thoroughness and documentation. If the "offensive" condition of the body kept Mitchell from doing a less than thorough examination, then he had no business trying to conduct an autopsy. ;;;;;;

And you, MJR, "have no business" calling that an "autopsy." You are so desperate to discredit Ahlgren and Monier, and their theories, that you even accuse them of lying about this issue! Your claim, in another message, that they have lied - there really was an autopsy, you said - is outrageous. On page 108 of Crime of the Century the authors use the word "autopsy" in quotes to show what you have exactly stated here yourself - that Mitchell's examination was a sham and should NEVER be considered, by any standard, a true autopsy. There was NO autopsy of that child's corpse. Not by your own standard or anyone else's.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 20:37:01  
207.220.151.113 writes:

"More certain data could not be obtained because, after Betty Gow and Colonel Lindbergh identified the body, the Colonel ordered the remains cremated immediately, before an autopsy or any pathological or toxicological tests could be performed. In compliance with his orders, the remains were cremated within the hour."

Show that statement to a dozen people and ask them what procedures or examinations were done. Want to guess what the answers will be?

The bottom line here is that both the statement and the impression it gives are false.

BTW, what is the source for the claim that Lindbergh gave any such order?

Mjr

# The "Errors" List

Sunday, 07-Feb-99 01:34:32

Message:  
152.163.204.192 writes:

The following "errors" list of Ahlgren and Monier's book was compiled by a Trenton Police Museum volunteer (anonymous). No other "errors" list was ever compiled for any other book on the Lindbergh case. Police archivist, Mark Falzini, says he will put on file any list of errors volunteered by anyone interested in compiling such a list of other writers - Berg, Fisher, Milton, etc. Mark agreed with me that many of the following items are erroneously called "errors" and he will no longer refer to it as an "errors" list. I will post this list piecemeal so readers can tackle a few at a time. I am listing it here exactly as Mark sent it to me.

.....

Book jacket, front: There was an autopsy; the desire for cremation is not unusual.

Chapter 1 page 7: Because Anne & Betty didn't see the note first doesn't mean it wasn't there.

Chapter 1 page 8: SOURCE? Lindbergh hid the baby in a closet two months before the kidnapping.

Featherbed Lane washed out during rain; other access was available then AND now.

Chapter 1 page 9: Lindbergh "commanded" Anne to fly to the Orient with him is inaccurate. It was a mutual agreement.

Chapter 1 page 10: SOURCE? Lindbergh "instructed" Anne to stay at Hopewell is inaccurate. Records show it was ANNE'S decision to stay because the baby had a cold.

Chapter 1 page 11: "Violette" is misspelled  
Lindbergh "basked" in publicity is inaccurate

Chapter 1 page 12: How could Lindbergh have ordered that the baby be left alone if he wasn't even home? What is the SOURCE of this? The information on this page regarding the household routine is taken out of context.

Chapter 1 page 13: Not unusual for a father not to check in on a sleeping baby

Chapter 1 page 14: No record of Anne asking Lindbergh "Do you have our baby?" SOURCE?

**Chapter 1 page 15: Discovery of ransom note on windowsill NOT on the radiator**

**Chapter 1 page 16: "Ladder built by and for a very tall man with legs" SOURCE?**

**Chapter 1 page 17: State Troopers arrived...motorcycles...aimlessly  
trampled...ruined  
clues. SOURCE?**

**Chapter 1 page 18: Courtesy by Lindbergh to newspapermen uncharacteristic.  
Hewanted/needed help, by publicity, to get the baby back**

**Chapter 1 page 21: Autopsy was performed; cremation followed soon but not  
immediately.**

**Re: The "Errors" List  
Sunday, 07-Feb-99 07:22:49  
207.220.150.78 writes:**

**What are you looking for here, Ronelle?**

**Comments? Questions? Rebuttal of the 'errors'? Additional information for why  
they are 'errors'? Additional errors? Errors in other works?**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: The "Errors" List  
Sunday, 07-Feb-99 10:51:47  
205.188.192.161 writes:**

**;;;;;;Comments? Questions? Rebuttal of the 'errors'? Additional information for  
why they are 'errors'? Additional errors? Errors in other works?**

**.....  
.....**

**Any of the above MJR.**

**I am afraid that the partial list I have put up here is already too unwieldy for a single  
thread. Do you have any suggestions?**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: The "Errors" List  
Sunday, 07-Feb-99 19:52:25  
207.220.150.194 writes:**

**--- I am afraid that the partial list I have put up here is already too unwieldy for a single thread. Do you have any suggestions? ---**

**Not really. Trying to do it by 'error' would be a nightmare and you already provided posts on individual authors. About the only other thing I could suggest is just to do a few at a time and see how complicated it gets.**

**Mjr**

**Re:"Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Sunday, 07-Feb-99 20:09:56  
207.220.150.194 writes:**

**RONELLE --- NOTICE THAT I CHANGED THE TITLE OF THE ORIGINAL POST TO REFLECT THE TOPICS DISCUSSED IN THIS REPLY. DO YOU THINK BREAKING IT DOWN AND LABELING THIS WAY MIGHT HELP KEEP THINGS CLEAR?**

**--- Chapter 1 page 15: Discovery of ransom note on windowsill NOT on the radiator  
It was my understanding that the radiator WAS the window sill.**

**ADD:**

**Ch. 1 pg. 16 "Also found in the mud under the window was a three-quarter inch Bucks chisel..."**

**This has been stated in several works, including Fisher's. Not only is the statement made, but the usual picture with it is the one of the ladder against the side of the house and the x on the ground below it. (A&M's cover and one of Fisher's prints.)**

**According to Cpl. Wolf's report, the chisel was NOT found beneath the window - it was found 75 or so feet from the house, by the ladder and the footprints. "A carpenter's wood chisel was also found nearby the ladder." pg. 2, para. 2**

**(I don't know why this particular error bothers me so much, except perhaps that it mis-states the very first official report in the case.)**



**Re: Re:"Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Tuesday, 09-Feb-99 00:50:20  
205.188.192.48 writes:**

**This is an excellent idea you have of keeping track of the various items in this message thread!**

**The radiator cover was at the same level as the window. But the question that always bothers me is why some authors (I think Berg does this too ) make a point of the window being slightly open when Lindbergh enters the nursery the first time. He is supposed to have closed the slightly-opened window himself, according to some accounts. But, how could the envelope have stayed in place during such a windy evening? If the note was sitting there from the moment the "kidnapper" took his child then how could it not have blown away when that window was wide open during the kidnapper's escape? The note might have blown away before he had time to close the window behind him. Anyway, what kind of an idiot hangs onto a burlap sack with a 30 pound baby in it and descends a shaky ladder on a windy, rainy night and puts an envelope on the sill? Placing the note on the sill before climbing out is even dumber and none of this makes sense as an authentic kidnap plot. That note should have logically been placed in the crib and nowhere else. Until you put Lindbergh into the scenario it does not make sense. The crib had already been scrutinized and the note could no longer be placed there, hence, the nonsensical placement on the window sill/radiator. Betty Gow could have put it in the crib herself if she had been involved.**

**The chisel was probably used to open the closed, but unlocked, window and NOT to fracture the baby's head as Wilentz suddenly claimed in his summation. What other purpose could it have served if not to pry the window ajar? And why are there so many discrepancies in where it was found? As for Hauptmann, all the cops had to do was lose one chisel from his toolchest to prove this was the one. So, where were his fingerprints on the one found at the scene? Maybe the reason there are discrepancies in where it was actually found has more to do with the reports that it was found embedded in mud? That is always the reason given for the lack of Hauptmann's prints. Maybe the cops changed the location to fit the muddy hole it is supposed to have been found in so they could have an excuse for the lack of prints?**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re:"Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 03:44:48  
207.220.150.37 writes:**

**---- But the question that always bothers me is why some authors (I think Berg does this too ) make a point of the window being slightly open when Lindbergh enters the nursery the first time. He is supposed to have closed the slightly-opened window himself, according to some accounts.----**

**I don't know why some authors say this. (Fisher says it too.) Neither he nor Berg (who got a lot of his information from Fisher) saw fit to document their sources so it is somewhat hard to verify. I would very much like to see their sources though, because the only person who could say whether that window was open was Charles Lindbergh, himself - and he said it was closed. Betty said she didn't look around the room but thought it was just as she left it. Anne didn't look at the windows at all (then or later), and the window was closed at 10:30 when the police got there.**

**---- That note should have logically been placed in the crib and nowhere else. ----**

**Why? What makes you so sure that the kidnapers acted logically? Criminals often don't. (Was it logical for John - whether kidnapper, extortionist, or just con-man - to sit in the park and talk to Condon for an hour?)**

**--- Betty Gow could have put it in the crib herself if she had been involved. ----**

**She could have, but there is nothing that says she MUST have. She could just as easily put it on the window sill after closing the window behind the kidnapers.**

**---- And why are there so many discrepancies in where [the chisel] was found? ----**

**The discrepancies are in the books about the case, not in the record. The police report and the trial testimony both indicate that it was found by the ladder.**

**---- So, where were [Hauptmann's] fingerprints on the [chisel] found at the scene? --  
--**

**Where were Lindbergh's? Hauptmann or anyone else there intending to commit a crime probably would have been smart enough to wear gloves. OTOH, Lindbergh**

wouldn't need any gloves, would he? After all, there wasn't supposed to be any police investigation. But his prints weren't there either.

---- Maybe the reason there are discrepancies in where it was actually found has more to do with the reports that it was found embedded in mud? ----

Again, the police report and the trial testimony do not say that.

Like the location itself, I think this is one of those "facts" that was put into someone's book and just got repeated without checking. The book written by Sidney Whipple in 1935 has it right. The one written by J. Vreeland Haring in 1937 has the chisel by the house and in the mud. It may have started there.

--- Maybe the cops changed the location to fit the muddy hole it is supposed to have been found in so they could have an excuse for the lack of prints? ---

Don't think so. See above.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re:"Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 10:02:17  
208.131.144.218 writes:

In Ann Morrow's letter to her mother-in-law she writes, "At ten Betty went in to the baby, shut the window first, then lit the electric stove, then turned to the bed. It was empty and the sides still up."

CF

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:"Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Wednesday, 10-Feb-99 17:23:25  
205.188.198.173 writes:

If Betty closed the open window before discovering the empty crib, how could any envelope have remained on the sill throughout the howling wind? And, without

getting wet from the rain? Only one of 5 people (and a dog) could have placed it on the sill after the baby was discovered missing and Lindbergh makes the most sense to me.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Thursday, 11-Feb-99 06:39:58  
207.220.150.41 writes:

--- In Ann Morrow's letter to her mother-in-law she writes, "At ten Betty went in to the baby, shut the window first, then lit the electric stove, then turned to the bed. It was empty and the sides still up." ---

The window to which Anne refers is not the southeast corner window through which the kidnappers entered. It is the French window on the south wall of the room, which Betty had left open a crack after she put Charlie down. That window was open and the shutters on it were locked.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 14:04:32  
152.163.197.56 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;not the southeast corner window through which the kidnappers entered. It is the French window on the south wall of the room, which Betty had left open a crack  
;;;;;;;;;;

All the more reason that it is not probable that an envelope remained stable on the other window sill. Unless someone placed it there from within the room after the child was already gone, I do not see how any envelope could have remained on the sill (or radiator) on such a rainy and windy night with an open window on another side of that room.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 20:07:35  
207.220.151.113 writes:**

**The window was only open a crack and the shutters were closed. I doubt there was much wind inside the room.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Friday, 12-Feb-99 21:22:19  
152.163.206.194 writes:**

**I am aware of the slight opening and the closed shutters. But, I still think a howling and rainy wind (and that has been the weather description of just about everybody) would have created a strong enough vent to make the window sill (or radiator) an obviously unreliable position for the placement of such an important envelope. How could the "kidnapper" trust a windy spot like that? Why leave it in such a vulnerable position? It makes no sense unless someone placed it afterwards.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Saturday, 13-Feb-99 06:52:24  
207.220.150.55 writes:**

**--- But, I still think a howling and rainy wind ...would have created a strong enough vent to make the window sill... ---**

**That much wind inside the room? Doesn't say much for how well Betty Gow took care of her charge, does it?**

**--- How could the "kidnapper" trust a windy spot like that? Why leave it in such a vulnerable position? ---**

**Why not? Maybe the kidnappers didn't really care where they found the note.**

**As for it being placed there after the fact, how does that possibility point to Lindbergh in particular? The others in the house had far more of an opportunity to put it there after the fact than he did. Just as they had far more of an opportunity to wipe away any fingerprints than he did.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: "Errors" List/location of note/chisel  
Saturday, 13-Feb-99 16:23:07  
152.163.207.184 writes:**

**;;;;;;As for it being placed there after the fact, how does that possibility point to Lindbergh in particular? The others in the house had far more of an opportunity to put it there after the fact than he did. Just as they had far more of an opportunity to wipe away any fingerprints than he did.;;;;;;**

**But the possibility points to him as much as anyone else. The others continued searching for the missing child and HE did not. Why? ( He must have had supernatural powers to have known the child was "kidnapped" without even doing the minimal search a parent would do for a missing 20-month-old. When it became "apparent" that Lindbergh did not have the baby, Betty, Anne and Elsie became preoccupied with a search of the house. Lindbergh really did have as much of a chance to wipe the nursery down and plant that envelope himself. What makes you think he could not have done these things? They take only minutes (or even seconds) to accomplish.**

**ronelle**

**Timing**

**Sunday, 14-Feb-99 06:06:32**

**207.220.150.86 writes:**

**I am posting this response to Ronelle's 2-13 comments on the location of the note and chisel topic because it doesn't have that much to do with the location of those items, I suspect it will result in some dialoge and the re re re re stuff drives me nuts.**

**---The others continued searching for the missing child and HE did not. Why? ---**

**You are going to have provide a source for the statement that Lindbergh stopped searching. The other people who were there that night said that Charles and Oliver went downstairs and outside to search. No one there even suggested that Charles was not searching for Charlie.**

**How do you know that Charles stopped searching?**

**--- He must have had supernatural powers to have known the child was "kidnapped" without even doing the minimal search a parent would do for a missing 20-month-old. ---**

**I know that A&M made a big deal about how Charles didn't search the house before concluding Charlie had been taken: "Your first thought is that the child got out of the crib and crawled or toddled off somewhere, either in pursuit of a favorite toy or a stuffed animal or else to find another place to sleep. Children forever want to sleep in "mommy's bed" or "on the couch". Your first instinct is to look for him."**

**Apparently, however, Charles was not alone in quickly concluding that Charlie had not "toddled" off. Betty, upon finding the crib empty, didn't look around the room and she didn't look in the other room of the nursery suite (where she said she had not yet been). She didn't even turn on the light in the nursery. Instead, she, too, immediately concluded that Charlie had NOT left the nursery on his own. That is why her first action was to talk to Anne.**

**(Talk about illogical action -- if you found your child's or charge's crib empty wouldn't you at least turn on the light and look around the rest of the room? That seems to me to be the very first thing a person would do.)**

**In regard to Charles's conclusions consider the following:**

**--- Charlie was not in his crib.**

**--- Charlie did not leave it on his own. (Charles, Anne, Betty, and the police all said it was 'obvious' or 'apparent'(their words) from the condition of the crib that Charlie had not gotten out on his own - the bed covers were undisturbed, they could still see the imprint of his head on the pillow, etc).**

--- Neither Anne nor Betty had him.

--- There was mud on the floor in a trail between the window and the crib.

--- There was an envelope on the windowsill. (I know you disagree that it was there, but Charles testified he saw it and, like it or not, there is no one who said it wasn't there.)

--- Kidnappings were constantly in the headlines at this time.

--- The Lindberghs were a famous and relatively wealthy family.

--- Charles may have thought (my speculation, but IMHO it seems reasonable) that before Betty started alarming the house, she might have looked around for Charlie at least a little (like in the rest of the nursery).

Add a couple of things that Charles may or may not have known at that point (it is unclear whether he did):

--- Both doors from the room were closed when Betty left the nursery at 8:00 and closed when she returned.

--- The right hand shutter on the southeast corner window was open.

Was kidnapping really such a remote possibility?

--- Lindbergh really did have as much of a chance to wipe the nursery down and plant that envelope himself. ---

Only if you assume that he used the few minutes available to him between the time Oliver left for Hopewell and the time he returned with the HPD (who he met on the road) to wipe down the room, including the outside of the window. AND you assume he was prepared to take such a completely unnecessary risk with Anne, Betty and Elsie all upstairs with him, moving around and able to walk in on him at any time. (Elsie and Betty both testified that all three were upstairs until 10:30, when or after the HPD arrived.)

Shall we consider in those few minutes the time he would no doubt have spent checking to see where in the upstairs Anne, Betty and Elsie were? How do you suppose he figured out where they were up there without any of them noticing him? (None of them even said they saw him upstairs during that time.) Do you think he just walked in and started wiping off those unsuspecting fingerprints without even finding out where the others were?

Compare that scenario and those few minutes to the time available to others:



**Betty was alone in the suite from 7:30 to 8:00 and for another 5 minutes between the time she entered the room at 10:00 and the time she discovered Charlie missing.**

**Betty and Elsie were upstairs from 9:00 to 10:00.**

**Oliver was alone from 9:00 to 10:00.**

**Even Anne was alone upstairs from 9:30 to 10:00.**

**It was only 20 to 25 minutes from the time Charlie was discovered missing to the time the HPD arrived. Even forgetting about phone calls and getting his rifle and looking outside, etc., Charles had nowhere near the time available to others. More significantly, he had nowhere near the PRIVACY that I suggest was necessary to make such a risk worthwhile.**

**(What would be more suspicious, his fingerprints in the room or being caught wiping fingerprints away?)**

**Come to think of it, why would Charles even bother to take the extreme and unnecessary risk of doing something like that at all? No one would have questioned finding his prints in the room (even if only because he was in there after the discovery that Charlie was missing). If it is a question of the police not finding a stranger's prints, everyone would just have presumed, as they did, that the kidnapper wore gloves.**

**It seems to me that if I were sufficiently concerned about fingerprints that I would take such a risk, I would not have wiped them off. Instead, I would have gone into that room (with witnesses) and handled everything I could lay my hands on --- including and especially the note.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Timing**

**Sunday, 14-Feb-99 16:36:14**

**207.172.7.101 writes:**

**First of all, thanks for circumventing the re,re,re stuff. It also drives me nuts! Wouldn't it be nice if this information could somehow be tucked away in archives? I've seen it done in other forums and they are really pleasant places to visit.**

So MJR, I want to put all my intuitive powers to work here and take a guess that you are, indeed, a MAN. Any woman as familiar with this case as you and I, would never ask WHY Betty Gow never bothered to turn on the light to search the room immediately after discovering Charlie missing. It's obvious that she immediately assumed one of the parents had the baby. After discovering that Anne did not have him, Betty must have instinctively feared for the child's safety when she heard that he might be in the hands of the practical joker. If you have any doubts about why Betty had this particular reaction, I invite you to revisit page 234 in Berg's book. When I first read these paragraphs, I was completely horrified by Lindbergh's behavior. Today this would be considered child abuse! It's hard to imagine Betty Gow having much respect for Charles Lindbergh, yet I'm sure that over the months, she learned that in order to keep her job, she had to develop a fair amount of tolerance.

One doesn't have to look very far into this forum or in Berg's reviews on Amazon.com to see that, in general, it is men who defend (or ignore) Charles Lindbergh's behavior and it is women who see through him. The argument "Lindbergh may have had a sick sense of humor/flawed character... but that doesn't make him a murderer" just doesn't hold water with most women. Historically, we know how our judicial system works. We know that in another 60 years attorneys will provide us with a convincing argument that "O.J. Simpson may have been a controlling man and a wife beater... but that doesn't make him a murderer" Yeah, sure.

Melinda

Re: Re: Timing  
Monday, 15-Feb-99 02:49:32  
207.220.150.71 writes:

--- It's obvious that she immediately assumed one of the parents had the baby. ----

That was my point. Betty immediately assumed Charlie had not "toddled" away.

I disagree, BTW, that a woman would not have turned on that light and looked for Charlie. If it was AT ALL a realistic possibility that he had gotten out of the crib himself, I think a woman would have done just that. If it was NOT a realistic possibility, why is it so suspicious that Lindbergh didn't consider it?

--- ... it is men who defend (or ignore) Charles Lindbergh's behavior and it is women who see through him. ---

I neither "defend" nor "ignore" Lindbergh's "jokes".

I do think that the stories about them are often mis-stated or only half stated. This is based on the fact that the descriptions of the incidents given by the people who actually witnessed them are often quite different than the stories as quoted.

I also question the fact that the overall opinions of Charles Lindbergh held by those same people are routinely ignored or dismissed.

--- The argument "Lindbergh may have had a sick sense of humor/flawed character... but that doesn't make him a murderer" just doesn't hold water with most women. ---

Sorry, but I disagree. There are women who accuse or convict based on EVIDENCE rather than character.

If past behavior is evidence of guilt then I take it you consider the fact that Hauptmann was a two-time loser (including a violent felony and a second-story job) "proof" that he was guilty.

--- Historically, we know how our judicial system works. ---

Like it or not, how our judicial system works is that an accusation or conviction is supposed to be based on evidence - not whether the accused is a good person.

In any event, there is a little bit of a difference between this case and Simpson's. One is a history of domestic violence AND substantial other evidence to support guilt. The other is a history of "practical jokes", or what ever you wish to call them, but NO real evidence other than "character" and the accusers' interpretation and suspicion of his actions around and after the crime to support guilt. Interpretations, I suggest, that are only suspicious if one BEGINS with the belief that Lindbergh had something to hide. (Or, of course, if one ignores some of the other facts.)

This is why I have repeatedly asked for evidence that does not involve "character" and "interpretation". I have yet to see any.

Tell me BTW, if the ONLY real evidence against Simpson had been the history of violence would you have convicted him based on that? Rather than Simpson, the accusation against Lindbergh reminds me more of Sam Sheppard who was found guilty of adultery and convicted of murder.

Mjr