

**Re: Timing**  
**Monday, 15-Feb-99 02:40:34**  
**152.163.197.74 writes:**

**;;;;;;;;;;I know that A&M made a big deal about how Charles didn't search the house before concluding Charlie had been taken;;;;;;;;;;**

**I can't believe you don't understand this - it really IS a big deal! Especially if you are a police chief for 28 years of your life as Monier has been. Imagine - you are a cop investigating this case today and you discover that the father made no attempt to search the house! I cannot understand your refusal to accept this fact. I am sure that if it was any other case, with any other father, you would be skeptical about such behavior. But, because it is Charles Lindbergh, the daredevil hero, you allow him to have supernatural powers. He "knew" the baby was taken by "THEY" ( and, yes, it is also a big deal to use that word when the ransom letter has not even been "found" nor opened to reveal "WE") He did not need to look further than a mere glance into the nursery (he never even entered it!)before getting out a shotgun and calling the trenton police AND his lawyer!**

**Sure, Lindbergh ran around outside (no one really knows what he was actually doing there) but he NEVER joined the others in a search of the attic, basement, or any other room.Why was he so sure they WOULDN'T find the kid in the attic? He didn't wait until the search was completed before getting out his gun and calling the cops!**

**;;;;;;;;;;Was kidnapping really such a remote possibility?**

**;;;;;;;;;;**

**Yes. To the others in that house it was a remote possibility, especially since the baby's father played a kidnap "joke" on the household a few weeks earlier! And, how many of those current kidnappings were of babies? The only person in the house who made that leap of thought was Charles Lindbergh and no one else. Why? It was just as nonsensical as the Ramseys claim of an intruder. Or OJ's claim of drug addicts! In order to focus attention elsewhere. Everyone else in that house preferred the logical procedure of searching the other rooms. It is a big house! A 20-month-old child could be virtually anywhere! (I once lost my son at that very same age in Macy's - he crawled out of his stroller and went to sleep under the display of shirts! It is quite common behavior.)**

**As for Betty not turning on a light I think Melinda has answered that perfectly - Betty and Anne were not alarmed because they both instinctively believed it was another prank.**

**;;;;;;;;;;? 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). ;;;;;;;;;;; But they would have questioned finding his prints in surprising places that he would not have been able to account for. At least, that is what he might have been**

afraid of. It is strange that the fingerprints of Anne, Betty, and Elsie were not found after having searched the nursery. But, criminals always make stupid mistakes. He could not have been as calm and collected as Anne described in her letter. More likely that Charles Lindbergh was in an intense state of panic.

ronelle

Re: Re: Timing  
Monday, 15-Feb-99 04:56:58  
207.220.150.71 writes:

--- ...the father made no attempt to search  
the house! ---

Charlie was gone. He did not get out of the crib by himself. He was not taken out of the crib by his mother or his nurse. He was not taken out of the crib by the butler or the cook (who Betty and Charles at least spoke to prior to calling the police). Ergo, he was taken out of his crib (and his room) but not by anyone in the house.

Who was Charles to think took Charlie? Where was he supposed to search for the place this outsider took him?

--- He "knew" the baby was taken by "THEY" ( and, yes, it is also a big deal to use that word when the ransom letter has not even been "found" nor opened to reveal "WE") ---

It is only significant to some. As I said before, every other writer or commentator on this case knew perfectly well who "they" were.

As for the note not being "found" (the quotations implying that it was not found because it was not there, right?), who said it wasn't? Lindbergh testified that he had already noticed it and there is no evidence to support the claim that he was lying. If Betty and Anne didn't see the note maybe it is because Betty didn't look around the room and Anne didn't look at the windows. (Their testimony.)

Please provide a source that says the note wasn't there.

--- He did not need to look further than a mere glance into the nursery (he never even entered it!)---

**Sorry, but that just isn't so. Betty said that he went into the nursery (with her right behind him) and looked in the crib - exactly as she had done, exactly as Anne had done (except that he turned on the light).**

**---calling the trenton police AND his lawyer!---**

**Charlie was gone, not under his own power, and NO ONE in the house had him. Lindbergh should not have called the police? He should have waited precious minutes and searched the entire house for wherever the outsider put him? Why, when they could do (and did) both?**

**As for calling Breckinridge, I point out again that Breckinridge was not only his lawyer but also his friend. How many lawyers do you know who, when called in the middle of the night to consult with a client, bring their wives along on the consultation?**

**--- Sure, Lindbergh ran around outside (no one really knows what he was actually doing there)---**

**He was searching, with Whateley. There is no evidence to even suggest otherwise. Unless you start with the presumption of guilt, this does not sound strange.**

**-- but he NEVER joined the others in a search of the attic, basement, or any other room. Why was he so sure they WOULDN'T find the kid in the attic? ---**

**Why didn't Betty or Anne or Elsie search downstairs? According to the testimony, they all stayed upstairs. Did they think he couldn't be in the attic?**

**BTW, how do you know that he wasn't searching downstairs while they were upstairs?**

**Got a source for the claim that Charles was not searching?**

**---He didn't wait until the search was completed before getting out his gun and calling the cops! ---**

**That's right. He knew his son was gone, not on his own, and that no one in the house had him. He called the police and went out into the driveway (armed) in hopes of catching the people who DID have him. Again, unless you start with the presumption of guilt, this doesn't sound unreasonable.**

**--- To the others in that house it was a remote possibility, especially since the baby's father played a kidnap "joke" on the household a few weeks earlier!...The only person in the house who made that leap of thought was Charles Lindbergh and no one else. ---**

**Anne said she thought of Charles momentarily and Betty's first thought was not Charles - it was that Anne had Charlie.**

**How can you possibly know that they thought after that moment?**

**Got a source for what Anne and the others thought after realizing Charles didn't have him?**

**---- Everyone else in that house preferred the logical procedure of searching the other rooms.----**

**Again, how do you know this? Did Anne, or anyone else there say that they thought there should have been a search before calling the police? And, how do you know they thought he would be there? Maybe they searched for the simple reason that there really was nothing else they could do. Maybe they searched in hopes that they might find him - even if they didn't really think they would. If they thought he was still in the house, why did they stop looking after searching the upstairs?**

**Got a source for what Anne and the others thought was the 'logical' procedure or what they 'preferred'?**

**--- A 20-month-old child could be virtually anywhere! ---**

**Not if he didn't get out of his crib by himself and wasn't with any of the household members, he couldn't.**

**--- As for Betty not turning on a light I think Melinda has answered that perfectly - Betty and Anne were not alarmed because they both instinctively believed it was another prank. ---**

**Sorry, but I disagree. I find it incredible that Betty didn't even look around the room. No matter what she might have thought, IMHO the natural reaction would have been to turn on the light and look.**

**BTW, if Betty's first thought was that Charles had him, why did she approach the sick, pregnant lady of the house first? Very thoughtful of her.**

**--- But they would have questioned finding his prints in surprising places that he would not have been able to account for. At least, that is what he might have been afraid of. ---**

**Fine, so wipe clean only those places. That is also, BTW, all the more reason to handle things, especially the note, immediately. After all, he couldn't be sure he would have the time or the privacy to wipe fingerprints off later, could he?**

**--- It is strange that the fingerprints of Anne, Betty, and Elsie were not found after having searched the nursery. ---**

**And that, of course means Charles wiped them off. No one else, just Charles, who had only a few minutes and with Anne, Betty and Elsie running around upstairs with him.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Timing  
Tuesday, 16-Feb-99 02:01:52  
205.188.192.176 writes:**

**;;;;;;Charlie was gone. He did not get out of the crib by himself;;;;;;  
There is no way anyone could have been absolutely sure about that, at least not unless the child was drugged to keep him asleep during the night.**

**;;;;;;every other writer or commentator on this case knew perfectly well who "they" were;;;;;;  
Every other writer or commentator was a journalist - not a cop. Every other writer or commentator - just like Berg - is attracted to histrionics for the sake of a feel-good (or, feel-bad) story. None of them were cops who make a living every day from actually doing the stuff others merely write about. Ask Police Chief Monier, or any other cop, what that slip of the tongue would have done to the investigation of any other citizen.**

**;;;;;;Lindbergh testified that he had already noticed it and there is no evidence to support the claim that he was lying;;;;;;  
There is no evidence to support he told the truth either. The person who ought to have been suspect #1 testified to lots of things that cannot be corroborated - no one bothered to ask for it. Heros are always truthful and never lie.**

**;;;;;;Betty's first thought was not Charles - it was that Anne had Charlie.  
;;;;;;**

**Nope. Upon finding the crib empty, Anne's letter clearly states "She [Betty] thought C. took him for a joke. I did too until I saw his face."**

**And, the question of why Betty would ask Anne if she had the baby, before asking C, I would imagine that if it IS another "joke" it would be only proper for Anne to be the one to deal with her impossible husband - not the nursemaid.**

**;;;;;;;;;;That's right. He knew his son was gone, not on his own, and that no one in the house had him. ;;;;;;;;;;**

**Again, it is not possible for him to have known this so soon. The others had not completed any search of closets or other places within the house yet. And, if it was as obvious as you say it was, that the child was taken and didn't climb out himself, then why did they all run around searching? No one thought it was a kidnap except the father. According to what I remember reading Lindbergh never even entered the nursery but passed by on his way to the bedroom to get his shotgun.**

**;;;;;;;;;;;;;the natural reaction [for Betty Gow] would have been to turn on the light and look.;;;;;;;;;;**

**But the "natural reaction" in this particular household had already been tainted by an adolescent-minded master whose habit it was to put everyone on edge with cruel pranks - like putting his son in the trash bin in the trash closet.**

**The odds of parental involvement in a child's death are twelve to one, according to Dr Cyril Wecht. Your refusal to be even a little bit skeptical about Lindbergh's behavior is unreal according to investigative techniques. Your demand for sources regarding what people thought 67 years ago is ridiculous especially since the biggest liar, after Wilentz, at Hauptmann's trial was Lindbergh. The person - or persons - you secretly believe are culprits, could not possibly have had better windows of opportunity or better access to the crime than Charles Lindbergh. Is that why you are hiding your "culprit" from the readers of this board? Whomever you think it is, they are certainly dead by now - so what is your excuse for being so secretive? Or, are you afraid we will ask you for sources?**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Timing  
Tuesday, 16-Feb-99 07:30:13  
207.220.150.48 writes:**

**The people who looked in that crib described the bed covers, etc. as being undisturbed. Betty was sufficiently sure someone had taken Charlie that she didn't look for him at all - not even in the room - before asking Anne whether she had him. Irrespective of WHO she might of thought took him, the fact remains (and this was my point) that she thought he was TAKEN and did not leave by himself.**

**I'm sorry, but IMHO, Betty's actions indicate that she initially thought Anne had picked him up and taken him into her room. I don't doubt Anne's statement that Betty at some point expressed the thought that Charles took him. IMHO, however, her actions suggest it was not her first thought.**

**---There is no evidence to support [Lindbergh] told the truth either. ---**

**So you feel free to say that he lied - without any evidence to support the accusation.**

**There was no evidence to support Richard Hauptmann's claim that he had several thousand dollars tucked away in a trunk in his apartment - do you also say he was lying when he said he did? No one can prove he was telling the truth.**

**---...it is not possible for him to have known this so soon. ---**

**Why not? Charlie was most definitely gone from the crib. He was not with Betty, or Anne and by the time they called the police, Elsie and Oliver who were both upstairs and he knew Charlie was not with either of them. There was no one else in the house. Why is it not possible for him to "know" (reasonably conclude) that someone outside the household had taken him?**

**--- No one thought it was a kidnap except the father. ----**

**--- Your demand for sources regarding what people thought 67 years ago is ridiculous ---**

**You accuse me of thinking Charles was "psychic" because he concluded that Charlie had been kidnapped, yet here you are telling me what all the other people in the house thought. You have no way of knowing what the people in the house thought all that time.**

**I'm sorry that you consider my "demand" for sources ridiculous but if you have no source to support your comments about what Anne and the other thought, how can you claim to know those thoughts?**

**Particularly, how can you state what they "thought" as a FACT?**

**--- According to what I remember reading Lindbergh never even entered the nursery but passed by on his way to the bedroom to get his shotgun. ---**

**I don't know what you read, but apparently it wasn't the trial transcript or Betty Gow's statement to the police, because they both say he went into the nursery.**

**Mjr**

**A little help**  
**Monday, 15-Feb-1999 00:23:57**

**Message:**  
**205.188.193.49 writes:**

I have to defend Bruno Richard Hauptmann in a trial reenactment in my high school. I'm finding it a lot easier than I thought. If you have any doubt Hauptmann is innocent, look at the number of people out to get him. Cecil Barr, for example said that "without a doubt the man who passed me the ransom bill is Hauptmann." We can now prove otherwise. There are countless others. If we have proof that these people were out to frame Hauptmann, how many others were there that we don't have concrete proof of? Also, if you really want to talk about circumstantial evidence, try the fact that Lindbergh could recognize Hauptmann's voice. That fact would be laughed out of a 1999 court. There is also absolutely no forensic evidence to convict Hauptmann. I have however, noticed a snag, I have not been able to find the date that the search and arrest warrants were granted. I have recently heard that it is very possible that the search of Hauptmann's home was illegal. Can anyone help me? Are there any little known facts, or personal theories I should know. This page is great, it helped me more than you will ever know!

**Bailey**

**Re: A little help**  
**Tuesday, 16-Feb-1999 13:38:32**  
**207.172.7.100 writes:**

Although I have e-mailed you personally, Bailey, I thought I would also post a "thank you" on this forum. It does my heart good to know people like you are interested in the facts... and in passing on your findings to your fellow students. When we hear news items, such as the 4 law students and their professor who recently helped prove and ultimately free an "innocent" death row inmate, I know there is hope for re-opening the case against Hauptmann. Keep up the good work!

**Melinda**



**Re: A little help,some**  
**Tuesday, 02-Mar-1999 18:55:13**  
**140.211.118.177 writes:**

**Hi,**

**I am currently involved in a production of "Hauptmann," and I find it fascinating that so many people feel that he is innocent. The answer to your question is yes the police did illegally search his house because they were there waiting for him when he got home from work that day. They totally destroyed the room and quickly interrogated him into submission. I agree that this is an injustice to Bruno and I think that it needs another look by our legal system. By the way I am playing Charles Lindberg in the play and I should be a great show. I am performing it at Western Oregon University, just outside of Salem. I encourage anyone to read the play by John Logan or if you live in this area, check it out! Thanks for your time.**  
**Ryan**

**Ryan Perry**

**Re: Re: A little help,some**  
**Thursday, 08-Apr-1999 12:02:07**  
**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**Perhaps you should review the facts, especially regarding the arrest of BRH. You may find you are significantly in error. However, that doesn't seem to stop others who champion this case on one side or the other. Under modern law, since BRH was a tenant in the house, there may be a question as to whether he had exclusive use of the garage where the money was found; or the attic where additional money was found. Without exclusive use, his right of privacy under the Fourth Amendment may have been greatly diminished. But then, that's applying today's law to yesterday...**

**JM**

## **Involved**

**Monday, 22-Feb-1999 16:00:59**

**Message:**

**24.4.252.64 writes:**

**Hauptmann was obviously involved. With all of the evidence against him, how could he not be? Why would he have "Jasfie's" name and phone number written on the inside of his closet. If he was just interested in the case, as he claimed, why write this info in such a suspicious location. What's wrong with a piece of paper? Another thing. Hauptmann was missing a tool from his carpentry kit. The same type and size tool was found on the Lindbergh property, apparently used to take apart the ladder after the child was taken. That's no coincidence. Hauptmann was definitely involved. He may not have been the one who actually dropped the child and killed him, but he knows who did(IF it wasn't him).**

**Todd Kovacs**

**Re: Involved**

**Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 06:37:37**

**207.220.150.57 writes:**

**--- Why would he have "Jasfie's" name and phone number written on the inside of his closet. If he was just interested in the case, as he claimed, why write this info in such a suspicious location. ---**

**Why write it in a place he couldn't reach and, quite likely, couldn't see (since there was no light in the closet)? Why write the phone number down at all since, having no telephone, Hauptmann would have to leave his home to make any call, anyway?**

**In order to see what was written on that closet trim, the police officer who "found" it (Henry Bruckman) had to remove all the shelves and back into the closet. "Squeezed" into the closet as one of the officers present testified. Why did he do this? Bruckman said: "As the result of the investigation and interviewing various witnesses...I appeared at the Hauptmann apartment...I wanted to give them the benefit of such knowledge as I gained during the course of the investigation, and I went there FOR THE PURPOSE OF DIRECTING THEIR ATTENTION ALONG CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONAL LINES..." [Empahsis added]**

**Bruckman went there, emptied the closet and "squeezed" backwards into it for a reason. What witnesses do you suppose he interviewed that caused him to look in that closet? What "investigation" do you suppose led him there? Could it be that someone TOLD him there was something there?**

**I suggest to you that that is precisely what happened. Someone told him to look there, someone who was not in a position to "find" the evidence himself (ergo, not a police officer). Who? Well, maybe it was Tom Cassidy from the New York Daily News who later went around telling people that HE wrote it because he needed a story for that day. (He said he saw nothing wrong in doing it, after all everyone knew Hauptmann was guilty.)**

**Two people, in separate interviews with Anthony Scaduto, said Cassidy told them this. (According to another author, reporters told this to Harold Hoffman, too.)**

**--- Hauptmann was missing a tool from his carpentry kit...That's no coincidence.---**

**Anthony Scaduto found 3 3/4 inch chisels in the NYPD files - chisels labeled as belonging to Hauptmann. Even Koehler apparently stated that Hauptmann had a 3/4 inch chisel when arrested.**

**I suggest, however, that you are right - it was NO coincidence that they were not in Hauptmann's tool box during Koehler's dramatic "search" of it in Flemington.**

**(Cynic that I am, I would prefer to see the chisels myself. Scaduto, however, is one author who has been very accurate in most everything I have independently verified.)**

**--- The same type and size tool was found on the Lindbergh property, apparently used to take apart the ladder after the child was taken. ---**

**Actually, the police thought the chisel was probably brought to pry open the window. The two bottom parts of the ladder were still connected when found and, since it wasn't used, the third piece may not have been connected at the Lindbergh house at all.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Involved  
Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 10:16:25  
24.4.252.64 writes:**

**---The police thought the chisel was probably brought to pry open the window.---**

**---...the third piece may not have been connected---**

**Thought, probably, may not have. Sounds like there are a lot of speculations being made here.**

**"With all other things being equal, the simplest explanation tends to be the right one."**

If I had just accidentally killed the child of one of the most well known men in the world, I wouldn't wait around to take apart the whole ladder I used to climb into his house.

---since it wasn't used---

Since what wasn't used? The ladder or the third piece. Please explain.

I don't understand how anyone can think that Hauptmann had absolutely nothing to do with this kidnapping. This amazes me.

Re: Re: Re: Involved

Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 18:08:28

207.220.151.68 writes:

-- ---The police thought the chisel was probably brought to pry open the window.---  
...the third piece may not have been connected --- --

---Thought,probably, may not have. Sounds like there are a lot of speculations being made here. ----

Of course the police were speculating. No one knows for sure what the chisel was doing there.

As for the statement that the third section of the ladder may not have been used to gain entry into the house,only the kidnappers would know that 100%. The statement, however, is well supported.

--- If I had just accidentally killed the child of one of the most well known men in the world, I wouldn't wait around to take apart the whole ladder I used to climb into his house.

---since it wasn't used---

--- Since what wasn't used? The ladder or the third piece. Please explain. ---

The third piece of the ladder.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Involved

Wednesday, 24-Feb-1999 01:01:30

205.188.192.42 writes:

;;;;;"With all other things being equal, the simplest explanation tends to be the right one."

;;;;;;

I wish you would apply an alias so we all can follow the debate more easily. But, as you can see from the ideas expressed on this message board (and all that has been written since Scaduto's research in 1976), Occam's Razor theory does NOT apply to Hauptmann as lone murderer and lone kidnapper. Hauptmann "the kidnap killer" raises too many unanswerable questions.

If "Hauptmann the lone killer" is your choice of simple answers then you have to give some plausible answer to why the attic wood does not match the ladder wood, why the Reliance Mgmt time sheets have blobs of ink over Hauptmann's name and no other carpenter's, why Jafsie refused to ID him originally and gave several versions of his description that did not match, why none of Hauptmann's fingerprints were found anywhere in NJ, why he refused 90,000. from newspapers for his confession before he was executed, why Isidor Fisch paid for his steamship passage with ransom money, etc. Don't you honestly think there is too much reasonable doubt to say for certain that Hauptmann was guilty? He would have to have known exactly where the mansion was and exactly where the nursery was, and which window could not be locked from the inside. He would have had to know the family would be there on that night when they had never done so before, and - that the dog wouldn't bark! What extraordinary powers! Or was it just dumb luck in your opinion?

This is what you call the simplest explanation?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved  
Wednesday, 24-Feb-1999 10:15:03  
24.4.252.64 writes:

Every one gets lucky once in a while. I never said Haupmann did it alone. Things worked out perfectly for Haupmann, and his partner(s), that is why the "Crime of the Century" debate still rages on today.

Honestly, do you really thing Haupmann had zero involmnet in this case? Please answer this one question...

Oh, and my alias is Todd Kovacs, doesn't that show up on the board?

tk

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved**  
**Wednesday, 24-Feb-1999 23:44:56**  
**205.188.199.38 writes:**

**Todd, unless you put your name or initials on every piece of the thread it is difficult to know if you are a new debater or an earlier one from a previous message.**

**To answer your question, yes, I do believe Hauptmann to be completely blameless in the death of the Lindbergh baby. As for his guilt involving the money I could leave room for possibilities but I feel Isidor Fisch is the key to that whole scenario. (And now Melinda tells us that the FBI won't open his file to the public.) The baby's disappearance and the demand for money, in my opinion, are completely separate events - just 2 different scams going on at the same time and both feeding off the other.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved**  
**Thursday, 25-Feb-1999 04:58:25**  
**207.220.150.67 writes:**

**--- I never said Hauptmann did it alone. ---**

**The claim that Hauptmann, and Hauptmann ALONE, committed this crime was what the State said the evidence 'proved'. That was the central basis of their case. They 'proved' that it was Hauptmann alone - it was the only way they could place him in the Lindbergh nursery (which was necessary to their burglary charge and therefore the felony murder case).**

**If you don't think Hauptmann was alone in this, then I suggest that you must have some problems with the evidence, too.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved**  
**Thursday, 25-Feb-1999 12:46:27**  
**24.4.252.64 writes:**

**It's not that I have problems with the evidence, I just feel Hauptmann deserved being punished for being involved with this crime.**

**Todd**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved  
Friday, 26-Feb-1999 06:48:16  
207.220.150.114 writes:**

**The evidence presented by the State of New Jersey 'proved' that Richard Hauptmann, all by himself and without anyone else, committed this crime. THAT is what they 'proved'. It was necessary to his conviction for the felony murder. THAT is how they put him in the electric chair.**

**Hauptmann didn't do it alone? Are you saying that the evidence shows something OTHER than what the State of New Jersey said it did?**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved  
Friday, 26-Feb-1999 10:32:57  
24.4.252.64 writes:**

**All I am saying is that it is obvious to me as well as the State of New Jersey that Hauptmann was somehow involved in this murder/kidnapping. Did he do it alone? Maybe. I don't know and neither I nor anyone else will ever know...**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved  
Friday, 26-Feb-1999 18:33:39  
152.163.197.214 writes:**

**And you think that "somehow involved" is enough reason for the death penalty? He was found guilty of being the lone kidnapper and killer and although he was offered a plea bargain to save his life (all he had to do was turn in his "accomplices") he continued to claim innocence of the crime.**

**What is really obvious is that Hauptmann was rushed into the electric chair just so a disorderly and heavily tampered case could be "officially" closed. If it weren't for Anna Hauptmann's belief in her husband's innocence and the great crime reporter, Anthony Scaduto, NJ officials might have had their way. But, since the light of day**

is the best disinfectant I have no doubt, judging from the interest shown on this message board, that someday the truth will be acknowledged.

ronelle

**Re: Involved**

**Sunday, 14-Mar-1999 09:38:20**

**208.225.162.78 writes:**

todd after reading threw your letters i have decided that you are either a cinic with a one track mind or old man who has nothing better to do then to stir up controversey. This case may have a lot of evidence saying that Bruno Hauptmann was in fact the kidnapper and killer. But the fact is that if this case were presented in todays courts it woult be thrown out. Do you even know how he became a suspect?? A neighbor thought he was doing to good for someone in the time of the depression and if he did it how could he have spent that whole night with his wife or do you think she was involved to???

Please do e-mail me with your reply... I would like to know you thoughts on this whole thing abviuosly you have many convictions.. And I maybe only 17 and have no idea what I'm talknig about but if I do have an idea becuase maybe I have all the facts then i guess you don't....

waiting for a reply at ApRiL\_sUn\_ShInE@yahoo.com

thank you....

**ApRiL\_sUn\_ShInE**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved**

**Saturday, 06-Mar-1999 21:12:18**

**153.35.231.6 writes:**

tk-

IF Hauptmann was guilty, the police, and prosecution made complete asses of themselves by creating STACKS of evidence to prove his guilt. They had absolutely NOTHING that could place him at the Lindbergh house (as the neighbors denied having seen anything abnormal when first asked, and there were no fingerprints, and the press walked all over everything, etc,etc,etc). Without evidence proving he was at the house, what did they have? Possession of ransom money--and what



does that prove, really? What does that mean to you? To me it means nothing. He could have found it on the street, or (and why do people say this sounds so far fetched?????) it could have been given to him by a friend (who was known as a con man--Isidor Fisch).

Also, Jafsie says he heard other voices--Italian voices on the phone when he talked to the kidnappers--thus proving it wasn't a "Lone Wolf." Admittedly, Jafsie is not a great source since the man is a proven liar, and pompous @\$%, but when tied to everything...there are just too many questions.

Now, why would the police want to frame him some people would ask. Well, because in two years they had nothing, and the press was starting to turn on them, calling them incompetent, and bumbling. How better to stop that than to end the case. When they found someone who held SOME of the ransom money (why would a lone wolf only have SOME of the ransom money?)they jumped on the opportunity to put an end to their own suffering, and make themselves heros. But in the end they didn't really do that, because today there are scores of people out there that believe they are the murderers, and they gave the real kidnappers a "get out of jail free" card when they fried the wrong man.

I don't understand how people can read about the trial, and the evidence that was given, and believe BEYOND A SHADOW OF A DOUBT that he did everything the prosecution said he did. I don't understand how the jurors could do that.

You ask, how can people think he wasn't guilty. Because if it is possible that the police and prosecution fudged even the slightest bit, why would you believe they wouldn't keep fudging evidence, and creating evidence to make sure everyone believed that they weren't criminals themselves. Once they started, it would have been extremely difficult to stop.

BRH  
B.R.Hauptmann

Re: Involved  
Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 12:10:45  
205.183.31.66 writes:

thanks todd, i thought i was the only one on this website that thinks hauptman was guilty.people on this site say things that cant be backed up with the documentation that it needs. there is no proof whatsoever that lindbergh killed his own son. i dont care what book is written i will never in a million yrs support that claim. that book them two morons wrote is bull.

steve romeo

**Re: Re: Involved**  
**Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 13:57:26**  
**24.4.252.64 writes:**

**Steve,**  
**I can see how some people want to create a huge cover-up and conspiracy about this case, it makes it more interesting. There simply isn't enough substantial documentation from a case that was tried in the 30's. They didn't have the technology that we have today. If that was the case, there would be no question on Hauptmann's guilt.**  
**And saying that Lindbergh killed his baby is like saying O.J. is innocent.**

**Re: Re: Re: Involved**  
**Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 14:12:58**  
**205.183.31.66 writes:**

**why make the case more interesting with making false statements and throwing things in that dont belong. theres plenty of documentations, but some authors say not to trust the jersey police and its museum with all the stuff they have. even to this day people think they have somthing to hide. i was there many times they never hid anything from me**

**steve romeo**

**Re: Involved**  
**Tuesday, 23-Feb-1999 20:40:27**  
**207.172.160.218 writes:**

**Well, actually, TODD, the detective who found the name and number of Dr. Condon later admitted that he wrote it there himself. He did it just to gain some publicity and pick up a little money. Just makes you wonder what ELSE they framed him with. I think that detective should be ashamed of himself.**

**Lyndsay**