

Re: Re: Re: Involved
Wednesday, 24-Feb-1999 15:41:22
209.214.47.84 writes:

To Steve Romeo:

Maybe something should bite you! Steve, with all your rantings and ravings towards Hauptmann one would think that you are a Lindbergh family member. No matter how much we can prove to you about every aspect of this case, you come up with the "Been there, done that!" Ronelle and Mjr has given several facts to the forum, yet you tend to not acknowledge them. Tell me something Steve, if a Lindbergh family member wrote a book telling that Lindbergh accidently killed the baby when playing another joke, would you still say Hauptmann still did the crime? Why do you not want Hauptmann's named cleared? The New Jersey Police framed an innocent man, and Lindbergh led the foray for it.

Karyn Von Eberhardt

Re: Re: Involved
Wednesday, 24-Feb-1999 10:19:31
24.4.252.64 writes:

Well, LYNDSAY, (mjr) was trying to tell me that a reporter wrote it there. It seems that all of you people with "conspiract theories" should get your stories straight if you really want this guy Haupmann's name cleared. And you think the detective should be ashamed of himself? It sounds like he needs a good spanking.

Todd

Re: Re: Re: Involved
Thursday, 25-Feb-1999 05:16:36
207.220.150.67 writes:

---- Well, LYNDSAY, (mjr) was trying to tell me that a reporter wrote it there. ----

I don't know where Lyndsay got her (his) information but if she (he) is not careful, I may ask for the dreaded SOURCES. :)

OTOH, the people Cassidy told about writing on the board were saying that in 1935 and 1936 (to Harold Hoffman) and they were still saying it in the early 1970s when interviewed by Anthony Scaduto.

--- "conspiract theories" ---

Just FYI, I don't do "conspiracy theories". I am not the kind of person who sees a conspiracy behind every bush - or every 'grassy knoll' as the case may be. :) Indeed, I am not sure that what happened here can really be called a conspiracy in the sense that a bunch of people got together to convict a man they knew was innocent. I'm sure that they all had their own reasons for doing what they did (a part of the reward, trying to help, pressure from the State, a sincere belief that Hauptmann was guilty, etc.). Many, I suspect, had the same attitude as Tom Cassidy - "everyone knows he's guilty, so what difference will it make if I "fudge" this evidence a little?".

Mjr

**Re: Re: Involved
Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 12:59:29
24.4.252.64 writes:**

Involved refers to both "a" and "c".

a. Yes, the ladder, holes in his story, and repetitive lying is what they "used to hang" (fry, whatever you prefer) Hauptmann. They had the ladder, it was the same wood. Hauptmann was a shady German who had a criminal history. He's involved.

c. Buying gas with Lindbergh ransom money and storing huge wads of it behind boards in your garage. How did Hauptmann just happen to get all of these gold certificates? I hope you don't believe that Fisch gave him the money and Bruno knew nothing about it. It seems an unrealisttic thought.

By the way, who cares about that insignificant country called Canada. It is only safe because they border the U.S. so nobody wants to mess with it. Oh, and the kidnapping took place in NJ, not Canada, so what's your point.

T. Kovacs

**Re: Re: Re: Involved
Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 16:22:46**

204.170.64.66 writes:

Dear Sir:

The ladder evidence is not as rock solid as it should be when used to hang someone. ask yourself is their evidence conclusive even though it is but circumstantial.

The possession of the money is not conclusive as to his guilt in the kidnapping case. He had only 1/3 of the \$\$, where is the rest of it? How did he come by that? Could have been laundered

His criminal history, that could be an interesting topic for discussion.

As for your negative comments on our neighbor of the Great White North, I do not wish to be an accomplice to a possible breach of the peace between two NAFTA partners.

Philip

Re: Re: Re: Involved

Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 00:34:08

205.188.193.31 writes:

;;;;;;Oh, and the kidnapping took place in NJ, not Canada, so what's your point.
;;;;;;;;;

Philip made an interesting point that you seem to be trying to ridicule. Ransom payments ought to be illegal here too! The Jersey and NYC cops allowed a run-amoc father to lead an "investigation" in which he promised the "kidnappers" they could walk away freely, without worry of capture, after returning his son to him! He handed over 50,000 bucks to someone in a cemetery in exchange for a piece of paper and would not allow the cops to trail the guy! What kind of society makes deals with kidnappers allowing them to remain free in exchange for the hostage? How do you think the regular folks felt about their hero when they read this in the newspapers? The "hero" was willing to jeopardize other people's children by setting a dangerous precedent with no concern for the welfare of the society he lived in! It is one more reason to believe Lindy knew his son was dead and that there was NO kidnapping.

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 07:07:05
207.220.150.45 writes:**

--- The "hero" was willing to jeopardize other people's children by setting a dangerous precedent with no concern for the welfare of the society he lived in! ---

Oh, please. Lindbergh was 'setting a precedent' by paying the ransom? I hate to tell you this, but that precedent had already been set long before. Others were still setting it even then. Lindbergh paying the ransom was hardly something new. If Lindbergh had refused, THAT might have set a precedent - of course it might also have resulted in his son's death.

What you are doing is criticizing him because he wasn't willing to jeopardize his own son to set a new precedent.

--- How do you think the regular folks felt about their hero when they read this in the newspapers?---

I suspect they felt he was doing exactly what they would do - ANYTHING IT TOOK to get his son back unharmed.

---... he promised the "kidnappers" they could walk away freely, without worry of capture, after returning his son to him!---

That's right. He told them "I'll do anything you say, I won't turn you in. Just give me back my son." So would I. I would promise them anything, do anything, lie through my teeth, grovel in the dirt and kiss their...feet. So would most parents.

--- He handed over 50,000 bucks to someone in a cemetery in exchange for a piece of paper and would not allow the cops to trail the guy! ---

It is easy to criticize him because he objected to Mulrooney's plan to 'stake out' every mail box in NYC or to the idea of following John. But neither of those plans gave any real assurance that Charlie would be recovered. OTOH, BOTH ran the definite risk that Charlie would, instead, find himself in the hands of panicky, angry criminals.

It is easy to sit and say that the victims' families should let the police swoop in and arrest (or even follow) the person who picks up the ransom. It is easy to sit and say that the victims' families should refuse to pay the ransom - or should tell the kidnappers they will make sure they are caught. All of that is very easy to say. It is not so easy to do.

What if it was your child? What would you do?

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 10:45:45
204.170.64.37 writes:**

If you look back to the first events Lindy took after his discovery he seems rational, what any father would do, call the police, went out side to look over the ground.

After the note found in the nursery was examined Lindy then took charge he informed those in the nursery which included Kelly the fingerprint man, Breckinridge, Trooper Wolf, Major Schoeffel , Harry Wolf and Williamson of the Hopewell PD left. Swatzy,

Lindy informed the NJSP that he wanted no interference -no Police activity, newspaper publicity, friendly efforts anything which could prevent him from paying the ransom to regain his son.

Where did this come from? What did Lindy know about kidnapping?

This was likely advise given to him by Breckenridge when Lindy called him.

In my opinion when Lindy call Breckinridge and told hi of the kidnapping- Breckinridge asked Lindy if he had contacted the Police, when Lindy answered in the affirmative Breckinridge likley instructed him not to say anything until he arrived and it is best to keep this quiet.

Breckinridge having spent his life around money liley understood the ways the rich handle trouble, quietly and with private detectives. but the cat was out of the bag, how much ? they would now have to wait and see.

I believe the first telephone calls from Lindy's house were:

a. Whately: called the Hopewell PD, Lindy was at the time looking for the kid. b. Lindy: called the local NJSP- twice, he then called Breckinridge.

Arrive:

a. First to arrive was the Hopewell PD, (time?)

Lindy and Whatley were on the Wertsville rd looking in the bushes.

b. A little later, (time ?) arrived the NJSP: Schwartzy, Schoeffel, Bornmann, De Gaetano & Wolfe.

c. A little later(time?) arrived Breckinridge.

The obvious questions here are:

At what times did these people arrive?

I believe Schwartzy was at home in Lawrenceville when the call came in. How many auto did the NJSP arrive in ? 1,2? Schwartzy may have used his own car or had one at his disposal.

Breckinridge- where was he? his office is in the Wall street area I do no know where he lived. but there is no mention of his arriving late- had he driven from NY it would have taken more than 2 hours,

Philip Migliore

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 03:56:42
207.220.150.45 writes:**

--- a. First to arrive was the Hopewell PD, (time?)Lindy and Whatley were on the Wertsville rd looking in the bushes. ---

10:25-10:30.

They met Whateley on the way in. Lindbergh met them at the front door of the house.

--- b. A little later, (time ?) arrived the NJSP: Schwartzy, Schoeffel, Bornmann, DeGaetano & Wolfe. ---

10:55.

Wolf, who was the first Trooper on the scene, said that others (including Bornmann and DeGaetano) arrived about 11:25 from two different places. More officers

(including Kelly) arrived about midnight. Still more (including Schoeffel) arrived shortly after that.

--- c. A little later(time?) arrived Breckinridge.---

No earlier than 11:30 and probably somewhat later.

I will see if I can get a more precise time, but Betty Gow said she, Anne and Elsie were in the living room from around 10:30 until "Mrs. Lindbergh's friends arrived". Asked if that was "at least an hour or so" she said "yes".

---How many auto did the NJSP arrive in ? 1,2?---

Wolf's report doesn't say how many cars there were but based on what he says about the arrival of various officers there must have been at least a half dozen. (His; 2 that arrived about 11:25; Kelly's at 12:00; at least one other that arrived shortly thereafter. He doesn't mention Schwarzkopf arriving in any of those so there was probably at least one more car, too.)

Half a dozen cars at least, but probably more. For example, Wolf describes Schoeffel and Keaton arriving but doesn't say whether it was in the same car. Also, when Wolf describes the events of later that night, he mentions officers not listed as arriving in the cars listed above.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 04:01:32
205.188.200.47 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;he was doing exactly what they would do - ANYTHING IT TOOK to get his son back unharmed.

;;;;;;;;;;

Really? You have to be joking now! If he was, as you claim, doing "anything it took" then why did he forbid everyone, including the cops and his wife, from opening a supposed ransom note - for 2 hours? Why did he reject all legitimate offers of bloodhounds, human search chains, the FBI and \$35,000.00 reward offer from Gov Moore? Remember Capt. Mulrooney and his mailbox contraption? Lindbergh forbade that as well. And, if he really thought he needed the help of the Mafia he ought to have taken Al Capone's offer but he refused THAT too. You can't really mean ANYTHING cause ANYTHING should have included these measures.

;;;;;;;;;;. I would promise them anything, do anything, lie through my teeth, grovel in the dirt and kiss their...feet. So would most parents. ;;;;;;;;;;

But I am sure you, and most parents, would have opened that ransom note immediately and NOT rejected any of the above!

;;;;;;;;;? I hate to tell you this, but that precedent had already been set long before;;;;;;;;;

Parents may have paid ransom demands in the past but that is NOT what I am referring to here. No parent EVER was in control of a case like this where the "kidnappers" were being PUBLICLY promised the freedom to do their dirty deeds! Lindbergh's promises , as well as his outright attempts, to allow the "kidnappers" to go free is frightening considering what the entire nation put itself through on behalf of this ungrateful jerk. The public was hysterical over the supposed snatching of the famous tot. How do you think they liked hearing that Lindy was declaring OPEN SEASON for kidnappers by setting this precedent? Nobody ever negotiated deals like that - just show me one case where kidnappers were given immunity from prosecution if they returned the kid. Lindbergh's refusal to do anything to catch the "kidnappers" (his refusal to list serial numbers of all the ransom bills for example) is totally beyond the beyonds of logic and unnecessarily destructive to police efforts in trying to squelch the public's fears. His perverse behavior is, IMHO, legitimate circumstantial evidence of a kidnapping hoax.

I would be consumed with unbelievable grief if it had been my child and I would have done everything in my power to aid the cops who surely have more experience in crime than I.

Certainly I would have looked under the bed, in the closet, downstairs, upstairs and all around the house BEFORE I called them in the first place!

The fact that Lindy looked absolutely NOWHERE before making that call reveals another aspect of his behavior that, amazingly, doesn't seem to bother you. No one calls the police on a 20 month old child BEFORE looking around the house.

ronelle

</HTML>

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 21:52:14
207.220.150.139 writes:

--- Why did he reject all legitimate offers of bloodhounds, human search chains, ---

How would the bloodhounds and "human chains" result in Charlie's return? The police had already searched the area around the house for MILES. They believed that Charlie was taken to a car out on Featherbed Lane and removed from the area that way. What were the bloodhounds, etc. going to accomplish except to have more people lurking around?

--- the FBI ---

In 1932, if you wanted the 'big guys' from the Federal Government involved, you didn't contact the FBI (which was hardly the formidable organization it is today, had no real police powers and wasn't even called the FBI yet). You got help from the Treasury Department - the guys who put Al Capone away. They were already involved in the case - along with the NJSP, NYPD and a dozen other organizations.

In the end, of course, having the Justice Department BI involved didn't do Hauptmann any good, did it? Between Thomas "Mister, Mister you stop lying. You're telling a story." Sisk and Leon "Let's not tell anyone what Condon said." Turrou, they helped seal Hauptmann's fate, didn't they?

---\$35,000.00 reward offer from Gov Moore? ---

A&M think the reward was a good idea? Every law enforcement professional I have known didn't like rewards. Usually all they brought were false leads and fruitcakes. They already had those by the thousands.

--- And, if he really thought he needed the help of the Mafia he ought to have taken Al Capone's offer but he refused THAT too. ---

I guess I'll give you that one in terms of "anything", because, of course, he told the government that he didn't expect them to release a monster like Capone under any circumstances. In this, his actions resemble more the current attitude of dealing with international terrorism (which I consider totally different from individual crime). Are you suggesting he was wrong to have taken that attitude?

---- No parent EVER was in control of a case like this where the "kidnappers" were being PUBLICLY promised the freedom to do their dirty deeds! Nobody ever negotiated deals like that - just show me one case where kidnappers were given immunity from prosecution if they returned the kid.---

The Lindberghs promised they would do nothing to 'injure' the kidnappers, they would keep everything confidential and, basically, they would not cooperate with the police to catch them - if they returned Charlie. They did not promise any immunity. They had no power to grant immunity and they knew it. The kidnappers knew it too. The State of New Jersey made it very clear that even if the Lindberghs didn't want to prosecute - it did and it would.

I doubt that the Lindberghs were the first victims of a crime to promise the criminals that they would never tell the police anything. Nor were they the last. I doubt that the Lindberghs' promise encouraged anyone else to commit a kidnapping.

-- Remember Capt. Mulrooney and his mailbox contraption? Lindbergh forbade that as well. ---

I remember Mulrooney's contraption. He was going to install a device in certain Brooklyn mailboxes that captured the letters as they were mailed. Then after the person mailing the letter departed, they would open the mailbox and look at the letter. If it was addressed to Lindbergh or Hopewell they would follow the person who mailed it. If not, they would toss it back in with the rest of the mail.

1) Every time a letter went into the box, a man ran up, opened the box and looked at the letter. What made Mulrooney think the kidnappers wouldn't notice the activity? What would happen if they did? Not mail the letter? (Just what every kidnapping victim's family wants - to NOT hear from the kidnappers.) Mail it somewhere else? (Maybe, unless all the activity got them spooked.)

2) If the police officers were going to wait until the mailer departed, how were they going to follow him? If they didn't wait and opened the box while he was still around, how effective would they be at 'tailing' him back to Charlie?

Mulrooney and A&M may think the plan had little risk, but I suggest that is based on the false (and dangerous) assumption that the kidnappers were rational, reasonable and calm. I do not think that is a reasonable assumption to make - especially with a life at stake. Criminals often do irrational and illogical things - including killing people (even ones who can't identify them) just for spite. Could Mulrooney guaranty that this wouldn't happen if his men were spotted?

IMHO, all Mulrooney's plan would have been likely to accomplish would be to tell the kidnappers that any attempt to contact the Lindberghs could result in capture.

--- I would be consumed with unbelievable grief if it had been my child and I would have done everything in my power to aid the cops who surely have more experience in crime than I.---

Aid them in catching the kidnappers or aid them in getting your child back? What if you believed that what the police wanted you to do presented a risk to your child's

life? What if they told you "when one of the gang shows up to pick up the money, we are going to grab him. Hopefully he will tell us where your child is before the others panic, kill him and disappear." You would say "sure, ok."?

---Certainly I would have looked under the bed, in the closet, downstairs, upstairs and all around the house BEFORE I called them in the first place!
The fact that Lindy looked absolutely NOWHERE before making that call reveals another aspect of his behavior that, amazingly, doesn't seem to bother you. No one calls the police on a 20 month old child BEFORE looking around the house. ---

Are we going to have this discussion again?

When Betty Gow walked into that room, the condition of the bed brought her to the immediate conclusion that someone had TAKEN Charlie from his bed rather than that he had climbed out by himself. (That is why SHE did not look under the bed, etc. That is why she didn't even turn on the light and look around the room at all.) She naturally assumed that the "taker" was one of the parents.

When Lindbergh walked into the room, he came to the same conclusion - that Charlie had been TAKEN from the crib rather than that he had climbed out by himself. He, however, had the added information that he KNEW the parents weren't the 'takers'. He also knew Betty wasn't the 'taker'. Because he turned on the light in the room, he also may have seen the mud on the floor, the envelope on the windowsill and the open shutter.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Involved
Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 01:13:20
152.163.197.189 writes:

;;;;;What were the bloodhounds,etc. going to accomplish except to have more people lurking around?

;;;;;;

But, MJR, your previous argument was based upon a defense of Lindbergh who you claim was only trying his best to do ANYTHING to get his child back. And ANYTHING , in my book, includes EVERYTHING - no matter how hopeless it may seem. With hindsight we now know that Charlie was lying above ground a short distance away which makes Lindbergh's rejection somewhat suspicious to me in light of all the other EVERYTHINGS and ANYTHINGS that he refused to do as well.

;;;;;the FBI;;;

Whatever the Bureau was or wasn't in those years, it was still a giant level above the traffic-citation cops and Bamburger's floor-walkers that Lindbergh preferred.

;;;;;;A&M think the reward was a good idea? Every law enforcement professional I have known didn't like rewards. Usually all they brought were false leads and fruitcakes. They already had those by the thousands;;;;;;;

But my point is NOT whether reward money is a good idea or not in terms of law enforcement practices and opinions. (Actually I do not know if Lindbergh's demand to Gov. Moore to rescind the reward money is even in their book) My argument is focused more on the question of why Lindbergh thwarted so many attempts by individuals who sincerely wanted to get his son back.

;;;;;;Are you suggesting he was wrong to have taken that attitude?

;;;;;;;

I am suggesting that if he REALLY believed the Mafia took his child the idea of Mickey Rossner, a low level nobody from nowhere with no good connections is NOT the answer to any desperate parent's hopes. Why take a nobody when you can have the class act himself? And since the Mafia never, ever, took a single baby this is such a ridiculous idea in the first place. But, if the Mafia DID take babies they surely would have asked for more than 50,000.00! They certainly wouldn't have kept reassuring the Lindberghs in every ransom note that the baby is in gut health and gut care! What kind of organized crime syndicate tells the parents that the kid is in good care? The purpose of the note is to scare everyone into panic - not to assuage their suffering! Whoever wrote those later extortion notes did NOT have any baby in their possession.

;;;;;;;based on the false (and dangerous) assumption that the kidnapers were rational, reasonable and calm;;;

Well didn't they appear to be calm? They reassured the parents that he was in gut care. Nothing in any ransom note actually threatens the life of Charlie. And that, to me, is very strange.

None of us can predict what we would do in such circumstances, however, Lindbergh's behavior is not helpful to any intensive search in the early moments and hours, (and you seem to have forgotten the unopened "ransom note")which would reasonably put him on a priority list of suspects today. That is what Ahlgren and Monier did. They worked the case as it would be done today. The only reason, it seems to me, that you refuse to allow his name on a list of suspects is that his name is Charles Lindbergh and not Joe Shmoe.

ronelle

ronelle

Saturday, 27-Feb-1999 23:01:38

Message:

152.163.207.204 writes:

I thought this message was worth repeating as April 3 approaches. The ladder that David Wilentz "hung around Hauptmann's neck" is on exhibit in the Trenton Police Museum along with the attic floorboard from which they claimed he cut off a piece to construct a kidnap ladder. It is now possible for both pieces of wood to be DNA-analyzed. Perhaps an outraged public could influence NJ to test it? If the 2 pieces do not come from the same tree, Hauptmann must be exonerated. None of the other evidence - even the ransom money - warrants the death penalty.

Date: 98-01-07 13:39:29 EST

Ronelle:

Yes, two separate pieces of wood can be analyzed for DNA content to determine whether or not they both came from the same tree -- or from different trees. I understand that Canadian researchers in Victoria, BC are using this technique.

John.

John A. Helms
Dept. of Env. Sci., Policy, & Mgt.
145 Mulford Hall - Univ. of Calif.
Berkeley, CA 94720

lindyhoax@aol.com

Re: Re: DNA and the Ladder (again)

Friday, 09-Apr-1999 13:14:08

209.12.168.207 writes:

Wood DNA has already been used in a criminal case (Arizona) where specific tree vegetation was used to connect a defendant to a specific tree just above where the murder victim was discovered.

JM

Re: Re: ronelle

Sunday, 23-May-1999 16:25:53
208.29.101.254 writes:

Sorry about the above message, I accidently hit enter too soon.

about the Lindy Ladder, what would it take to persuade the testing? How much would it cost, and how much encouraging? Anyway, if it is so that the Ladder would solve the Crime of the Century (which I believe it can) why wasn't it done long ago?

Carrie Burgess

Re: ronelle
Monday, 01-Mar-1999 08:11:04
205.183.31.67 writes:

ronellr, im all for the testing. there is no way that wood expert is wrong. he found alot of things out before they caught hauptmann. the lumber yard in the bronx, and he knew part of the ladder rail 16 was either from an attic or a barn. most of his findings were before they got hauptmann

</HTML>

Lindbergh Did It"

Sunday, 14-Mar-1999 23:16:05

Message:

198.78.59.32 writes:

I'm sure I'm going to be roundly blasted on all sides for this, and I feel presumptuous even posting because I just found this website tonight, and I haven't read the book professing Lindbergh's guilt, but here's my feeling:

Lindbergh was a practical joker, and not the greatest husband and father--I can't dispute that. But although giving your friend kerosene to drink, and even hiding your baby in a closet, are jokes that are absolutely not funny and border on the cruel, they required nowhere near the planning, forethought, or organization that it would require for him to "pull off" the practical joke of building a ladder, climbing up that ladder into your baby's room, putting your baby in a burlap sack, carrying your baby down the ladder, and then--oops! the ladder breaks--so now he's got to hide the baby, dismantle the ladder, hide the evidence, pretend to be surprised and alarmed when the baby turns up missing--and he's supposed to do all of this when his wife and three servants were all wandering around the house and he couldn't have been sure of their whereabouts? This makes very little sense to me. Plus, and this might be minor but it might be important too--Lindbergh was a man obsessed with details, especially with how much things weighed. While preparing to fly the Atlantic he almost considered going without water because he was afraid it would weigh down the plane. Do you think he would have carried his baby son down a homemade ladder (at night, in the cold, by the way, when he knew the baby had been sick) without first testing to see if the ladder would hold his and the baby's weight?

By the way, my defense of Lindbergh does not mean that I believe in Hauptmann's guilt.

Quinn

Re: "Lindbergh Did It"

Monday, 15-Mar-1999 17:46:55

204.170.64.69 writes:

You have to do a little better than that to support your idea that Lucky Lindy killed his 20 month old son, even if he was only kidding around.

You did hit on a very good point- Hauptmann's conviction rested a great deal on his being connected with the ladder. Remember Hauptmann was a carpenter and also

knew about carrying weights up and down ladders. His full tool box probably weighed more than 40 lbs and he would have understood that removing a child would add to his weight and could break a rung of the ladder.

Philip

Re: "Lindbergh Did It"
Monday, 15-Mar-1999 21:53:24
152.163.201.182 writes:

Quinn - For someone who just discovered this site you are remarkably knowledgeable. Don't worry about being presumptuous or being "roundly blasted on all sides" because this message board was meant as a forum for the testing of all theories related to the case.

Although you may not believe Lindbergh could have been the culprit in his own child's death, accidental or otherwise, I hope you are willing to admit that he ought to have been considered a suspect as any other father certainly would be today. Because of this lack of suspicion by the authorities at the time of the child's disappearance we are probably doomed to question the details of Lindy's involvement forever more.

But, in my opinion, he could easily have meticulously planned to carry out a fake kidnapping that unexpectedly ended in a death he had to hide - from his wife and from the public. The best laid plans can go awry and according to Reeve's memoir her father was obsessed with "the unforeseeable" all of his life.

His early years of daredevil barnstorming - hanging from flying planes by his teeth and walking on wings - make him an eligible candidate for any sort of ladder stunt. Whoever climbed that ladder had to be sure of his acrobatic agility! His daughter's story about her father having built a ladder for her mother during their Sirius flights also makes him a candidate for the building of a homemade ladder. And as for worrying about the child being cold (and having a cold) you only have to read about his perverse child rearing ideas to understand that his baby's cold would be of no concern to him whatsoever. He built a chicken coop for his baby and left him there to cry for many hours in extremely cold weather. In fact, part of Ahlgren & Monier's theory deals with the suspicion that Lindbergh only used that excuse (the baby's cold) to get his wife to stay one more day at Hopewell, and not return to her mother in Englewood as they always did, in order to keep her there so he could perform his "trick."

ronelle

Re: "Lindbergh Did It"
Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 13:14:14
207.172.7.101 writes:

Quinn, you make an excellent point! Lindbergh's obsessive nature, his close attention to details concerning weight, makes it highly unlikely that he would have carried out such an elaborate prank without carefully thinking through every detail. In fact a few months ago I found myself obsessing over Lindbergh's obsessiveness, to the point that I had to admit to myself that the "practical joke" theory was somewhat flawed. Unfortunately you will have to wait for my book to learn the results of my research, and then judge for yourself. But I will just tell you now, I believe very strongly that Alghren and Monier were half way there. (How's that for a little more suspense?)

One more thing. Ronelle is absolutely right - Lindbergh was not the least bit concerned about the baby's cold... anymore than he was concerned or even able to comprehend the psychological damage he was most likely inflicting on his son when he left him out in that cage. The truth is, Lindy was using the same tactics his father used on him - trying to make a MAN out of that baby boy. Today this would be called child abuse.

Melinda

BRONX TOUR**Monday, 15-Mar-1999 08:50:51****Message:****205.183.31.66 writes:**

i talked to my friend who does the bronx tour.if anybodys interested, it will be sometime in sept. if he gets enough people he will get a bus.it starts at the bronx courthouse and goes to condons house, hauptmans house the 2 cemetarys,annas bakery she worked in, the lumber yard. the sreet where perrones cab got stoped.its from 10:30 in the morniong till 4:30.he does an experiment at the cemetary to see if lindbergh really heard hey doctor thats fun. also lunch. please post if interested and i will give you his address. i dont know how much he charges it depends how many people he gets

STEVE ROMEO**Re: BRONX TOUR****Monday, 15-Mar-1999 17:35:43****204.170.64.69 writes:**

steve I know where those locations are and perhaps a few more, I was in the Bronx this past weekend drove past Haupt's house, the Freddy Bakery, City Island Condon's office, Al Reisch's house and other locations.

Skippy Lane told me you people stopped at his house last year.

Interestingly, he lives next door to the author of the Book ; Awakenings, the movie starred Robin Williams & Deniro. If you wish to organize a Bronx tour, and even a Hopewell tour as I live close to there, between now and Mother's day let

Philip Migliore

BRONX TOUR

Monday, 15-Mar-1999 08:50:51

Message:

205.183.31.66 writes:

i talked to my friend who does the bronx tour.if anybodys interested, it will be sometime in sept. if he gets enough people he will get a bus.it starts at the bronx courthouse and goes to condons house, hauptmans house the 2 cemetarys,annas bakery she worked in, the lumber yard. the sreet where perrones cab got stoped.its from 10:30 in the morniong till 4:30.he does an experiment at the cemetary to see if lindbergh really heard hey doctor thats fun. also lunch. please post if interested and i will give you his address. i dont know how much he charges it depends how many people he gets

STEVE ROMEO

Re: BRONX TOUR

Monday, 15-Mar-1999 17:35:43

204.170.64.69 writes:

steve I know where those locations are and perhaps a few more, I was in the Bronx this past weekend drove past Haupt's house, the Freddy Bakery, City Island Condon's office, Al Reisch's house and other locations.

Skippy Lane told me you people stopped at his house last year.

Interestingly, he lives next door to the author of the Book ; Awakenings, the movie starred Robin Williams & Deniro. If you wish to organize a Bronx tour, and even a Hopewell tour as I live close to there, between now and Mother's day let

Philip Migliore

Re: BRONX TOUR

Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 12:08:16

207.172.7.100 writes:

Hey Steve,

Thanks for keeping us posted on these events. I will certainly try to make this tour. (Besides, the very thought of a bus full of debaters... well, it's just too exciting to pass up ;-) If your friend doesn't object, you could post his name and address on this forum and I will pass it on to a few others who do not own computers.

And just wondering... is this tour going to be "timed" with the release of Jim Fisher's book?

Melinda

Re: Re: BRONX TOUR
Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 08:00:54
205.183.31.66 writes:

hi melinda, i will post his adress tomorrow. its got nothing to do with jim fishers book.this guy rick sloan is a lincoln assination historian whos been studying the lindbergh case for a while now.the tour is great. he went to city island the last time but i couldnt go my mother was sick.kenneth kerwin the guy who claim was the lindbergh baby was on the one i went to.and anna hauptmans friend. at the diner, they all attacked me for my theory, but it was all in fun. you will enjoy it. to see hauptmans house is spooky. id love to go inside it

steve romeo

Re: Re: Re: BRONX TOUR
Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 09:55:44
204.170.64.37 writes:

Dear Steve:

I am sure Sloan does an excellent job and I do not seek to compete with him, my offer is if you wish one earlier I can be of assistance.
As I live near Hopewell I can show a group here also.

If you want to get a hard core group yu and 3 or 4 other Lindy incorrigibles, Tommy DiNotte, if she is up to it Nancy Attardo and a civilian we could organize a small expedition without busses etc.

I think I found something new over this past weekend.

Philip

**bronx tour if interested
Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 13:50:08**

**Message:
205.183.31.67 writes:**

**if anybody is seriously considering going on this tour, you can directly write to
richard sloan
3855 arthur ave
seaford, long island
new york, 11783**

steve romeo

Was the Jury sequestered?
Monday, 15-Mar-1999 23:04:35

Message:
152.202.206.249 writes:

Does anyone know if the Jury for the trial was sequestered? Were they exposed to any outside media once the trial began? Where could I find this information?
Thanks,

Shawn

Re: Was the Jury sequestered?
Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 06:48:42
207.220.150.88 writes:

--- Does anyone know if the Jury for the trial was sequestered? Were they exposed to any outside media once the trial began? ---

That depends on how you define 'sequestered'.

"[The jurors] were constantly kept together, were attended by four constables...they lodged on the third floor of the local hotel and exercised on the porch of the second floor. The hotel is opposite the court house and entertained the public generally including reporters. The jury took their meals in the main dining room behind screens at the farthest point from the entrance door." (From the Opinion of the Court of Errors and Appeals). That, alone, sounds like it might have been alright. There are some considerations that Court didn't add:

-- The jury walked (with its four constables)to and from the hotel to the courthouse every day through the mob of people in the street. The mob was not restrained from expressing its opinions to the jury as they crossed.

-- The jury exercised on the second floor porch within full view and hearing of the what was happening in the street below them.

-- Maybe most significantly, on the other side of the 'screen' from where the jurors dined sat the press corps. The reporters routinely discussed the case at meals, including many of the things the jury was 'sequestered' to avoid hearing.

According to one story, only one of the reporters ever suggested that the corps watch what they said because of the proximity of the jury, or that they keep an open mind. That reporter was Damon Runyon who, interestingly, wrote for the same Hearst papers who hired Reilly.

So, were they 'sequestered'? Not IMHO.

Mjr

Re: Was the Jury sequestered?
Tuesday, 16-Mar-1999 20:32:00
207.172.7.100 writes:

From behind that flimsy little curtain the jurors were able to hear at least three different live radio broadcasts including Sam Leibowitz. At one point a reporter yelled out something about Hauptmann being a Nazi. Apparently Damon Runyan was the only one in the room who tried to remind his fellow journalists that Hauptmann was innocent until proven guilty. But, as one of the authors tells us, his voice was "like a sparrow in the wind".

The jury was mostly made up of Germans whose ancestors settled in the N.J and PA area as early as the 17th Century. To this day, these people refuse to even mention the word Nazi, not because they are ashamed, for they had nothing to do with either war, but because they don't want anyone trying to make any false connections. (And believe me, these people have had to deal with a lot of prejudice) So then, all these jurors had to hear was Hauptmann is a Nazi and "presto" he became their number one enemy.

Sequestered? I don't think so.

Melinda

Re: Re: Was the Jury sequestered?

Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 10:59:42

205.183.31.66 writes:

melinda, the evidence was overwhelming. the defense had nothing because hauptman told them nothing. reilly was so desperate he got phantom witnessess who were embarrassing.wilentz attacked hauptmans many conflicting statments from his own mouth. i think if the trial was anywhere else, or hauptmans orginal attorney, the outcome would have been the same

romeo for melinda