

## **Still Involved**

**Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 15:02:48**

**Message:**

**24.4.252.64 writes:**

**I still think this is a great forum for discussing this case, but no one has written anything to convince me that Hauptmann wasn't involved with this case. What about his criminal history, all of the marked money, tools left behind, matching wood, matching handwriting, his arrogance on the stand (I recommend A&E's Biography of Charles Lindbergh for great actual footage of the trial.) The same facts are presented over and over on this site and they are mostly speculating that Hauptmann may be innocent. I don't buy it. I wish someone would come up with some hard evidence to prove me wrong. I reminds me of people who are convinced that UFO's have landed on earth but can never seem to come up with any real evidence. Bruno Richard Hauptmann was involved in this kidnapping. I challenge anyone to prove me wrong.**

**TK**

**Todd Kovacs**

**Re: Still Involved**

**Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 08:49:43**

**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**todd, you can debate for me ive been called names on the website. not only does these people think hauptman was innocent they think linbergh did it. hauptman gets every excuse in the book. they have a alibi for every move he made. they ignore facts in the case. they will never come up with the smoking gun because there is none. my friend jim fisher wrote another book thats coming out in sept that should put a end to this nonsense but probably wont. hes waiting for the smking gun.they think that every witness was bought out and every piece of physical evidence was planted. well thats ompossible beause of the amount the police had. i look into the interogations in the bronx when nobody knew who hauptman was. he lied time and time again and perjured himself. so good luck you will bang your head against the wall**

**STEVE ROMEO FOR TODD**

Re: Re: Still Involved  
Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 10:23:33  
205.188.198.26 writes:

I'm just curious about one thing Steve - did you (or Todd) ever read Ahlgren and Monier's book? Or Anthony Scaduto's Scapegoat and Ludovic Kennedy's Airman and the Carpenter? Instead of "banging your head against the wall" maybe you could read those books and have more of an understanding of WHY so many people are exasperated with your arguments (or lack of arguments)!

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Still Involved  
Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 10:45:00  
24.4.252.64 writes:

Ronelle,  
Ahlgren and Monier's book is next on my list and I can't wait to read it. I think it will be interesting to read this perspective/point of view on the Lindbergh kidnapping. My only hope is that their literary brainwashing doesn't have the effect on me that it has on the other participants on this site.

T Kovacs for Ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved  
Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 11:34:08  
152.163.195.189 writes:

;;;;;;My only hope is that their literary brainwashing doesn't have the effect on me that it has on the other participants on this site.

;;;;;;

Todd - If this is your only hope then you have already been brainwashed! Brainwashing comes from all sides and your "hope" is a sure sign that you have already made up your mind NOT to be fairminded. And, BTW, there is nothing "literary" about Ahlgren and Monier's book - it is simply an enlightening and plausible police investigation that uses present-day law enforcement methods of inquiry to present a case based upon circumstantial evidence. Who is better at such skills - an accomplished "literary" journalist or people who have spent most of their

**lives living and breathing the law enforcement and the criminal justice systems? No one who has written a book on this case , to this very day, has had ANY law enforcement experience like MOnier and Ahlgren! Jim Fisher is a professor at a small college and his FBI "experience" is a joke. Scaduto is a GREAT crime investigator but has nothing that even resembles Monier's 28 years of law enforcement experience. So before you worry about being "brainwashed" you ought to worry about why you are so worried.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved  
Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 12:33:28  
204.170.64.37 writes:**

**Have you read Fisher 1996 book - Fall Guys?  
and never forget Occam's Razor**

**Philip for ronell**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved  
Friday, 19-Mar-1999 15:01:10  
24.4.252.64 writes:**

**I'm not worried. Im a realist.**

**Do you think that the aliens might have kidnapped the kid? You never know.  
If Haupmann knew that people like you were defending him in 1999, I'm sure he'd  
get a great laugh.**

**Let me ask you a question that I've asked others.**

**What were you doing the night of March 1, 1997?**

**Anna Haupmann wanted to believed she was with her husband the night of the kidnapping. Some people on this site have said, if she was with him, how could he have done it? The fact is, you can't remember things like that and two years after the kidnapping Anna was asked what she was doing on a specific night, two years prior. Of course she'll give her hubby an alibi.**

**I'm still waiting for some hard evidence proving Haupmann's innocence. I guess I'll never see it.**

**P.S. I think Steve R is flirting with you.**

**tk to ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 18:15:50**  
**204.170.64.54 writes:**

**Dear Mr Kovac:**

**There are several stories in the Lindbergh Case.**  
**The one which puts Hauptmann in the Electric chair is the ladder, and it is the ladder which appears to be the most contrived.**  
**Though it is not likley there is always a chance of some shred of new evidence comming to light. Who knows Until that happens there will be not be a last word in the Lindbergh kidnaping, because the more one studies the case the more the loose ends appear and the more the state's evidence appears contrived.**

**Philip**

**Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Thursday, 18-Mar-1999 13:10:49**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**ronelle of studied this case since 1990. ive read all the books and reseached it at the museum. i new joe perrones son in law i discussed this case with mrs. hauptmans lawyer. im not changing my tune because 2 people wrote a book saying lindbergh did it with flimsy proof im sorry. the only book i believe in is fishers book its consistant to what i found. if you believe that other book, thats your perogitive i dont**

**STEVE FOR RONELLE**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Friday, 19-Mar-1999 09:15:24**  
**152.163.213.47 writes:**

**but did you read Ahlgren and Monier's book? I would just like to know if you did or didn't cause you don't seem to know anything about their theory beyond "Lindbergh did it" -**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Friday, 19-Mar-1999 09:19:46**  
**205.183.31.67 writes:**

**no i didnt only excerpts from some garbage tabloid. but i will if you insist ronelle im easy**

**STEVE ROMEO FOR RONELLE**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 02:47:06**  
**205.188.200.34 writes:**

**So give us all a break here Steve - get to a library (Long Island has a few) and read the book already.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Still Involved**  
**Monday, 22-Mar-1999 10:01:04**  
**205.183.31.66 writes:**

**give you a break? this website would be boring without me.i bring out the best in you people. i will read the book i promise ronelle. i hope to meet some of you some day. i hope you can make that bronx tour, dont forget, i was the only guy on the tour who thinks hauptman was guilty. so i get it from all angles, but its a fun day**

**STEVE FOR RONELLE**

**Re: Still Involved**  
**Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 06:23:25**  
**207.220.150.56 writes:**

**--- I wish someone would come up with some hard evidence to prove me wrong...Bruno Richard Haupmann was involved in this kidnapping. I challenge anyone to prove me wrong.---**

**Another person looking for proof that something DID NOT happen.**

**There is no 'proof' that Hauptmann DID NOT do it. By the same token, there is no 'proof' that Lindbergh DID NOT, or that David Wilentz DID NOT or, for that matter, that I DID NOT, do it. There is none because it is almost, if not completely, impossible to prove that something DID NOT happen. Consider your UFO analogy - can you prove that aliens HAVE NOT been here? No. All you can argue is the lack of evidence that they HAVE.**

**Well, the 'evidence' that Hauptmann DID do it does not stand up to scrutiny. Just like the 'evidence' that Lindbergh DID do it.**

**---...his arrogance on the stand...---**

**What was it about him on the stand that conveyed "arrogance"?**

**---I reminds me of people who are convinced that UFO's have landed on earth but can never seem to come up with any real evidence.---**

**Personally, I put the UFO folks more in a class with those who believe in things like: disappearing footprints; employment records that exist, then don't exist, then do exist again (but we don't need to show them to the jury); the ability to hear clearly and identify a voice that says two words (three syllables at best) from almost the length of a football field; 'experts' who can suddenly determine things they say they couldn't tell before, etc.**

**Mjr**

**A few days until trial**  
**Wednesday, 17-Mar-1999 17:39:53**

**Message:**  
**205.188.198.49 writes:**

**Hello to everyone out there. I know that a lot of people need info for there papers and whatnot, as do I. I am doing a mock trial in class and it is very important to me that I have a strong case. I am going in a few days and I have been getting nervous and worried. Can anyone take a few seconds to reply to this message with a few very strong details and evidence of the case that will make the jury's verdict not guilty? I appreciate it so much! Thanks!**

**Kris**

**Re: A few days until trial**  
**Friday, 19-Mar-1999 18:06:14**  
**204.170.64.14 writes:**

**If it is not too late, could you be a little more specific about your position , yes not guilty but what is your argument?  
also where are you what school?**

**Philip**

**Re: Re: A few days until trial**  
**Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 11:17:38**  
**152.163.205.48 writes:**

**Yes, though it doesn't matter now because my case is tommorow and i don't think you can reply that quick, i am defense team. Sorry I didn't make my self clear. It's a school project, a major project and the prosecution is really good. I needed some hard facts to stump them, got any??**

**Kris**

**Re: Re: Re: A few days until trial  
Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 11:35:14  
205.188.199.38 writes:**

**Did you get a copy of the tampered Reliance timesheets - they are depicted in Scaduto's book Scapegoat? Have you found the information that shows Isidor Fisch paid for part of his passage to Austria with ransom money? The FBI has sealed Fisch's files and if you can introduce that info it might also be helpful.**

**Lindbergh had a hearing problem from loud engines, according to his daughter. And - here it is again - It is NOT humanly possible to recognize a voice the way Lindbergh swore he could! He would have been impeached by Reilly in a second if Reilly had done his job. You will defend Hauptmann better than Reilly I am sure. In fact, if you are arguing this case in 1999 and not 1935 you could probably ravage the prosecution simply by showing Reilly's malpractice. Reilly was paid off by the Hearst newspapers (\$10,000.00) to defend Hauptmann simply for the scoop! He betrayed his client in many ways. Also, Hauptmann was never provided any sort of translator from whom he might have better understood the questioning. This is blatantly unfair.**

**ronelle**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: A few days until trial  
Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 14:07:41  
204.170.64.37 writes:**

**where did you find the info about Fisch buying tickets for austria with hot money?  
The fisch file is closed? where have you come by that information?**

**Philip fo Ronelle**



**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: A few days until trial**

**Monday, 22-Mar-1999 03:14:52**

**152.163.195.208 writes:**

**I think the Fisch revelation is in Scaduto, Behn and Ahlgren and Monier. And Melinda Rose told us about Fisch's sealed files at the FBI offices when she was there recently. It is a message on a previous thread. Also, the FBI and David Wilentz evidently knew about Fisch's payment for his ticket with ransom notes. IMHO Fisch is obviously the key to the extortion aspect of the crime. He was a scam artist and swindler and had underworld connections. Lots of people must have salivated at such a grand opportunity to profit from a rich family's loss.**

**ronelle**

## **Crucial Points**

**Friday, 19-Mar-1999 22:10:56**

**Message:**  
**204.170.64.13 writes:**

**Everyone who has studied the Lindbergh Case has an event or set of circumstances they see as the key, crucial element, lynch pin which determines how they see the case.**

**In up to 150 words What is yours and why?**

**Philip Migliore**

**Re: Crucial Points**  
**Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 15:05:57**  
**204.170.64.16 writes:**

**The Dr. Denton sleeping suit. It was sent to Jafsie's house on Decatur avenue. Lindy did not positively identify the Dr Denton received in the mail but said it could be the same one his son wore that night. What objective questions should be asked about this?**

**Why did the words, Dressed in one piece coverall night suit even appear on the WANTED poster, the child did not wander off into the woods he was definitely stolen, kidnapped.**

**Did the Lindy's own more than one pair of Dr. Dentons? in case one was in the wash or wet? If so was there any sort of comparison done? sometimes parents will put the child's name on the inside of clothing so as not to get them confused with those belonging to other children who may be visiting with their parents.**

**At this time, other than Dr. Denton, what other popular baby sleeping suits were on the market?**

**Cemetery John identified the pins from the baby's blanket- looking at pins that size what other uses would they have?**

**MY interest here is the Dr. Dentons, as I have not seen mention of them prior to their being recieved in the mail.**

**BUT the WANTED poster does describe the baby as dressed in a one piece coverall night suit.**

**When the baby's remains were found the night suit was no where to be found. Then again neither was the child's diaper or its rubber pants liner, nor the second thumb guard.**

**Philip Migliore**

**Re: Crucial Points**

**Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 04:53:32**

**207.220.150.56 writes:**

**If you consider ALL the evidence, including the evidence impeaching the State's witnesses**

**and corroborating Hauptmann's claims,IMHO, the State's case against him collapses. No contested witness for the State can withstand close scrutiny, not even the 'experts'. Unfortunately, the evidence that allows that scrutiny was withheld from the defense and the jury in 1935. There were also things that were available to the defense but not pursued. These things are now apparently beyond reach, (Reliance timesheets for March 1). The very fact that these records were kept from jury is cause for concern.**

**If you like, you may add that, IMHO, the evidence of March 1 indicates involvement by someone inside the Lindbergh household. They picked a night when the Lindberghs shouldn't have been there; picked the only window that couldn't be secured; pulled it off in an incredibly narrow time frame. Luck? Possibly, but somehow I doubt it.**

**Mjr**

**Re: Re: Re: Crucial Points**  
**Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 22:40:39**  
**204.170.64.20 writes:**

**Dear Steve:**

**Hauptmann 's possession of nearly 1/3 the ransom does not make him the kidnapper. where is the rest of the loot? he spent it? On what? vacations radio's and binoculars- that did not account for more that about 1500\$, if even that much. Also it cannot be proven that Hauptmann used Lindbergh Ransom money in those purchases.**

**He owned stocks and a mortgage, what about those?  
No proof exists he ever used Ransom money there either,**

**Incidently with the 2\$ reward out for each bill found, had Hauptmann started passing out that amount of hot cash it would have drew attention to him a lot quicker.**

**The wood traced to the National Mill lumber yard on white plaines road, where the seafood store is now, just above Gun Hill Road, does not prove it was the exact same wood, board etc,they traced a shipment which had similiar cuts on it as the saw in the South Carolina Mill where the lumber was dressed left its signature,they sent out over 30 car loads of that wood at that time, there was no proof it was the same board, and the fact that they had some wood from that mill does not in itself mean a great deal, I would like to know what wood they had from other mills at the same time. EXPERT testimony is opinion, and does not carry the weight of prime evidence.**

**That Anna Hauptmann could not convince the court she saw the shoe box because Wilentz went after her to confuse and frighten her, like shooting fish in a barrel, it is not unusual not is it really morally wrong, he had a case to rove and she was in the way and she was no match for him.**

**The police were interrogating Hauptmann about possession of money,**

- a. Gold notes and coins ; illegal, fine and imprisonment**
- b. Hidden Cash ; hoarding, illegal, fine and imprisonment**
- c. Income taxes, had he paid taxes on it? silly? Al Capone did not think so , they gave him 13 years.**

**Would they be mean enough to lower the boom on him if they were unable to shake his Alibi?**

**What did they do to Red Johnson?**

**Say new evidence surfaces and Hauptmann is proved beyond the shadow of a doubt 100% innocent, that does not mean a member of the Lindbergh family did it, it does not automatically mean anything, only that Hauptmann did not do it, but that is in a hypothetical scenario.**

**Personally , I agree with you, I think he did, but I have doubt's about the case they used against him, to me it seems not to be fair, but more a railroading, what if it was a meber of your family caught in a similiar net?**

**In some ways the Lindbergh Case and the controversey which still and to this day surround it's fairness may have in not a small way contributed to the OJ fiasco.**

**Philip Migliore**

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Crucial Points  
Friday, 26-Mar-1999 15:36:11  
205.183.31.66 writes:**

**how can you say there is no proof? he admited spending the ransom money and he did all over the place. in fact if he got acquitted in flemington the new york had enough evidence to convict him on extortion charges that would have put him away for life.the police grilled red johnson and ernie brinkert to the point where they had nothing. this stuff about the police didnt investigate certain matters,is absurd they investigated alot of areas prior of aresting hauptman.how can you question the wood evidence.the wood expert traced the lumber from where hauptman worked.**

**STEVE FOR PHIL**

**Re:**

**Saturday, 27-Mar-1999 14:55:37**

**204.170.64.15 writes:**

**Dear Steve:**

**The evidence NY had was more solid a case than New Jersey's.**

**The use of the Ladder as evidence was highly controversial. Osborne's testimony pertaining to the lumbar yard was not contested in any real way as the defence could not afford a credible expert, the state had all the money it needed.**

**I do not believe for a second that another qualified expert with enough time and resources could have disputed his findings.**

**The evidence identifying Hauptmann to Cemetery John was pretty flimsy and the witnesses placing Hauptmann near the Lindbergh house prior to the kidnapping even less so.**

**What would Hauptmann have to fear if he was 100% innocent?**

**What did they do to Red Johnson, deported him.**

**Violet Sharp? drove her to suicide. I should look into that, how do you just DRIVE, someone to suicide ?**

**Hauptmann knew he was up the creek one way or another. I think he was mentally ill, a slow but progressive form of schizophrenia, though I cannot say if he would have been a candidate for suicide himself.**

**Philip for Steve**

**Re:**

**Monday, 29-Mar-1999 11:55:04**

**204.170.64.35 writes:**

**dear steve:**

**What is a wood expert? if you recall the state did not really know,I doubt if there was or even today a real definition, a forester?**

It appears that most of his findings were based upon his observations, and his alone, there were no "examinations" which could be performed by third parties to either dismiss or corroborate his testimony.

As to with olding of evidence, that is a very strong term and I do believe it would apply, he answered the questions put to him and answered them a briefly as possible. Not volunteering anything more, why, so as not to confuse the jury and more important not to give the defense anything they could possibly grab onto.

Besides any court "expert" no matter what the case, will only give his opinion, and that depends on which side is requesting his opinion. What if his findings were not in line with the prosecution's case ? Would they have still put him on the stand ? Do not say the defense as I doubt the prosecution would have made it known to them he was in any way involved.

I wonder about the reasons for the Federal Lindbergh Law. The mediocrities of american journalism would have us believe it was to make it easier to prosecute kidnapers. If that is the reason the Lindy case was made to order, different jurisdictions, confusion as to which charges to apply. The federals did a good job to end kidnapping, but I wonder if another part of it was the New Dealers revulsion at the site of the way they saw NJ handle this case in front of the entire world.

I think, you may have something with the gassing in ww1. Remember the post trauma stress trouble after Vietnam, violent crimes committed, and "I think" some of those post office massacres were done by Vietnam vets.

Philip for steve

Re:

Monday, 29-Mar-1999 08:05:12

205.183.31.67 writes:

phil,i dont think the wood expert for the state would surpress evidence or hamper it, when most of his findings were concluded before the caught hauptman. he was suppose to be the best in the country involving wood. his findings were impressive. hauptman was gased in world war 1 i think that made him a little nuts in the head with the type of crimes he did in germany

steve for phil

Re:

Sunday, 28-Mar-1999 05:49:27

207.220.150.46 writes:

---wood expert before they caught hauptman traced the lumber at the exact store he bought it in and later was learned he worked there.---

Koehler was very sure about that. Of course he was also very sure about a 3/4 inch chisel being used to build the ladder (at least in 1935).

If you take a look at his methodology, however, you'll see that he shouldn't have been quite as sure as he was. In fact, the lumberyard in the Bronx was one POSSIBLE source for the wood - not at all the only possible source Koehler said it was - maybe not even the most likely one.

---rail 16 was said came from a attic or a barn before they caught hauptman---

Or a shop or a warehouse. Or a painters' scaffold or 'other construction purpose'. And, of course, Rail 16 was not alone in that. Rail 14 and Rail 15 and Rail 17 had also been previously used inside somewhere.

---wilentz was tripping over evidence.---

Sure he was, Steve.

That is why he used Hochmuth as the ONE AND ONLY witness who even attempted to put Richard Hauptmann in the state of New Jersey on March 1. (And witnesses like Whitted and Rossiter to put in New Jersey EVER.)

That is why he used Cecile Barr as the ONE AND ONLY witness who even attempted to put ransom money in Hauptmann's hands before mid-August, 1934.

He was so sure of his case that when he wanted to 'prove' Hauptmann didn't work on March 1 he showed the jury the company's time records for the period of March 16-31 instead of the records for March 1-15.

He was so sure of his case that he had no problem letting the defense into the Hauptmanns' apartment so they could examine the attic themselves.

He was so sure of his case that he didn't care whether the jury knew about Fisch and his confidence games - or that Fisch had told his family about his business relationship with Hauptmann. (Both of which corroborate parts of the 'Fisch story'.)

He was so sure of his case that when Lewis Bornmann effectively testified that he was the first police officer in the attic after Hauptmann's arrest, he jumped right up and told the Court (and the defense and the jury) that the testimony was not correct.



etc.

---he paid his rent with ransom money.---

Now there is the act of a man who KNOWS the money he has is traceable ransom money.

---he lied at the inntorignations in the bronx---

He lied to the police initially, true. That doesn't make him a killer. BTW - the extent of the lying is debatable. He testified (in the Bronx and Flemington) that he later told them he had 'another 14,000 hidden in his garage' and, IMHO, the testimony of the witness used to 'rebut' that effectively confirms it.

Mjr

Re:

Monday, 29-Mar-1999 08:22:14

205.183.31.67 writes:

then why did the wood expert go directly to that lumberyard before they caught hauptman?then they find that he worked there and bought lumber there.wilentz had alot of evidence, it wasnt his fault reilly didnt have much.hauptman told police he worked very little when arrested. cecil barr was a very good witness her testamony showed hauptman lied about when he met fisch. jim fisher told me that

steve for mjr

Re: Re:

Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 07:32:03

207.220.150.81 writes:

--- then why did the wood expert go directly to that lumberyard before they caught hauptman?---

As I said, Steve, it was likely A possibility. It was just not the ONLY possibility the way Koehler claimed. Besides, he didn't go "directly" there.

-- cecil barr was a very good witness her testimony showed hauptman lied about when he met fisch. jim fisher told me that ---

LOL Jim Fisher told you that? If he did it says A LOT about his knowledge of the facts and his credibility as a source on this case.

Cecile Barr's ONLY purpose on the stand was to try to prove that Hauptmann was spending ransom money BEFORE the date he claimed he found Fisch's shoe box. If Wilentz had ANY other witness that could testify to this, why on Earth did he use one for a date when Hauptmann had a half-dozen alibi witnesses. (His birthday, remember?)

Mjr

Re: Re: Re:  
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 08:04:30  
205.183.31.66 writes:

barr was a very good witness to the case.the alibi witnesses didnt hold water with that birthday excuse. i think hauptman still went to that theater anyway.jim fisher is very knowlegable on this case ive studied with him many times. and mrs hauptmans attorney i met with and noel behn. i cant wait for fishers new book on the case comes out. i dont know how ronnelle can believe that lindbergh did this crime, did i miss somthing these last 9 yrs?

steve for mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 05:55:05  
207.220.150.88 writes:

---jim fisher is very knowlegable on this case---

Not if, as you said, he told you that Barr's testimony 'proved' anything about when Hauptmann met Fisch.

---barr was a very good witness to the case.the alibi witnesses didnt hold water with that birthday excuse. i think hauptman still went to that theater anyway.---

Let me see if I understand you here.

On one side of the scale you have Cecile Barr who saw someone she didn't know and saw him for a few moments almost a year before. She says he was Hauptmann.

On the other side of the scale you have the fact that it was Hauptmann's birthday (his last before his arrest), and half a dozen people who knew him and said he was home that night for the party Anna gave him. You also have common sense which suggests that Hauptmann - on his birthday and with his wife and a 23 day old son at home - is not likely to be going out to the flicks.

But you think Barr is right and the half dozen are - what? Just wrong? Lying? Didn't notice that the guest of honor disappeared?

Is there any witness for the State whose story you DON'T believe?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:  
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 08:30:00  
205.183.31.66 writes:

i defintley dont believe scadutos belief that every single piece of evidence was surpressed . thats absurd in any case. i dont believe hauptman was framed it would have been a tremendous undertaking.since the defense couldnt produce anybody to question some of the witnesses on the prosicution side i have to assume some of witnesses were reliable.hauptmans alibis were weak. his backround in germany and his lying i take seriously. when reilly went to the radio to get witnesses and quacks i thnk killed any chance to convince a jury thats what i look at. this case is slowly branching off to stupidity with this theory that lindbergh did it and his sisterinlaw

steve for mjr

**Re: Crucial Points**

**Thursday, 08-Apr-1999 11:53:48**

**209.12.168.207 writes:**

**There are a number of "crucial points" in totality. However, from a legal standpoint, the person who wrote the first note is guilty as a principal in the crime of homicide in the perpetration of a burglary. As a principal, that person would be subject to execution, just as one who contracts for a murder for hire, or the one who plans a robbery where a death ensues but stays home while the robbery occurs. The book Hand of Hauptmann makes a rather compelling case that BRH wrote the first note. From a legal standpoint of culpability, it doesn't matter whether he climbed the ladder or not. There is other evidence which circumstantially connects him with the actual kidnapping, but if it could be shown that he wrote one of the notes; and that the same person wrote all the notes including the first one, he was a principal in the crime.**

**JM**