

CoNtRoVeRsY

Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 00:40:22

Message:

63.10.106.92 writes:

I am also involved in a class project regarding the Lindbergh case. The part I am focusing on is finding evidence in favor of Hauptmann. I came to this site because it seemed to be perfect to help me out. I find the information here interesting because there isn't any concrete PROOF to reverse the court decision. I mean, a good arguement is presented, but is there any info that just screams "Hauptmann is innocent!!!"?

I am not saying he was guilty. I am asking if he's innocent. I challenge everyone to shock me with evidence!!! => (Please)

-Eve

Re: CoNtRoVeRsY

Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 08:04:20

204.170.64.34 writes:

please be a little more specific, what does you argument look like so far. remember the prosecution 's evidence is based on circumstance they must without winess prove motive means and opportunity.

how have you built up your casse what is your favorite defence so far.

Philip Migliore

Re: Re: CoNtRoVeRsY

Monday, 22-Mar-1999 11:19:37

63.10.107.220 writes:

It's not that I personally have a case to build. It is a group project for a forensic science class, and each of us has taken a "category" to research for now. (It's early on in our project) My subject area is basically the controversy. I need to write up a mini-paper for my group in defense of Bruno, and yes, I have found a lot of info on this page, but nothing as concrete as I's like.

The fact thaty this is a forensic class (as opposed to a law class) means we are focusing specifically on evidence. For example, the ladder. Koehler was in the forensic field. My prof loves him. So the evidence against Hauptmann regarding the ladder is strong.

I need some things that are just too "fishy" abot the case that should have not have gotten Hauptmann executed because it would have prevented a "beyond a reasonable doubt" decision.

Thanks,
Eve

Re: Re: Re: CoNtRoVeRsY
Monday, 22-Mar-1999 19:02:52
204.170.64.25 writes:

Koehler's expert testimony was somewhat selective

An early examination of the ladder indicated that at least somesections of the ladder were cut by a left handed person, I have never seen anything suggesting Haupy was left handed nor any of this mentioned in the trial.

The defense sought to have the ladder excluded as evidence as it had been taken apart and re assembled several times and the state could not completely account for its whereabouts, between its discovery and the trial.

The notorious rail 16 was at best confusing to the jury, if you examine the same photo's as they saw in court you may wonder how could they determine this had all been from one piece.

There were a number of holes in the beam in the attic which alligned with holes in the rail exactly. Yet it was not until later after the trial that any examination into the authenticity of the holes examined and it was found that someone had tried to tamper with them by inserting wood shaving in them.
But as to their age? Nothing.

Hauptmann did not own the house he rented there, I do not recall any examination of Hauptmann's other carpentry work to compare it to the ladder.

There is also mention- though I have not seen it, that after the case closed an FBI memo surfaced which seriously questioned the credibility of the ladder as evidence.

Philip Migliore

**Re: CoNtRoVeRsY
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 13:33:20
205.183.31.67 writes:**

they wont shock you with evidence but will try to pin the murder on the father and ann morrows sister and write books on it to make money. there is no concrete proof that hauptman was inocent. only false hopes.i think hauptman was guilty, people on this website have a hard time with my beliefs, but i base them on facts and not what ifs

steve for eve

**Re: CoNtRoVeRsY
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 13:56:57
24.4.252.64 writes:**

Eve,

No, there is no solid evidence saying that Haupmann was innocent. I have also challenged the people on this site to prove this and they have come up with nothing.

On the other hand, Haupmann was found guilty, and rightfully so. They found a chisel of his on the crime scene. The wood of the ladder matched wood from his attic. He had a criminal history. He had "Jafsie's"(a go between in the ransom money exchange) name and number written in his closet in his home. And of course, they found almost half of the marked Lindbergh money in his garage, hidden. Although he never admitted to this crime, he knew as well as the police that he was involved in this crime.

Good luck on your project, and if you want to read an excellent book, read "Lindbergh", by Scott Berg. Later.

Todd

Mencken's Diary
Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 12:21:46

Message:
205.188.192.23 writes:

Here is H.L.Mencken's Jan 21, 1935 diary entry.

"Dr. Marjorie Nicolson, dean of Smith College, was here for lunch yesterday...She has been in Washington attending a meeting of the Smith Alumnae Assoc. With her there was young Constance Morrow, sister to Mrs. Lindbergh....Dr. William A. Neilson, president of Smith, was at Flemington, New Jersey at the time of the opening of the Hauptmann trial and saw a great deal of the Lindberghs. He told Dr. Nicolson that Mrs. Lindbergh laughed at the newspaper accounts of her heroic bearing on the stand. She said that the kidnapping was now an old story to the Morrow family, and that they had begun to look at it objectively - in fact, they had reached such a point that they made limericks on the names of the witnesses at the trial. All of the shock and sorrow were endured and survived long ago. Lindbergh, according to Dr. Neilson, goes to the trial as to a show, and is delighted that he has so good a seat. Like his wife, he has absolutely no heat against Hauptmann. The thing, he feels, is now out of his hands, and what interests him mainly is the sheer drama of it."

ronelle

Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Saturday, 20-Mar-1999 14:11:53
204.170.64.34 writes:

Dear Ronelle,

I am sure Mencken was correct, they may have even have gone further which he did not mention. a few years before the lindy case F. Scott Fitzgerald observed ;The rich are different. Meaning their perspectives and values are not the same as the average citizen, and never shall be.

Philip Migliore

Re: Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 11:12:35
205.188.199.47 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;The rich are different. Meaning their perspectives and values are not the same as the average citizen, and never shall be.
;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

But the rich are NOT different from the average citizen when it comes to losing a baby to a supposed kidnapper! Don't rich folks seek justice for their murdered children as much as poor folks? Why would anyone be so removed from such a trial and NOT take it seriously?

We know, however, from Harold Nicolson's diary that when the guilty verdict finally came Lindbergh still had to convince Anne that Hauptmann was indeed guilty. According to Nicolson she and Betty Gow had doubts and Lindbergh was still trying to convince them.

It is disturbing to think that a man's life was in the balance and the victim's father was thrilled to have a good seat! The fact is that Lindy lied about Hauptmann's voice and everyone understood it had to be a lie. They just did not care that a hero lied. (Steve Romeo never shuts up about Hauptmann's "lies" but I don't hear him screaming about Lindy's despicable lie.) It is not humanly possible to pick a voice from such a distance 2 years later after never seeing or hearing that person again. Yet, no one cared. Lindbergh was, and is still today, excused for this perjury because his defenders say he was trying to end the trial quickly in order to protect his dear wife from the emotional tortures of this trial. Torture indeed! Maybe he just didn't like her limericks? HL Mencken's description blows away any excuse you might want to make for a husband trying to protect his wife's emotions by lying in order to end her suffering.

Also, the ONLY public statement ever made by Lindbergh, in his entire lifetime, concerning the trial, was that he "want[ed] it to be fair." Yet his seat was always at the Prosecutor's table throughout the trial. Fair my eye!

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 14:01:34
204.170.64.37 writes:**

Ronelle

I do not retreat from Rich are Different, yes they care about their children however the Lindy's appear to have been able to put the past behind them rather than languish in sorrow for the rest of their lives.

Though I have not seen reference to it , I would not be surprised if Ann Lindy sought out psychiatric therapy if she had trouble adjusting.

Philip Migliore

**Re: Re: Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Sunday, 21-Mar-1999 22:13:43
207.220.150.203 writes:**

--- It is disturbing to think that a man's life was in the balance and the victim's father was thrilled to have a good seat!---

More disturbing than the image of the victim's mother making JOKES about her son's murder? What kind of mother could do that? The same kind who rarely showed her children physical affection?

And you call Charles weird.

-- We know, however, from Harold Nicolson's diary that when the guilty verdict finally came Lindbergh still had to convince Anne that Hauptmann was indeed guilty.

According to Nicolson she and Betty Gow had doubts and Lindbergh was still trying to convince them. ---

We know that Lindbergh went over the evidence item by item. It was Nicolson's impression that he was talking more to Anne than to him. Why did he do that? Did she have doubts? Maybe. She had not, after all, been in the courthouse listening to

the evidence. Maybe she was disturbed by the sounds of the mob outside the courthouse - the mob even Lindbergh described as a lynching crowd. Maybe she was disturbed, too, by the fact that the man to be put to death had a wife and small child. Maybe she didn't like the idea of the death penalty at all. Maybe he just wanted to reassure her that the jury had done the right thing. It doesn't mean she doubted the crime itself. It doesn't mean she suspected Charles of anything.

---The fact is that Lindy lied about Hauptmann's voice...---

Lie: an INTENTIONALLY false statement.

How do you know that his statement was INTENTIONALLY false? How can you know that he did not believe his statement was true?

I don't think it is enough to say that such an identification was impossible. OK, Lindbergh couldn't make that ID - I agree with that - but he believed he could. That makes him wrong, it even makes him a fool. It doesn't make him a liar.

I am curious about the post here:

"Dr. Marjorie Nicolson, dean of Smith College, was here for lunch yesterday...She has been in Washington attending a meeting of the Smith Alumnae Assoc. With her there was young Constance Morrow, sister to Mrs. Lindbergh....Dr. William A. Neilson, president of Smith, was at Flemington, New Jersey at the time of the opening of the Hauptmann trial and saw a great deal of the Lindberghs. He told Dr. Nicolson..."

It is not clear from the way this is phrased whether Mencken heard this story from Neilson, who apparently was there with the Lindberghs or from Nicolson, who was not.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Monday, 22-Mar-1999 03:00:54
152.163.195.208 writes:

;;;;;;And you call Charles weird.

;;;;;;

If you are trying to say that Anne was just as mentally ill as her husband I absolutely agree with you but I have never focused on her as a suspect though we really ought to consider it. Her reaction to the death of Reeve's baby (the same age as Charlie when he died in her Connecticut home in 1984)is disturbing. Anne forces Reeve to sit tight and watch over the child's corpse for many hours. She was reliving the death of her own child who was cremated by her husband who never allowed her to cry.

The most doubtful aspect for me, of Ahlgren and Monier's theory, when I first heard of it, was Anne. I could not understand how any wife could live with such a person and NOT know he was faking a kidnap to hide his negligence. But after reading Dorothy Hermann and Joyce Milton I do believe Anne must have been depressed or mentally ill throughout her marriage. And, according to her daughter's memoir, she is not in control of her faculties nowadays. Reeve claims it is a stroke but who will ever know the truth?

As for Lindbergh's lie, you and I have gone over this issue before. I say he KNEW he was lying and you say he THOUGHT he was telling the truth which would not technically be called perjury. So, if you are right (and I don't think you are)IMHO Lindbergh should have been admitted to Bellevue immediately after his testimony if he , as you defend, really believed himself to have such supernatural powers that could pick out a voice he heard 2 and a half years earlier. The reason I disagree with you so strongly on this point is that Lindbergh changed his version of what he heard indicating that he was not sure about any of it - ever! Any responsible and honest person would have admitted they couldn't swear on a bible to something as ridiculous as that but Lindy pointed his finger and strapped the defendant in the chair anyhow. He may even have heard nothing at all. We now know he had a hearing problem which Reeve describes in her book (from the loud airplane engines) and it is not far-fetched to wonder if his eardrums were shot by 1935.

As for Mencken I will try to find the entire citation. (BTW, Dr. Marjorie Nicolson is not related to Nigel or Harold.)

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: HL Mencken's Diary
Monday, 22-Mar-1999 08:35:22
204.170.64.31 writes:

Again , you are looking at Lindy Morrow, especially with your personal values and expectations of how they should react. I believe that is an error. Before you begin you may wish to consider that by June 01, 1932 Lindy went back to work. This was therapy he and Ann had to put this behind and move forward with their lives again.

I do not know if they had profession therapy, I would hardly doubt it, nor what they were prescribed, especially when they were present at that trial, what try of anti depressant anxiety drugs they had in 1935? Maybe they used hypnosis and a lite psychotropic drug, like THC, I do not know.

P.Migliore

Heroes and antisemitism
Monday, 22-Mar-99 20:28:37

Message:
209.210.251.21 writes:

After reading Ronelle Delmont's critique of Lindberg, I can only wonder: If a person is undeniably anti-semitic, is there nothing he can do that is heroic? Is a person's feelings about Jews simply the one and only factor in determining his heroism, his humanity, and his value as a human being?

Rick Markell

Re: Heroes and antisemitism
Tuesday, 23-Mar-99 09:50:58
205.183.31.66 writes:

i can only wonder why some people connect the loss of his son to what happened in germany when he got a medal from goring. the two dont even match. but people bring that up and mix it with the crime making him a suspect and a jew hater and hauptman is a great guy when it is proven that hes a convicted felon that escaped jail in germany with a criminal record.but that dont count on this website

steve for rick

Re: Heroes and antisemitism
Friday, 26-Mar-99 22:09:46
205.188.198.39 writes:

;;;;;;If a person is undeniably anti-semitic, is there nothing he can do that is heroic?
;;;;;;

Yes, there is one thing he might do - apologize afterward. That might have been something of an heroic achievement for Lindbergh but 3 decades was not enough time for him to make up his "heroic" mind. I guess you, like Scott Berg, could call him "heroic" for sticking to his beliefs and not giving in to other people's opinions.

;;;;;;? Is a person's feelings about Jews simply the one and only factor in determining his heroism, his humanity, and his value as a human being?
;;;;;;

A person's feelings about Jews certainly has nothing to do with the bravery (or stupidity)required to fly solo across a huge ocean but it could have, as Ahlgren and

Monier claim, alot to do with a terrifying 3-ring circus, known as the Trial of the Century in which a Jewish prosecutor, greedy for political power, unabashedly framed an innocent German. The most fascinating part of Ahlgren and Monier's theory involves their explanation for Lindbergh's atypical, post-trial, prewar behavior. His highly public anti-Semitic speeches are linked to the horror he witnessed and participated in at Flemington. If A & M are correct about Lindbergh's kidnapping hoax, and I believe they are, he would have been forced somehow to rationalize his own guilt. The blame, Lindbergh could always say, was not his own but Wilentz' - and later he could disguise his accusations by publicly accusing all Jews of evil intent. Hauptmann's bravery at Flemington, where Lindbergh had the best seat in the house (at the ruthless prosecutor's table), must have been traumatic. If anyone in the world knew what it felt like to be assaulted, (although adoringly), by the public, it was Lucky Lindy.

For his perjury and finger-pointing at Flemington, Lindbergh the lucky daredevil, IMHO, was one of history's worst cowards. I have no clue as to what kind of heroism, humanity, and value as a human being you are referring to. If your hero had gotten his wish I could never have been born and the rest of the world, including the USA, would be heiling Hitler.

ronelle

Re:

Monday, 29-Mar-99 08:13:51

205.183.31.67 writes:

ronnelle hauptman was not brave he was a coward and a good lyer. he was a criminal in germany and here.i didnt read that book yet but i know i wont buy into anything about lindbergh kidnaping his own son.jim fisher would eat them guys alive in a debate

steve for ronelle

What's up with that?
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 14:02:27

Message:
24.4.252.64 writes:

I am in the middle of reading "Crime of the Century: The Lindbergh Kidnapping Hoax" and they made a pretty good point. Why would the kidnapper do it between 7:30 and 10pm when there were lights on and activity in the house? It would make more sense to do it in the middle of the night when everyone was asleep and you would get a better head start. What's up with that?
I still think Hauptmann was involved but that whole thing about Lindbergh is starting to seem possible. Any thoughts?

Todd Kovacs

Re: What's up with that?
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 15:38:51
205.183.31.67 writes:

out of all the theoris the hauptman supporters throw out you, the dumbest and the ones with the least proof is ann morrows sister did it and the worst is that lindbergh did it. everybody worrys what time he did it who cares? the bottom line he got away with it.they could have caught him in the middle of the night. theres to many what ifs and whys. they have to look at the facts in this case but they dont. they caught hauptman with his back to a wall and he lied and made up stories that bit him on the ass many times. were there acomplices? possible but no concrete proof has surfaced since then. but to pin it on family members is crazy

steve for todd

Re: Re: What's up with that?
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 19:54:59
152.163.197.207 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;but to pin it on family members is crazy

;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;;

Steve, how far out of this world is Seaford, Long Island that you don't know just how "crazy" it is to ignore the possibility of family members when something horrific happens to a child? (Or to anyone for that matter!) The chances of being harmed by someone you know is quite high whether you are a child or an adult. Reliable crime statistics prove the opposite point you are trying to make. Of course,

those statistics, by themselves, do not make Lindbergh guilty of anything. But, they do make theorizing about this case completely off-balance if we do NOT include Lindbergh as a suspect. And, when you do include him as a possible suspect, the entire scenario of March 1, 1932 begins to change even more for Hauptmann's innocence.

ronelle

Re: What's up with that?
Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 04:10:28
207.220.150.56 writes:

---Why would the kidnapper do it between 7:30 and 10pm when there were lights on and activity in the house? It would make more sense to do it in the middle of the night when everyone was asleep and you would get a better head start.---

No one knows for sure why they picked that early time. I suggest that it had something to do with the fact that later, after everyone went to bed, there were three adults within a few feet of the nursery. As it stood, after 8:00 he was completely alone on the second floor.

Mjr

Re: Re: What's up with that?
Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 12:38:08
24.4.252.64 writes:

--why they picked that early time--
So you think it was a group who was involved in this kidnapping? And how would "they" know that the adults slept in adjacent bedrooms? They must have been staking the house out for awhile. Unless it was someone who knew the house well, or knew someone who knew the house well.

Re:
Sunday, 28-Mar-1999 05:14:27
207.220.150.46 writes:

---So you think it was a group who was involved in this kidnapping? ---

Yes, that is exactly what I think. It is what the police thought, too, right up until the time they needed the "lone wolf" theory in order to get Hauptmann to the electric chair.

--- And how would "they" know that the adults slept in adjacent bedrooms? ---

Probably the same way they knew the Lindberghs would be in Hopewell that night, and knew which room was the nursery and which window couldn't be secured.

--- They must have been staking the house out for awhile. ---

Staking out the house wouldn't do it. If they were just watching the house or the family, they wouldn't have even looked for them in Hopewell that night.

Mjr

Re:

Monday, 29-Mar-1999 11:47:16

205.183.31.66 writes:

with going over the police investigation of the crib, the ladder being left behind, and fitting in a car, im leaning and i believe he acted alone. i know the police and the people all these yrs think of other people involved. gov hoffman pleaded with hauptman to mention other people involved he never did. i know it can be debated but thats where im going with this. any input?

steve for mjr

Re: Re:

Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 07:14:42

207.220.150.81 writes:

---any input?---

How about some questions:

How did Hauptmann know the Lindberghs were in Hopewell that night?

How did he know which room was the nursery and which window couldn't be secured - or was it just blind luck that the first window tried turned out to be the right one?

How did he know enough about the schedule of the household to know when Charlie would be alone - or was that more luck?

Who was the person Condon heard 'directing' the man he spoke to on the phone just after receiving the first note?

Who was the man Condon and Reich saw at Woodlawn Cemetery, and the man Lindbergh saw at St. Raymond's? Is it just a coincidence that even a cursory examination of the descriptions indicates they were the same person (and that the person was not John)?

Hauptmann was a fair sized man and that nursery window is not that big (nor is the window sill). Where did he put Charlie as he maneuvered his way out that window onto the ladder? Even the police officer who tried it (in broad daylight, with the shutters and the window open) said he needed both hands and would have to have put down anything he was carrying. I have trouble with the idea that there was room on that window sill for BOTH him and Charlie.

What happened to the rest of the ransom money? (And please don't tell me Hauptmann spent it - even Wilentz didn't believe that - his 'proofs' notwithstanding.)

And, of course, Phil's question:

If Hauptmann did this alone, he must have planned to kill Charlie from the beginning, right? So, why such a shallow grave so close to the Lindbergh house? That does not suggest planing.

And, just out of curiosity, what do you think Hauptmann did for the several hours between the time Hochmuth 'saw' him and the time he committed this crime (8 or 9 hours MINIMUM)?

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 08:11:12
205.183.31.66 writes:**

i was in that room the window isnt small a good size man can go through it. it took alot of guts to come down on a crapy ladder

steve for mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re:
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 06:36:51
207.220.150.88 writes:

---a good size man can go through it. ---

No one disputes that the window was big enough for a man to go through (Sweeney did it).

What I question is whether it was big enough for a man to squirm around and manuver his way out the window to the ladder (off to one side and 30 inches below the window) with a 30 pound baby on the sill with him. AND to do so without disturbing the toy sitting on the suitcase on the chest under the window OR the stein sitting on the sill itself. AND to do so without leaving any marks in the side of the house as he felt with his feet for the top of the ladder. Not to mention standing on the top of the ladder, holding on to the baby with one hand and closing the window and shutter with the other.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 08:15:20
205.183.31.66 writes:

i know it was a scary thing to try.he must have been lucky enough that the ladder as light as it was didnt fall on him. im scared to go on my roof with a good ladder. this ladder had another piece to it. i think if that was used , that ladder might have fell

steve for mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Thursday, 01-Apr-1999 13:19:25
205.188.195.48 writes:

MJR

Your vivid description of a daredevil kidnapping feat only enhances the plausability for Lucky Lindy - the wing walker, the parachute jumper, the hero daredevil who took chances like nobody else. A person would have to be out of their mind or a

**believer in their own physical superiority to even think of pulling off such a trick!
Who else do you know of that would have even attempted such a thing? While 5
people were moving around the house yet? Isidor Fisch? Oliver Whateley?**

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Friday, 02-Apr-1999 12:23:23
205.183.31.67 writes:**

**ronnelle, i respect mjrs knowledge of the case even when we disagree on the
outcome. i dont know how you can rely believe that hauptman is a better man then
linbergh even with out this case. hauptman was a criminal case closed. i hate
when you twist things around**

steve for ronnelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 12:44:02
209.12.168.207 writes:**

**A cursory review of any police office files on burglary would show that burglary
while people are home is a more routine occurrence than you suggest. That is why
the punishment for classic first degree burglary (breaking, entering, dwelling house
of another, in the nighttime, with intent to commit a felony) is punished so much
more seriously than second degree (daytime) or third degree (commercial
establishment). Oftentimes, the result is the death of someone, as it was in this
case. Hauptmann was a serious criminal before the kidnapping (burglary and
robbery--the latter involving taking directly from a person using force or fear or a
weapon). The Lindy-haters often gloss over this point or ignore it completely.**

JM

</HTML>

What's the best source???
Tuesday, 23-Mar-1999 18:03:52

Message:
152.203.38.18 writes:

What is the best, in your opinion, source for the Lindbergh Kidnapping both on the web and books? I am most interested in documentation on the jury. Thanks.

Shawn

Re: What's the best source???
Wednesday, 24-Mar-1999 04:58:52
207.220.150.56 writes:

---What is the best, in your opinion, source for the Lindbergh Kidnapping both on the web and books? I am most interested in documentation on the jury. Thanks.---

I think the best book on the case is Scapegoat by Anthony Scaduto because it is the most well documented. It is also the one that I have found to be the most accurate in the areas I have been able to independantly verify.

Mjr

Re: Re: What's the best source???
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 10:31:14
209.12.168.207 writes:

Sources:
Airman and the Carpenter by Ludovic Kennedy
The Lindbergh Kidnapping Case, by Sidney Whipple
Scapegoat by Anthony Scaduto
Lindbergh by A. Scott Berg
Kidnap by George Waller
Crime of the Century by Ahlgren and Monier
The Lindbergh Case by Jim Fisher

The Hand of Hauptmann by J. Vreeland Haring

Kidnapping by Messick and Goldblatt

The Lindbergh Kidnapping Case by Ovid Demaris

Lindbergh the Crime by Noel Behn

In Search of the Lindbergh Baby by Theon Wright

Lindbergh by Leonard Mosley

There are several other bios on Lindbergh and the books by Anne Morrow

**Lindbergh are good sources for information. No one should debate this case
without sufficient research in these books.**

JM

Lindbergh Ransom Money

Thursday, 25-Mar-1999 16:00:22

Message:

204.170.64.45 writes:

The Lindbergh Ransom money 50,000.00 was and is the property of the Lindbergh family. Even bill that may turn up many years later, I believe the dodllar amount has to be returned or so should be returned to the Lindbergh family.

Does anyone know how to find out exactly how much Lindbergh Ransom money has been accounted for to date?

If anyone does know how or the amount please share the information.

Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money

Friday, 16-Apr-1999 23:55:43

12.79.174.10 writes:

Of the \$50,000, about \$14,000 was found in Hauptmann's home. That, plus the amount Hauptmann is known to have spent totals about \$18,000-\$20,000, leaving at least \$30,000 unaccounted for.

One theory is that the police helped themselves to it. Another theory is that Fisch was a co-conspirator and took his share of the ransom money back to Germany.

One thing is certain--the money was too hot to spend, and the balance never surfaced. Whoever had it did not have the luxury of time to wait for it to cool because gold notes were to become illegal (sometime in 1935, I think).

I think the likelihood is that the money was destroyed but, like so many unanswered questions in this case, that's something we'll probably never know.

Al Berkowitz

Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money

Monday, 19-Apr-1999 07:39:13

207.220.150.54 writes:

---Of the \$50,000, about \$14,000 was found in Hauptmann's home. That, plus the amount Hauptmann is known to have spent totals about 18,000-\$20,000, leaving at least \$30,000 unaccounted for.---

14,600 was found in the garage. About 140 was admittedly spent by Hauptmann (all after mid-August, 1934). The State alleged that he spent another 5.00 in November, 1933. (This was the only pre-August, 1934 bill the State even attempted to connect to Hauptmann.)

So, what is the basis for the claim that Hauptmann was "known to have spent" between 4,000 and 6,000 in ransom money?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money
Tuesday, 20-Apr-1999 23:37:01
12.79.177.39 writes:

After the kidnapping, his brokerage account, which was in a losing position, indicated that he invested several thousand dollars in the stock market. We don't know if he used the ransom money for that, but he had no other known source of funds. He stopped working immediately after the kidnapping in March 1932 and had no known employment from that point until his apprehension in 1934. It's unlikely he was able to pay his bills from his wife's employment at the Dyer Ave. bakery.

If we can discredit his Fisch story, we necessarily default to an assumption that he was at least one of the ransom recipients. If there were one or two other co-conspirators, that would put Hauptmann's share of the ransom in the range of one-third to one-half of the \$50,000, about \$17,000 to \$25,000. I think it's fair to say that he disposed of about \$5,000.

OK, OK, I'll amend "known to have spent" to "probably spent." Picky. Picky.

Al Berkowitz

Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money
Thursday, 22-Apr-1999 07:10:46
207.220.150.46 writes:

---I think it's fair to say that he disposed of about \$5,000. OK, OK, I'll amend "known to have spent" to "probably spent." Picky. Picky.---

Sorry to be 'picky' but I don't think it is "fair to say that he disposed of about \$5,000". There is no basis for your statement other than the fact that Hauptmann gave money to his broker - and your dismissal of his claims about where he got it.

Instead of presuming that any money Hauptmann gave them was ransom money (there being no evidence to that effect), try looking at what they knew about the ransom money they recovered.

Of the about \$4,400 recovered before mid-August, 1934, \$1,000 came from a couple of bulk gold note deposits made in late April, 1933. Almost \$3,000 came from the Faulkner exchange in May, 1933. That is almost all of the recovered money. Neither of these transactions was ever connected in any way to Hauptmann. Indeed, about the only thing everyone agreed on was that Hauptmann WAS NOT Faulkner.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money
Friday, 23-Apr-1999 10:32:01
192.60.36.248 writes:**

We seem to be more than a few bucks apart on this issue, so let's try to reason this out.

Fact: BRH was connected to over \$14,000 of the ransom money--that's indisputable.

Fact: BRH was an original ransom recipient in April 1932, and I infer from your silence that you are conceding this point.

You're saying that from April 1932 until his arrest in September 1934, only \$140 of the spent ransom money can be linked to BRH. This means that over a 30-month period in which he was unemployed, in which his family's only known source of income was from Anna's employment, his average monthly outlay of the ransom money was less than \$5.00. That just doesn't hold up to a test of reasonableness.

My problem with your rationale is your apparent rigid insistence that the mechanism established by the authorities for detecting the ransom money was foolproof. That's highly questionable. The banks weren't notified of the ransom notes' serial numbers until May 1932, and it was some time later that pamphlets

were issued to the general public. The fact is that the ransom recipients had an ample window of opportunity in which to pass the ransom bills.

Add to that the fact that banks were handling an inordinate volume of soon-to-be obsoleted gold notes which were being redeemed for newly issued silver certificates. In those years before electronic scanners and other hi-tech equipment, currency handling was a manual, time-consuming, labor-intensive procedure. If a bank came across a ransom bill, fine, but I don't think it's realistic to expect them to have dropped everything else they were doing to look for one.

I'll stand by my original assessment that BRH spent much more than the \$140 you're acknowledging.

Al Berkowitz

JM to AL
Friday, 23-Apr-1999 15:05:05
209.12.168.207 writes:

Those of us who have copies of the paper sent to the banks can appreciate your position. It would require a 2 foot by 3 foot frame to display, and the print is quite small given the number of bills involved.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money
Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 08:34:52
206.214.112.19 writes:

---Fact: BRH was connected to over \$14,000 of the ransom money--that's indisputable.---

Correct - the money in his possession at the time of his arrest. Since that money was not 'disposed of', I didn't count it. Since you came up with the \$5,000 figure, apparently you didn't, either. :)

---Fact: BRH was an original ransom recipient in April 1932, and I infer from your silence that you are conceding this point.---

LOL Nice try, but I suspect that you are well aware that I do not concede that.

---You're saying that from April 1932 until his arrest in September 1934, only \$140 of the spent ransom money can be linked to BRH.---

Like it or not, that is correct (although actually the figure is about \$160). All of it spent in the four week period from mid-August, 1934 to his arrest. (The only exception, of course, is the November 26, 1933 note spent when Hauptmann had a half dozen alibi witnesses who said he was at home.)

---This means that over a 30-month period in which he was unemployed, in which his family's only known source of income was from Anna's employment, his average monthly outlay of the ransom money was less than \$5.00. ---

It does not mean that at all. To reach this conclusion you must dismiss:

- the evidence that Hauptmann did independent contracting work in carpentry.**
- the fact that his brokerage account records show cash withdrawals (sometimes profits, sometimes credit against his account).**
- his claim that he kept cash in the house (which Anna said he had done before).**
- his claim that he got some of the money he used from Fisch - a claim for which there is corroboration.**

You must also presume that if Hauptmann gave his broker money, it must have been ransom money. IMHO, that is neither a valid presumption, nor is it one supported by the known evidence about the disposal of the money.

---My problem with your rationale is your apparent rigid insistence that the mechanism established by the authorities for detecting the ransom money was foolproof.---

Foolproof? Hardly. I have no doubt that some of the money slipped through the cracks. I DO doubt that \$5,000 slipped through. (Not to mention the remaining \$25,000.)

The banks caught bills, they certainly caught the bulk deposits in April and May, 1933 (BTW, it was not just the banks looking, money coming from banks was rechecked at the Fed), but they didn't catch the vast, vast majority of this \$5,000 he spent? What about the other \$25,000 the State claimed he spent? They missed that, too?

---The banks weren't notified of the ransom notes' serial numbers until May 1932...---

The list was published in the NYT of April 10, 1932. The first bill recovered was on April 4, so someone was paying attention, even before the list was published.

I merely suggest that instead of starting with a disputed claim and going forward from there, presuming other disputed claims (Hauptmann got the ransom money, ergo what he gave his broker was ransom money), that you begin with what is KNOWN about the disposal of the money.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh Ransom Money
Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 13:20:53
12.79.176.112 writes:**

--I merely suggest that instead of starting with a disputed claim and going forward from there, presuming other disputed claims (Hauptmann got the ransom money, ergo what he gave his broker was ransom money), that you begin with what is KNOWN about the disposal of the money--

. . .and all I'm suggesting is that common sense cannot possibly support the premise that a man who had access to over \$14,000 would spend only \$140.00 (\$160.00?) of it during the Depression Era of 1932-1934.

You've got your perception, I've got mine. Let's leave it at that.

Al Berkowitz

**What was the original plan, as best
we can piece together part 2
Thursday, 25-Mar-1999 22:32:37**

**Message:
204.170.64.10 writes:**

**Re: What was the original plan, as best we can piece together part 2
Thursday, 25-Mar-1999 22:44:25
204.170.64.10 writes:**

In the first part of this message, found a few boards down, we discussed the intention of the kidnapper was not to kill the child, otherwise he would have made better preparations to dispose of the body.

Amazing luck the kidnapper had.

Does anyone believe they understand the case so far and may venture to say what the kidnapper's next move would have been?

Below is pure spec:

Where could he have hidden the child ?

What were his intentions ? get the money and return the child ? keep the child, perhaps there was a baby blackmarket ?

**Re:
Monday, 29-Mar-1999 11:40:00
205.183.31.66 writes:**

well, he killed the baby instantly he had no intentions of keeping it. thats why i think he was a lone wolf. he dumped the baby in the woods quickly and got the hell out of hopewell. thats why he left the ladder he was alone he couldnt carry both. his nwxt move was to lie to the lindberghs with phony ransom notes until he got the money. the ladder was built to fit in a car, so i think when all said and done he was alone afterall

steve for phil

**Re: Re:
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 07:36:42
207.220.150.81 writes:**

---well, he killed the baby instantly he had no intentions of keeping it.---

Oh, you have some evidence, some proof, of premeditation? Wilentz didn't - that is why he had to charge Hauptmann the way he did.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 08:07:34
205.183.31.66 writes:**

im just assuming like everybody else on this website. the evidence points to that. i think hauptman killed the baby right away. thats my take on it.you might have a differnt one

steve romeo

**Re: Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 11:44:40
204.170.64.26 writes:**

Dear Steve:

I am trying to draw your attention to the events and not just what occurred but why? I believe that if enough of us focus on events that combined we have the ability to come closer than any single person or even team to unravelling and understanding the real sequence of important events and their meaning.

Using Occam's Razor, -simplicity-

how could we account for the events of March 01 in so far as the kidnapping,

**place: was it just luck kidnapper found Lindy @ Hopewell?
If kidnapping was planned in advance then:**

**Time : was it just luck, so early in the evening?
Materials : was it just luck chose right window?
Why was ladder , chisle carelessly left about?**

Why was body left carelessly in the woods nearby?

If we could begin on these or similiar questions then build from there, using our own abilities I believe we can make a positive contribution.

PS I did not want to go into a different topic, but felt I should in refering to the Nat Lumber and Mill company at White Plaines and Gun Hill Roads. Remember that when Haptmann used to ride the subway into Manhattan he walked to the station. The train he used - the Lexington Ave line is located close to the National Lumber Mill co.

In the trial their records showed that Haqupt had occasionally worked for them and on Dec 29, 1931 purchased 9\$ and change worth of lumber, which Koehler felt he was sure Haupt used in the ladder.

The first time Koehler visited the Nat Mill Co, the manager said they did NOT keep records for some time, then they were found, okay, then they had Hapt's name in there, Okay, since he lived close and was easily accesible to the lumber yard it would have to me appeared more suspicious if his name did not appear in their books, He was a carpenter. Go to a lumber yard in your area and ask about local carpenters, see what kind of answers you get.

Do Condon, on the stand was confused with a John Condex or similiar who borrowed a book on signs just prior tothe kidnaping from the NYPL.

Dr. Condon a man with many degrees and an office on city island across the street , even in 1932, from a branch of the NYPL, stated on the witness stand he had never borrowed a book ever, in his life from the NYPL.

What d you make of that?

Philip for Steve

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:

Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 08:20:12

205.183.31.66 writes:

**i dont think it was luck at all. i think he roamed around the grounds a few times and got to know what room the baby was in. the baby was always shown at the window even in the newsreels. jim fisher thinks he orignaly was going to kidnap the baby in englewood but who knows. its hard to speculate of what went on.theres to many what ifs and how comes on this website
steve for phil**