

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 10:29:58
204.170.64.52 writes:

If Haupy was wandering around Hopewell-Zion there is a better chance he would have been seen by more people than Hochmuth, Lupica and Whited.
Rossister

If he was planning for Englewood, no one saw him scouting around there?

Hochmuth was 88 and pretty much blind with catarachs -how ever it is spelled
Lupica was a kid,
Whited was considered un reliable
Rossister- a good samaritan sales man stopped at night on rt 31 to fix a tire?

we should just take this section of the
story and bounce it around and see what comes out.

PS

Remember when they said the ladder rung snapped with the weight of a man about 175 - Haupy's and when you add the 30 pounds of the child.

I remember reading about Condon, why he did not identify Haupy straight off. Later, he said it was because he realized that the Haupt arrested in Sept 1934 was heavier than the Cemetery John of April of 1932. I do not exactly remember but it may have been about 30 pounds more.

How does this figure in? at the trial the description of the man who would be able to climb up and break the rung on the way down would have been about Haupy's weight at the trial. Did he drop 30 pounds between arrest and trial, I do not think so he looks the same in photos?

Also would not a carpenter even a bad one know enough to make a ladder strong enough for him and his tools?

Remember about Haupy's German arrest, in 1919, he was 19-20 years old, it is likley he was much thinner during that famine maybe around 135-145 lbs. Easier for him to scamper up a ladder to the Burgonmeister's second floor bedroom window. A second story man would be like that.

Philip for Steve

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 14:52:02
205.183.31.67 writes:

your making excuses for hauptman theres always one for every little crack in this case i think he was dumb enough to do this basing his germany crimes. i dont care how young he was the ladder broke in hopewell hes lucky he didnt break his head. could hachmuchs sight be bad in 1932 then in 1936? good question. you cant say every witness was unreliable

STEVE ROMEO

Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 10:23:18
209.12.168.207 writes:

I am puzzled by your reference to "premeditation". Hauptmann was convicted of what we call today "felony murder" which requires no specific intent other than to commit the underlying crime -- here theft. The appellate court decision clearly points this out. Under this theory Hauptmann would have been guilty if he wrote the note and someone else carried it to Hopewell and took and killed the child. He would be a principal under the law and subject to the death penalty.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re:
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 12:32:25
204.170.64.29 writes:

Dear JM:

The intent is to attempt through the use of input by persons interested in the case to try to unravel the mystery and to understand, as much as possible through combined efforts, just what took place.

The case against Haupy is just one aspect of the Lindbergh Kidnapping case and it is by no means the complete story.

What is your background in the Lindy story, what have you read, studied ? Where are you located?

Also- The charge against Haupy has a great deal to do with our understanding of the story as his being charged with burglary during which little Lindy died as a result of external violence gives some indication as to the prosecution's evidence.

Philip for JM

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Re:
Thursday, 08-Apr-1999 09:09:52
209.12.168.207 writes:**

In response to both your pages, let's just say "I'm interested in the law and the Lindbergh case" As a circumstantial evidence case with significant scientific evidence, I have found it interesting. As to the bibliography, that was from my own collection -- all of which I have read. I tend to credit those books which do not selectively review the evidence more than the others. I have, however, gained something from all of them. As to personal experience, I am not as old as the case, but I have visited the house and the museum. I have considered getting a copy of the transcript of the trial, but it would probably be expensive. Perhaps we could get a group to do this. My personal gripe with the Monday morning quarterbacks is their own "selectivity" rather than taking a more global view of the case, the people, the evidence, and especially the case's place in time. If you have not read the NJ appellate opinion, it can be found in any law library at volume 180 Atlantic Reporter at page 809 (1935) As the appellate court observed in the 13-0 opinion on page 827 "There was much more evidence tending to establish his guilt. It was a circumstantial case, with the evidence point to guilt from so many directions as to leave no room for a reasonable doubt."

JM

**Re: What was the original plan, as best we can piece together part 2
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 12:40:07
204.170.64.29 writes:**

Dear JM:

I did not see your bibliography in your reply in Best Source ...message board.

I am familiar with most of these works , which if any do you regard as your primary informational source, have you any personal experience in the story?

Philip for JM p.2

Re: Re: What was the original plan, as best we can piece together part 2
Wednesday, 07-Apr-1999 20:57:56
12.74.65.179 writes:

Philip,

You asked JM if he had any personal experience in the story. Do you have personal experience with the story? Were you alive at the time of the kidnapping? It would be interesting to hear a first hand account of what it was like at the time of the crime. I appreciate your efforts to recreate the crime. I think it can lead to a better understanding of just how difficult an undertaking this crime would have been for one person. Hauptmann may have been involvred in the crime but he could not have done it without help. Although if he did have accomplices, I can't understand why he would go to his death without revealing who they were. He might have been able to save his own life if he had revealed the names of other participants. Hauptmann may have bought the money from Fisch. If this were the case, he may not have known of any other participants.

Thanks,
John

Re: Re: Re: What was the original plan, as best we can piece together part 2
Thursday, 08-Apr-1999 12:24:07
204.170.64.18 writes:

I was born in 1956.

I am from the Bronx, I have been in different ways familiar with the case my entire life,

relatives of both my parents knew major persons involved.

I continue to know persons, unrelated to me who were in close proximity of the case.

what are your credentials?

I would love your impute into my attempt to un ravel the case.

Philip for John

Re: Re: Re: Re: What was the original plan, as best we can piece together part 2
Thursday, 08-Apr-1999 23:19:08
12.74.66.235 writes:

Philip,

I am a little older than you. Born in RI in '52. Live now in AL. Got intersted in the case in college. My Dad was a policeman for a number of years and he had heard a number of rumors about what actually happened. He thought Hauptmann was involved in the crime in some way but not as the lead person. I guess I took up the thread much to the chagrin of my wife and kids. They kid me a lot about spending time trying to solve a 67 year old crime when almost all the principals have passed on. No particular qualifications regarding the crime. I have read a lot of books: Waller, Scaduto, Alhgren and Monier, Behn, Kennedy, Fisher, etc. I have also visited Hopewell. My wife and kids thought that was a bit over the top but I found it interesting. I particularly wanted to see if the Lindbergh house could still be clearly seen from Mt. Rose. It could not be seen clearly. The house was kind of eerie. A real feeling of sorrow for the child came over me there.

Who connected with the crime did your family members know? What about you? What is the local lore about the crime in the Bronx? I have visited the Bronx Board a number of times to get some feel for how the folks in the Bronx feel about what happened. Do people there still remember what happened?

By the way until I started visiting this board, I thought Hauptmann's only involvement with this crime was that he bought the money from Fisch. Now I wonder if he, as part of a group, was involved in the actual crime in some more direct way. My wife and kids are right you know. It's too late to solve this crime. When they executed Hauptmann they broke the only link they had in the chain. Still, I'll read Melinda's book when it comes out to see if there are any new insights.

Thanks,
John

Sir Ludovic Kennedy; A United States Lecture Tour Sunday, 28-Mar-1999 18:05:13

**Message:
207.172.7.101 writes:**

In a recent phone conversation with Mark Falzini, I learned that Sir Ludovic Kennedy would like to come to the U.S. and lecture on the Lindbergh kidnapping/trial of the Century. (I believe THE AIRMAN AND THE CARPENTER has been re-published recently with a new introduction) Last week I approached one university and, guess what?... there seems to be a lot of interest! I approached the Criminal Justice Department and suggested a lecture with a follow-up panel discussion on the death penalty. The person who chairs this department is planning to submit a proposal which will combine efforts (and funds) of the Criminal Justice Dept, Sociology Dept. and also Women's Studies. (always trying to slip that women's angle in there somewhere :-). If this proposal is approved, the school would be willing to help me contact other schools in the mid-atlantic region. (BTW, all these schools are located no more than a 1-2 hour drive from Hopewell)

So, that leaves the rest of the country. I need your help. Is there a college, university, law school etc. etc. in your area that might like to hire Sir Ludovic Kennedy to speak some time next spring? (I am trying as much as possible to plan things around the April 3rd anniversary, which will be 65 years)

At the present time, Sir Anthony is on tour with his new book and is unavailable to discuss any lecture plans. I have been advised to send him a letter through his publisher, but before I do this I will wait to hear any comments or suggestions you enthusiasts might have.

This is an exciting opportunity. Let's not pass it up. I look forward to hear from you, either on this forum or through e-mail.

P.S. I'll let you know the names of the Universities as soon as the proposals are approved.

Melinda

**Re: Sir Ludovic Kennedy; A United States Lecture Tour
Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 09:57:30
204.170.64.35 writes:**

Saw Ludovic Kennedy on PBS show about the sinking of the BISMARCK.

pbm

**The Giessler
Sunday, 28-Mar-1999 01:06:00**

**Message:
12.74.64.174 writes:**

**Apart from A. Scaduto's work, has anyone else ever come up with information regarding the possible involvement of the Geissler (sp?) family in the Crime?
John**

**Re: Sunday, 28-Mar-1999 12:42:20
204.170.64.30 writes:**

They owned a florist one source saays it was on Madison Avenue, though I do not know which one.

In records I have seen, they owners in a florist located in the lobby of the Savoy Plaza Hotel, which in 1932 was located on fifth avenue between 58 and 59 streets, directly across from the Plaza Hotel. Torn down many years ago, today the GM building is located there.

On this billboard I leared that Geissler had used the name of Condon's son in law attorney, Hacker though there was no clear connection.

**Do not get overly suspicious about mild coincidences in the Lindbergh case, if you do , you will get no sleep, because there are many, many of them.
where are you?**

Philip

**Re: Re: Saturday, 05-Jun-1999 15:36:32
207.41.174.82 writes:**

I think the best coincidence involving the Giessler was the one about Carl D. (the son) having lived at 3060 Decatur Avenue up till 1931? Remember that Cemetery John claimed to Condon that one of the gang "knows you very well".

It may interest you to know that Mrs. Hauptmann told me in 1993 that Sam Leibowitz wanted her husband to confess (among other things) the involvement of the Giessler and Ernest Brinkert in the crime. During the same interview Leibowitz made what Hauptmann construed to be threats of violence against Hauptmann's child.

I, for one, think that minor coicidences can be very revealing...

KT

Ransom Money
Monday, 29-Mar-1999 15:23:49

Message:
137.125.45.1 writes:

**Does anyone know how to obtain
the list of the serial numbers of the
ransom money?**

MArk

Re: Ransom Money
Monday, 29-Mar-1999 20:53:20
161.226.189.103 writes:

Could have Fisch had an agenda about Hauptmann before he died so this was all set up? If so, then what could have it been? Maybe Fisch already knew he had Tuberculosis and wanted final revenge. Did anyone ever think about that before they executed him so wrongly? Maybe Fisch had an accomplice because I believe he would have been too weak to do it alone. The baby's father could have also known that they had planned on kidnapping his son.

Connie Arana

Re: Re: Ransom Money

Monday, 29-Mar-1999 23:36:57
207.172.7.101 writes:

Anna Hauptmann talking with Anthony Scaduto:

"There were many things a little strange about Isador(Fisch). When he was going down to the boat, to go to Germany, Gerta (Henkel) and Erica (Henkel) decided they would go down and say goodbye, to surprise him. They went aboard and they saw Isador standing with four or five men. When Isador saw them he left his friends and came over to Gerta and said, 'What are you doing here?' He was angry. Gerta said, 'We wanted to surprise you, to say goodbye and make you surprised.' Isidor

from another and he even kept people in the same group away from other people in the group."

() are mine

If only we could learn the identity of those four or five men. Anna Hauptmann leaves us wondering, did some... or perhaps ALL of these guys know the truth about Isidor Fisch? Could they all have been involved in an extortion plot? Did they all travel back to Germany and conveniently "die" like Fisch, or did they all decide to take a little side trip to a Greek Island and live it up on ransom money?

(Not everyone died from Tuberculosis... if, in fact, that's really what was ailing Isidor Fisch. Is there any proof that he actually had TB????)

Melinda

Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 06:38:22
207.220.150.81 writes:

--- Is there any proof that he actually had TB????---

His doctor in New York diagnosed it. He said he first saw Fisch for the TB in 1931 and saw him last in November, 1933.

Also, Fisch's family was there when he started coughing up blood and was admitted to hospital in Leipzig. The letters between their German attorney and the New York attorney (all before Hauptmann's arrest) don't sound like they were part of any scheme to hide him.

If Fisch's plan was to go over to Germany and disappear, wouldn't he have taken his shoe box with him?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Tuesday, 30-Mar-1999 13:58:07
205.183.31.66 writes:

i wouldnt take scadutos book seriously. alot of assumptions that he made are completely false the jersey museum want open yet when he wrote his book. he was misled on things thats no fault of his. as afr as fisch goes, he died in poverty there was no ransom notes found in germany, in fact the jewish league in new york paid for his headstone. so i dont buy this stuff thier was a secret side to him. the shoebox story in that closet dosnt hold water just like the month he met hauptman was proven a lie

steve for melinda

Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 06:22:22
207.220.150.88 writes:

---i wouldnt take scadutos book seriously. alot of assumptions that he made are completely false---

Such as?

---the jersey museum want open yet when he wrote his book. he was misled on things thats no fault of his---

Of all the works published on this case, Scaduto's is the most accurate in everything I have been able to independently verify. There have been very few instances where the facts he stated are not accurate.

The fact that the museum in New Jersey was not yet open does not diminish the accuracy of the things he DID find, does it?

---as afr as fisch goes...i dont buy this stuff thier was a secret side to him.---

The evidence of Fischs "secret side" came from the police's own investigation of him. Surely you believe THEM?

---like the month he met hauptman was proven a lie---

You keep going back to this and I'm sorry but I fail to see why it is so significant.

The Henkels said they introduced Hauptmann and Fisch in July or August, 1932. Hauptmann agreed but said he already knew him and had met him in mid-March or April, 1932. Maybe Hauptmann was right. Maybe the Henkels were right. Maybe both were right(the Henkels thought so). What difference does it make?

BTW, since you believe the Henkels -- they also said Fisch told them he already knew Hauptmann when they introduced them. Do you believe that, too?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Wednesday, 31-Mar-1999 08:11:09
205.183.31.67 writes:

mjr, im going to have to look into that. but it has something to do in the circitlation of the ransom notes and when they were spent with when hauptman met fisch. as far as scaduto, i heard him in a debate with jim fisher in fact i have it on tape if you want a copy.i didnt like his repeated things about surpressed evidence.

STEVE FOR MJR

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Thursday, 01-Apr-1999 06:46:51
207.220.150.68 writes:

---i didnt like his repeated things about surpressed evidence.---

I don't like the idea much myself. The fact remains, however, that the State had evidence that destroyed the credibility of its own witnesses and evidence. It had evidence implicating people other than Hauptmann in the crime (like latent fingerprints on at least one of the notes) which would have destroyed its 'lone wolf' theory. It also had evidence that corroborated many, if not most, of Hauptmann's claims. It ignored the evidence, didn't disclose it and, in some cases, actively denied its existence.

Wilentz allowed witnesses to testify to things he knew, or should have known, were not true. He allowed witnesses to testify in ways so obscenely misleading that they

might as well have been committing perjury. He made no effort to advise anyone of the perjury or the misleading testimony.

Maybe the evidence wasn't 'suppressed' in the way we think of it today for the simple reason that the rules were different then and the State had no obligation under the law to divulge all this information. It was there, however. It is still there.

What do you call it when relevant evidence is intentionally kept from the court, the defense and the jury?

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Thursday, 01-Apr-1999 07:49:44
205.183.31.66 writes:

we can say all we want about wilentzes acts
but the fact remains the defense is responsible for picking that stuff up. there was nothing concrete for reilly, he cross examined witnesses and got nowhere, you cant blame the state for that. he brought in quacks that hurt him that had no credibility

steve for mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Friday, 02-Apr-1999 06:42:38
207.220.150.88 writes:

---we can say all we want about wilentzes acts
but the fact remains the defense is responsible for picking that stuff up.---

How is the defense supposed to "pick that stuff up" when the "stuff" is reports in the exclusive control of the State and other evidence that the State says doesn't exist?

I do note that you don't seem to deny that there was evidence withheld from the defense. All you do is make "excuses" for their action by saying that it is not their responsibility to give them to the defense.

As for "Wilentz's acts" there is no excuse for presenting or allowing perjured testimony.

--- there was nothing concrete for reilly, he
cross examined witnesses and got nowhere, you cant blame the state for that. ---

I don't have much use for Reilly in general, but he would have been able to cross-examine the witnesses far more effectively had he been allowed access to the evidence. Reilly and Co. had nothing to rely on other than rumor and newspapers BECAUSE the State didn't allow the defense to see the real stuff.

In any event, the fact that Reilly did a rotten job defending Hauptmann does NOT change the fact that the defense was not allowed access to the evidence. Nor does it change what the evidence DOES show.

Mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Friday, 02-Apr-1999 12:18:38
205.183.31.67 writes:

it isnt the states fault that hauptman made an ass out of himself. even you cant like the way he acted on the stand.i dont think reilly was as bad as hauptman supporters think. he grilled many witnesses on the stand ive read the transcripts many times. the police grilled many people in the morrow house lindberghs house ive read nonpopular documents in the jersey museum about what they did with the morrw house they monitered the mail coming in i have those documents. so i dont think the police were sitting on the job like some people claim.if rielly did a bad job, what about faucett? his first attorney? it was under him in the bronx when the grand jury decided to bring him to jersey for charges against him.ive beent studying that recently of what went on in the bronx. its interesting

steve for mjr

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Saturday, 03-Apr-1999 06:17:50
207.220.150.47 writes:

--- if rielly did a bad job, what about faucett? his first attorney? ---

Fawcett would have done a better job than Reilly if only because he believed in his client, which Reilly did not. He might have noticed things Reilly ignored and asked questions Reilly did not. No doubt he would NOT have asked some of the questions Reilly DID ask.

In the long run, however, Fawcett would have been hampered by the same thing - the inability to adequately cross-examine witnesses when you are not permitted to know what the evidence really says about them and their testimony.

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Thursday, 01-Apr-1999 12:55:13
205.188.195.48 writes:**

**;;;;;alot of assumptions that he made are completely false the ;;;;;
You keep repeating this claim Steve but you have never told us what false
assumptions Scaduto makes in his book that verify your claim that Hauptmann was
guilty.**

**;;;;;as for as fish goes, he died in poverty there was no ransom notes found in
germany, in fact the jewish league in new york paid for his headstone. ;;;;;;
A man who is in possession of alot of illegally - gotten money would be a complete
idiot to become rich suddenly in the depression without having a good explanation
for how he got the wealth. My own feeling however, is that the money might not
have really belonged to Fisch at all (he may have been laundering it for the thugs
who pulled off the scam). It is puzzling that he never took it with him and that makes
me wonder if it actually belonged to a more ominous group of dangerous mobsters.
But, you have to admit Steve that it is kind of fishy that the FBI has sealed his
files.**

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Friday, 02-Apr-1999 08:01:20
205.183.31.67 writes:**

**well scaduto didnt have the material we have or the current authors to verify his
claims. some of the stuff in his book, no fault of his, is inaccurate. i cant go into
detail i will have to read it again. i admit since my mother got sick the last three
years and passed away in sept, i havnt studied the case or looked into things the
way i use to. as far as fish goes, i dont believe that story hauptman gave about**

him.and the f.b.i. files, im going to ask jim fisher since hes a ex fbi agent and a fbi historian about them sealed files

steve for ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Friday, 02-Apr-1999 08:04:11
205.183.31.67 writes:

ronelle, i forgot to say to have a great easter this weekend. i really enjoy this website and hope to meet you all soon

steve for ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Saturday, 03-Apr-1999 09:03:01
205.188.198.32 writes:

Thanks for your wishes Steve but unfortunately it is difficult for me to enjoy Easter or Passover this year since it coincides with the anniversary of Hauptmann's murder.

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Ransom Money
Monday, 05-Apr-1999 08:00:14
205.183.31.67 writes:

ronelle do you take this case that close to the heart?i study this case as a hobby. i sleep very well on hauptmans death date. i dont feel sorry for a murderer.

steve for ronelle

SCROLL OF SHAME

Saturday, 03-Apr-1999 22:13:09

Message:

38.14.58.144 writes:

On this day, sixty four years ago, America allowed the state of New Jersey to send an innocent man to the electric chair. What better way to commemorate this horrible injustice than to start a SCROLL OF SHAME.

Of all the shameful documents I have come across, there's nothing quite as low-down and dispicable as the opening statement and summation delivered by prosecuting attorney, David Wilentz. Here are a few exerpts taken directly from the trial transcripts:

"This crime had been planned for some time. This defendant Hauptmann had conceived this plan and had undertaken it, had plotted it, prepared it, and we will show you that by the fact that he was in and about the vicinity of this Lindbergh home on many occasions before as well as at the time of the crime.

Melinda

Re: SCROLL OF SHAME

Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 12:44:02

205.183.31.66 writes:

hi melinda and happy easter. he wasnt a innocent man by no means. evidence did point to hauptman. it would have taken a tremendous plot to frame him and i dont think he did.

i think he was guilt as guilt can be. some of this stuff on this website does not compute with me. i believe that. my research only points to that. but that dont make me a bad person.ronelle wants me to read that book about lindbergh doing it. it wont change my feelings on the case. ive looked into all the mistakes to the case, i still walk towards hauptman

steve for melinda

**Re: Re: ronelle to steve
Friday, 09-Apr-1999 03:13:46
205.188.198.169 writes:**

;;;;;;;;;ronelle wants me to read that book about lindbergh doing it. it wont change my feelings on the case;;;;;;;;;

Do you mean to tell us that you have been on this message board for I-don't-know-how-many months-now, yelling at all of us about our "crazy" ideas that "make no sense," ranting and raving about Hauptmann's "lies" and Hauptmann's "guilt" and you have NEVER even seen Ahlgren and Monier's book? If you are so sure that reading their book won't change your feelings on the case then what exactly are you so frightened of? It's only a book about a theory - not religious belief. As long as you don't question any of Jim Fisher's "truths" I am sure he will still be your friend afterwards. Yes, Steve, there is hope - you probably CAN keep your faith (in Hauptmann's guilt) after reading A and M - Scott Berg was able to do it so why shouldn't you?

ronelle

**Re: Re: Re: ronelle to steve
Friday, 09-Apr-1999 08:06:32
205.183.31.66 writes:**

your right. i believe in jim fishers book just like you believe in that other book.i just have a problem with charles lindbergh killing his own son.nobody has given me any proof on this website, only that he was a practical joker. thats flimsy in my book.i hope i get to meet you at that get together in flemington next year. jim fisher was already contacted. i love them debates.

steve for ronelle

Re: SCROLL OF SHAME

Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 13:54:38

209.12.168.207 writes:

Let's see. If you had witnesses who described the man on the day of the kidnapping such that it matched BRH; BRH's handwriting matched the notes; BRH had actual ransom money from the payoff; BRH matched the descriptions of the man passing the ransom money; BRH lived in the middle of where many of the bills were passed; BRH spoke with the same speech devices as were manifested in the notes; many of the notes were postmarked in the vicinity of BRH's home; and there was more, perhaps, as a prosecutor, you would have a good faith basis for making such an opening statement. After all, opening statements are not evidence and jurors are instructed that what the lawyers say isn't evidence. Neither is a summation evidence. If you feel strongly about people making statements without sufficient facts to back them up, maybe you should take a closer look at this message board.

JM

Re: Re: SCROLL OF SHAME

Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 15:18:25

205.183.31.67 writes:

i couldnt agree with you more, people are off track here with this case. its starting to turn into the kennedy case with this branching out to a fog of what ifs and finger pointing

steve for jm

Re: Re: SCROLL OF SHAME

Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 07:58:37

207.220.150.82 writes:

---If you had witnesses who described the man on the day of the kidnapping such that it matched BRH;---

Witnesses? Actually when it comes to placing Hauptmann in NJ on March 1 the State had "witness" not "witnesses".

We have Ben Lupica, who saw someone who resembled Hauptmann but who Lupica could not identify and who was driving a car that was CERTAINLY not Hauptmann's car. He is the only one to come forward immediately after the crime itself and describe anyone who resembled Hauptmann.

The ONLY person who actually claimed he 'saw' HAUPTMANN in New Jersey on March 1 didn't come forward until 2 1/2 years after the crime - more than 3 months after Hauptmann's arrest. His statement doesn't describe the man he claimed he saw except that he wore "what looked like a yachting cap to me it had a shiny peak". He was "almost positive" Hauptmann was the same man, "but his face was a little more ruddy and might have been a little heavier".

Of course the witness also identified Hauptmann's blue Dodge as the green car he saw. He also told conflicting stories about what happened that day (the car went into the ditch, it went up to the ditch but didn't go in, etc.).

Most significantly, he admitted that he couldn't even see the men in the line-up where he viewed Hauptmann. He could only see 'figures'. (Not really surprising since he was partially blind with cataracts in both eyes - even in 1932.) If he couldn't see the men in the line-up how could he identify Hauptmann or anyone else?

Those are the only "witnesses".

Knowing all of that, would YOU be all that confident that you had placed Hauptmann in New Jersey on March 1?

Mjr

**Re: Re: Re: SCROLL OF SHAME
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 10:11:33
209.12.168.207 writes:**

Actually, were I the prosecutor, I would not have placed the "eye witnesses" on the stand at the trial. I don't think their absence from the stand weakens the case. The early descriptions fit BRH, the artist's drawing based on the descriptions certainly don't rule BRH out. The question was whether based on testimony and evidence available there was a "good faith" basis for making the statement cited in the earlier email.

JM

**Lindbergh's joke
Sunday, 04-Apr-1999 15:54:14**

**Message:
152.163.205.58 writes:**

I've heard from a few sources that Charles Lindbergh is actually responsible for his baby's death and that he accidentally killed the child during a practical joke gone wrong. Can someone please give me some details on this?

Kris

**Re: Lindbergh's joke
Monday, 05-Apr-1999 12:07:13
204.170.64.39 writes:**

**The joke if you truly do not know, is that Chucky Lindbergh loved to play practical jokes, one being to hide the bady and say it was missing. He is supposed to have done this a few weeks prior to the actual kidnapping.
Behrn Book**

Personally, I believe Kindy transported the child to be with his first wife, from whom he had not obtained, nor wanted a divorce.

In the summer of 1929, in a private ceremony performed in New York, Judge Crater married Charles Lindbergh, to none other than Amelia Earhardt.

P.B.M.

**Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Monday, 05-Apr-1999 14:09:59
205.183.31.66 writes:**

**the theory of charles lindbergh killing his own son to me is total hogwash. they have lindbergh a jerk and hauptman a great man. there running out of people to pin the murder on. i cant wait to see whos next
steve for kris**

Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Monday, 05-Apr-1999 14:31:45
24.4.252.64 writes:

You must be full of it. Where did you ever get info like that?

Todd

Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 10:15:01
209.12.168.207 writes:

The difficulty with this theory is that the Lindbergh family would have to voluntarily permit the child's body to remain face down in the ditch for months where the animals could (and did) eat on it when they could just as easily have fabricated an "accident" story and conducted a decent burial. Each of these "theories" should be carried out to its logical end before it is accepted so willingly.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 12:37:21
205.183.31.66 writes:

**jm, i have plenty of difficultys with this theory.
i cant believe these people think so low of the lindberghs, and make hauptman a prominent person, he was convicted felon a illegal alien, and a convicted murderer. theres no proof whatsoever that lindbergh planed this whole thing. he wouldnt have gotten away with it. it would have been a tremendous undertaking**

steve for jm

Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Friday, 09-Apr-1999 02:37:17
205.188.198.169 writes:

;;;;;;;;;The difficulty with this theory is that the Lindbergh family would have to voluntarily permit the child's body to remain face down in the ditch for months where the animals could (and did) eat on it ;;;;;;;;;;

I have no difficulty at all imagining Charles Lindbergh in a panic, attempting to hide his own negligent homicide of his firstborn child by hastily digging out a shallow gravesite with his large feet and covering the child with leaves. He was expected home at a certain time that evening and he was going to be very late, (an atypical predicament for the precision-obsessed pilot). There was no time to dig a proper grave. I do have difficulty with Anne Morrow and her mother allowing the child to be discarded the way he was and that is what I told Noel Behn 5 weeks before he died last July. His book "Lindbergh: The Crime" agrees, in part, with Ahlgren and Monier's theory that Lindbergh committed a kidnapping hoax to divert attention from himself. But Behn believed it was a family plot in which the grandma, mother and governess all knew the truth about sister Elizabeth throwing the child out of the window in a jealous rage. If there is one outrageous part of his theory it is the idea that all of those women would have allowed the child to be placed in a shallow grave to be eaten by forest animals. Behn's answer to me when I mentioned this flaw in his theory was - " They couldn't have stopped Lindbergh, he always did what he wanted.No one had any control over him when he wanted to do something. And, anyway, that wasn't the real Lindbergh child that was found in the woods." This answer is unacceptable to me because I do not believe all 3 of these women would have kept silent all of these years about such behavior. IMHO, Ahlgren and Monier's re-enactment makes the only sense. A "loner" does not look for accomplices and people to confide in after accidentally killing his son, especially not from his wife and powerful mother-in-law.

;;;;;;;;;when they could just as easily have fabricated an "accident" story and conducted a decent burial;;;;;;;;;;

They certainly could have fabricated any sort of a story they wished - their money was plentiful and any family doctor might have signed a death certificate asserting the child had fallen down a flight of stairs or whatever. The Morrow family, had it known the truth, could have covered it up if it wanted to - but the question is - would anyone have wanted to? Lindbergh was disliked by his in-laws and their friends. His kidnapping hoax would have to be good enough to fool the cops - (that would be the easy part) - as well as those closest to him - the mother and governess. As for leaving the child unburied, Lindbergh was commander in chief of the entire investigation for 3 months and everyone in the world was watching him - not much time to slip away and bury his child properly. Even a heartless, coldblooded murderer/kidnapper would have buried the child's body even if it was just to keep anyone from knowing he was dead. The illogic of the State of NJ 's

scenario is that the child, hastily discarded above ground, could have been discovered by anyone at anytime while the "killer" tried to collect \$50,000. in a Bronx cemetery! Does that make sense?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Friday, 09-Apr-1999 12:54:31
209.12.168.207 writes:

It is important to distinguish between fact and allegation, something the politicians have had real trouble with an respective hearings where no rules are enforced. That the child was found dead is a fact. That Lindbergh participated in the killing is an allegation without any other basis than conjected psychological profile and a prior "prank". That Condon's phone number was found in BRH's closet is a fact; that it was placed there by a news reporter is an allegation. It appears that much of the critique of the trial of BRH comes from those who claim that he was convicted on allegations rather than facts, but those same people use allegations as the basis for that critique. I would be interested to see the theories contra-BRH's culpability show the facts underlying the theories separated from the allegations. Since it appears that we are all searching for that illusive fugitive The Truth, we ought to see what facts we can agree on and where the theories diverge. You say it would easy for CAL to hastily dig a grave for the child. It would be just as easy for BRH to do the same--dump the body in case his car were stopped and searched on the way back to NY. It was a short trip, after all, CAL had just come from there earlier in the evening. CAL would have had to have acquired a burlap bag somewhere. Conjecture can carry one a great distance. It would be easy to suspect that BRH, as a carpenter (I see someone has promoted him to Master Carpenter along the way) may have had access to information about the new CAL home in Hopewell. There was a lot of publicity. Perhaps he saw floor plans or may have worked with some of the other workmen who worked on the house. It apparently was pretty common knowledge which room was CALjr's based on the news accounts and the pre-abduction publicity about the family. All of this, however, is mere speculation and should be roundly criticized as such because it strays from known facts.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Sunday, 11-Apr-1999 02:07:48
152.163.197.189 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;;;;". That Condon's phone number was found in BRH's closet is a fact; that it was placed there by a news reporter is an allegation. **;;;;;;;;;**
No it is not an allegation - the reporter admitted and even bragged to colleagues about having done so. And, does it really make any sense that Hauptmann would have written such a phone number inside of a dark closet when he NEVER owned a telephone?

ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Monday, 12-Apr-1999 12:19:30
209.12.168.207 writes:

Slow down; it is reported that the reporter admitted it; no reporter came forward under oath and made such a statement. It remains an allegation till it passes the test of fact. As to "Why would BRH write it down if he didn't have a phone" which is speculative thinking to which I could speculate that he wrote it down because he was the kidnapper and ransom receiver. It is still speculation. There were probably phones everywhere, if not in his apartment. That "why" questions are so speculative is the reason that prosecutors do not have to prove motive in criminal cases.

JM

Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Friday, 09-Apr-1999 13:19:56
205.183.31.67 writes:

sorry ronelle, it dont make any sense. your adding things and assuming. this would have been a tremendous task of covering up a murder like that. somebody would have talked i just cant see this theory from these authors. and noel behn, im sorry for his death i had dinner with him in flemington with jim fisher,i cant buy his theory either, i know me and you have differnt take on the case. id love to meet you and sit down and chat steve for ronelle

Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Saturday, 24-Apr-1999 12:52:18
204.60.25.91 writes:

If the body they found is The Eaglet's. I don't think it is, so this objection disappears.

David Sims

Second Baby
Sunday, 25-Apr-1999 21:26:27
12.70.16.173 writes:

You are free to believe that, but you might want to suggest an explanation for the baby found which seemed to have significant coincidental physical characteristics in common with "Eaglet" in addition to the coincidences of handmade underclothing, location and time of death/disappearance, and the ultimate problem of no other baby being reported missing.

Those persons surfing this board might be assisted in their selection of theories if we attempt to explain the basis for our own.

JM

Re: Second Baby
Monday, 26-Apr-1999 16:16:59
204.60.24.138 writes:

Babies usually don't grow an inch or two after they're dead.

I don't need to account for the baby being there, I don't need to prove the identity of the poor kid to feel reasonably certain that it wasn't the Eaglet. And from what I recall only Betty Gow said there was any of the handmade underclothing on the child -- the mother never viewed the corpse, the father merely said "I am satisfied this is my child" after a minute or two, and the family doctor had grave -- sorry -- doubts.

Yet I realize I'm on logically shaky ground here in asking for a proof of a negative, and concede the point.

David

Re: Lindbergh's joke
Monday, 05-Apr-1999 14:28:37
24.4.252.64 writes:

Kris,

Read Ahlgren & Monier's "Crime of the Century: The Lindbergh Kidnapping Hoax". These two, an attorney and a police officer, came to the conclusion that you heard about after researching the case. I actually just finished the book last night. Before I read it, I never thought that it was possible.

Lindbergh was known for playing practical jokes when he was younger on his army buddies, sometimes going a little too far. An interesting part of this "Lindbergh as the kidnapper" theory is that Lindbergh hid the same child in a closet a few weeks earlier as a practical joke. After his wife and the child's caretakers looked for and could not find the child, he let them in on the joke.

Many people believe, especially on this site, that the man found guilty of this crime, Bruno Richard Hauptmann, was framed and that a great deal of the evidence against him was fabricated.

The bottom line here is that almost all of the major players in this case are now dead and no one will ever know what really happened. That is what makes it so fascinating.

Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Tuesday, 06-Apr-1999 08:11:05
205.183.31.67 writes:

what does this practical joke stamp on lindbergh have anything to do with the murder?the evidence against hauptman was overwhelming.his flimsy alibis and lying and antics on the stand was a fact.those two guys in maine are dreaming

steve romeo

**Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Wednesday, 07-Apr-1999 07:55:29
209.48.174.34 writes:**

hey, i completely agree with you, sometime we should talk about what evidence we agree on; hauptman was beyond guilty, good call. let me know what evidence you find compelling against hauptman.

kelli

**Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Wednesday, 07-Apr-1999 11:16:23
205.183.31.67 writes:**

hi kelli,im glad your on the same page. i cant agree with this website theory that hauptman was innocent and lindbergh killed his own son. practical joker or not. thats serious stuff he wpouldnt pull a joke like that. they keep hopping on this. hauptman was a convicted felon in germany, he snuck over here illegaly the handwriting experts and many of them agree he wrote the notes. they found the same misspellings in his private writings. his alibis for having the money in his garage is flimsy. the fisch story is very fishy indeed. his alibis for his bank accounts are also flimsy. its easy in any case to start pointing fingers at other people and write books. i dont buy any of that. hauptman was a lousy lyer. he lied time and time again. but hes a great guy on this website they love him and hate lindbergh. you figure it out

steve for kelli

Re: Re: Re: Re: Re: Lindbergh's joke
Friday, 16-Apr-1999 13:07:04
204.60.24.11 writes:

Good to have a diversity of opinion here. I wonder, though, if Hauptmann were really guilty, why Wilentz, et al destroyed so much evidence and why the judge felt he had to run such a kangaroo court. I'd be interested to know what accounts of the legal proceedings you've seen; I'm certainly not setting myself up as any legal last word, but it seems even those who believe Hauptmann guilty admit that the trial was a farce. Besides, it just doesn't add up that Hauptmann could possibly pull the whole thing off himself. How did he even know they'd be there?

David

the pulitzer scroll of shame
Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 01:04:41

Message:
152.163.195.193 writes:

Melinda's Scroll of Shame , a little further down this message board, prompts me to offer another scroll suggestion - to the irresponsible Pulitzer guys who should have done their homework! Scott Berg deserves a Pulitzer like that woman who took the subway to the finish line of the Boston Marathon deserved a trophy. His book, all 650 pages of it, had already been written by so many researchers over the course of Lindbergh's life and death. Except for the new revelation that Anne Morrow wanted to divorce her husband and had engaged in a sexual affair with her doctor there is, as far as I could find, nothing new in the Lindbergh story that warranted a decade's worth of "research." Berg's idol-worshipping bio avoids any cogent justification for his claim that Hauptmann was definitely guilty. The book contains no sound argument for why he makes this claim nor does the author reveal anything new about Lindbergh that could not have been found in earlier books. So, what was Scott Berg doing for 10 years? Any of the well-informed people on this message board could have written his book. In a recent publication about Pulitzer Prize history a researcher (I have forgotten his name) revealed that the Pulitzer Board resisted awarding Lindbergh their award for "The Spirit of St. Louis" in the 1950s. (Was it because they suspected, as many still do, that Anne Morrow actually wrote the book for her husband or was Lindbergh's treasured Nazi medal a stumbling block for them? Whatever it was, Lindbergh received the award anyway.) I make a living by entertaining people with live "book reviews" and I am making this vow public here and now - NEVER will I ever recommend any book to any audience with the stamp of Pulitzer approval as a legitimate reason to read anything! Shame on them.

ronelle

Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame
Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 08:06:45
205.183.31.66 writes:

i wonder what you would have thought if berg thought hauptman was not guilty. you would have said it was a great book. i agree with you that there was nothing new in the book, but your going to have to deal with people like me that think he was guilty

steve for ronelle

Re: Re: the pulitzer scroll of shame

Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 13:10:41

205.183.31.66 writes:

and something else, how could you recommend that other book you worship that's in my mind fictional and discredit Berg's book? I don't understand that. On a theory no less.

STEVE FOR RONNELLE

The Steve-Ronnell Debates

Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 14:38:20

209.12.168.207 writes:

I find your two exchanges interesting. I find fault with books on both sides when the authors clearly cannot separate facts and allegations. Even on this board allegations and rampant hearsay are used to advance or confront "theories". It is amazing to watch allegations of Lindbergh's practical jokes advance to the point that he is characterized as a "cruel" hoaxer without so much as any facts beyond the allegations to prove that. Surely Ronnell in the "living reviews" is careful to separate allegation from fact or at least disclose the personal opinion agenda so that the audience can filter the "review" through that membrane. Steve should, of course, do that also, but his position is pretty clear.

JM

Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates

Tuesday, 13-Apr-1999 15:29:51

205.183.31.66 writes:

I like anybody who is interested in this case no matter what side they are on. Ronnelle and I get the best of each other, but it's all in a hobby of studying famous cases. I just can't buy that Lindbergh killed his own son. It's possible but unlikely. I don't agree that Mrs. Lindbergh's sister did it. Ronnelle has to make her mind up and other people here to. The cast of characters is running low. My friend thinks Red Johnson did it. It's comical when Hauptmann made sharp knife-type instruments with his spoon in his Bronx jail cell, his first lawyer really had to make some hard decisions. The insanity road was one of his options.

steve for jm

Re: Re: The Steve-Ronnell Debates
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 02:48:29
205.188.197.151 writes:

;;;;;;;;;;the cast of characters is running low. ;;;;;;;;;;
Exactly! There is such a small cast of possible characters in this crime that I am always amazed when people want to go traipsing around the world looking for possible suspects when it was obviously an inside job! How many people could be involved? A very small handful. Someone had to know the Lindberghs would be home on Tuesday night and that the shutters couldn't close, etc. And, the one person no one wants to consider is the baby's daddy! Just how many cases of parental child abuse do we have to expose in our country before people become willing to look at him as a serious suspect?

ronelle

"Someone had to know..."
Wednesday, 14-Apr-1999 13:40:27
209.12.168.207 writes:

You assume that the kidnapers knew these things--such as about the shutter. What if they were prepared to pry open the window, after all there was a chisel there. As to knowing about them being home, a little surveillance would have shown that. I assume you have been to the house and seen the wooded area out from this window, which was probably more so than judging from the pictures. I was rather impressed with all you could see from those woods when I visited the house a few years back. Many, many crimes are crimes of opportunity, especially in the case of serial rapists and murderers. They don't "know" some of the things about their crimes ahead of time.

JM

Re: "Someone had to know..."
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 06:54:58
207.220.150.82 writes:

---As to knowing about them being home, a little surveillance would have shown that. ---

Knowing which window was the nursery might have been from surveillance. Picking the window that couldn't be secured might have been luck. Getting in and out at a time Charlie was alone on the second floor might have been luck.

I suggest, however, that in regard to knowing the Lindberghs would be in Hopewell that night 'a little surveillance' probably wouldn't have shown them that. Indeed, if the kidnapers were operating on information from surveillance, they wouldn't even have gone to Hopewell that evening - they would have looked for the family in Englewood.

Mjr

Re: Re: "Someone had to know..."
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 09:52:45
209.12.168.207 writes:

But your response assumes so much. For example it assumes that they knew about the agenda of the Lindberghs. Car jackers don't know the agenda of their victims, yet they are wildly successful just on opportunity. What troubles me the most in these debates is the leap from assumption to allegation--and I criticize this on both sides of the debate. If we limit ourselves to the reasonable inferences from the known facts, much of this speculation should dissolve. Passion seems to drive much of this. Those who view CAL as a child abuser (certainly a tormentor) do not see our position as BRH being among the ultimate child abusers--those whose actions result in the death of children, whether he wrote the note, or whether he went in the window himself. Because I believe from the material I have read; the evidence I have seen; the results of the modern tests; that BRH wrote the first note, it doesn't bother me that he didn't go in the window himself. Certainly I don't think the kidnapers intended to kill the child and only did so through accident when the ladder collapsed or perhaps when the child began to cry out, neither of which legally excuses the criminal conduct. I think the only rational debate can ensue when the fairness of the trial by modern standards is separated from whether BRH was actively involved in the crime. We cannot undo the trial and post-Berger v. United States (1935) standards for judging prosecutors have evolved considerably since Berger was decided by the United States Supreme Court. As a matter of fact, the Berger decision is cited in the appellate opinion in the Hauptmann case and no fault was found in the trial or the sentence.

JM

**Re: Re: Re: "Someone had to know..."
Thursday, 15-Apr-1999 23:01:43
207.220.150.213 writes:**

---But your response assumes so much. For example it assumes that they knew about the agenda of the Lindberghs.---

Mmm. Aren't you the person who said "As to knowing about them being home, a little surveillance would have shown that."?

I merely pointed out that surveillance would not have shown that.

---Car jackers don't know the agenda of their victims, yet they are wildly successful just on opportunity.---

I don't think that is an appropriate analogy. Car jacking is a crime of opportunity, with the victim selected at random. Carjackers don't need to know their victim's agenda because they do not have a specific victim in mind.

I suggest that this crime was not a random act with a victim chosen merely because he was in the wrong place at the wrong time.

---If we limit ourselves to the reasonable inferences from the known facts, much of this speculation should dissolve.---

Good idea.

What the known facts about the day of the crime?

--Those who view CAL as a child abuser (certainly a tormentor) do not see our position as BRH being among the ultimate child abusers--those whose actions result in the death of children...---

I can't really speak for those who view Charles Lindbergh as abusive because I am not one of them.

As to the killer being the "ultimate child abuser", however, you'll get no argument from me there - and I doubt you'll get any from anyone else here. No one disagrees (I don't think) with the notion that the killer was a child abuser. We just disagree about who that killer was.

Mjr