



Министерство образования и науки Украины
Севастопольский национальный технический университет
Гуманитарный факультет

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT = ПРЕСТУПЛЕНИЕ И НАКАЗАНИЕ

Методические указания
к практическим занятиям по дисциплине
«Практический курс английского языка»
для студентов 4 курса
направления 6.020303 «Филология»
специальности 7.02030304 «Перевод»
дневной формы обучения

Севастополь
2014

2

УДК 800

Crime and Punishment = Преступление и наказание: методические указания к практическим занятиям по дисциплине «Практический курс английского языка» для студентов 4-го курса направления 6.020303 «Филология» специальности 7.02030304 «Перевод» дневной формы обучения/ Сост. Н.В.Чех, Т.Н.Черная. – Севастополь: Изд-во СевНТУ, 2009. – 24 с.

Цель: методические указания предназначены для углубленных практических занятий по теме «Crime and punishment» студентов 4 курса.

Методические указания рассмотрены и утверждены на заседании кафедры теории и практики перевода (протокол № 8 от 8.05.2009).

Допущено учебно-методическим центром СевНТУ в качестве методических указаний.

Рецензент: ст. преподаватель кафедры ТПП Палий Ю.В.

CONTENTS

The Typology of Crime	3
The Most Important Factors Affecting Crime in the 20th Century	7
The Purpose of 20th Century Punishments	9
To Tell the Truth on Crime, or to Win the Votes	11
The Crime of the Century	15
The Trial of the Century	19
Bibliography	23



THE TYPOLOGY OF CRIME

Pre-reading tasks:

1. What types of crime do you know?
2. Why do you think crime is more prevalent in some societies than in others?
3. Do you think your country is a safe place to live? Why or why not?
4. How can you avoid having things stolen from you?

Two significant trends in the typology of crime are the following: property crimes and crimes against persons, violent and otherwise, and the incidence of these crimes in rural, compared to urban, environments. Historians of crime influenced by Marxist economic theory have argued that these conjoined issues ride atop the deeper and more profound current then transforming Europe from the medieval to the modern: the development of industrial capitalism. Because the economy of medieval Europe did not produce a plenitude of goods available for theft, nor were the means of production in this agrarian society concentrated in the hands of a few capitalists (thus causing widespread poverty and the need to steal to survive), these historians argue, the majority of crimes were crimes of violence against persons. The onset of capitalist society reversed the situation in early modern Europe, multiplying many times the availability of goods and the extent of poverty, so that the broad typology of crime switched from crimes of violence to crimes against the property of the rich and well-to-do committed by the desperate poor. The agrarian society of the medieval period, with its population scattered across a pastoral landscape, concentrated its violence in its few crowded and noisome cities. Conclusions based on the research of historians of crime since the 1970s, however, disprove this thesis.

More recently, historians of crime have produced research supporting a new thesis that requires a new explanation. Crimes of violence seem to diminish dramatically in frequency in the seventeenth century, but the trend in crimes against property seems to remain stable. So, while Europe became a much less violent place, the rates of property crime remained level. What is surprising is the conclusion that cities were not the locations for the majority of violent crime; that honor goes to the countryside. To explain this conclusion, historians of crime have resurrected Norbert Elias's arguments in *The Civilizing Process* (1939),

which seem to better explain their results. Elias argued for the centrality of the royal courts in promoting the domestication of society from the sixteenth century on. The princes and their peers at court not only set the example for acceptable behavior, emphasizing self-restraint, but rulers also monopolized the means to commit violence within society. Consequently, increasingly complex European societies became peaceful on the domestic level, with low incidences of violent crime.

Feuds and family honor. Explanation of the types and incidence of violent crime entails explication of a number of important social, political, and economic factors. One reason behind the incidence of violent crime is that assaults and murder were usually the result of the social importance of honor, particularly in Mediterranean Europe. Family and clan were the foundation of European society well past the sixteenth century, but these organizations of people were held together by more than ties of mutual affection: often these groups adhered together to achieve economic and political goals that also tested their mutual loyalty. Fulfillment of basic male roles — son, father, husband, and loyal friend — was required: these men were aggressive, out in society, and politically engaged. Females submitted to the protection and direction of their male relatives. Women were assigned more passive roles as daughters, mothers, and wives, even though many worked in agriculture, business, and industry (cloth workers in Florence, for example). These roles were defined by tradition and by religion; there is nothing surprising here. The reason for going briefly over this familiar ground is that these roles and their constraints shaped the reasons for and the participants in violent crime. Incidences of assault, murder, and rape (another violent, not sexual, crime even then) were overwhelmingly the provenance of males. Violence was often required in the fulfillment of male roles in defense of the honor of women. Violence was necessary to achieve the political and economic goals of the family or clan, and this was true at every level of society excepting the most destitute in rural areas, whose poverty and lack of connections excluded them from the action.

In the Mediterranean region of Europe, family and clan competition, which extended across political borders as well as the physically defined lines between city and countryside, produced the endemic violence of the feud. In urban and in rural areas family- and clan-based feuding was both political and economic in nature. Political goals were often pursued through

violence, while economic relations were also protected with violent means, especially in border regions. The cataclysmic episodes of violence that shook many of Italy's major cities during the Renaissance are legendary.

Still less structured forms of violence, for example, commissioned assassinations, were carried out by men who may have been professional killers with more than one crime in their list but they could just as likely be well-known ruffians who killed when the right price was offered to them. Rape was mostly a group experience in the city, when it did not involve slave and servant women, but was committed by lone assailants in the countryside. In either case, the primary motive was the exercise of controlling power over vulnerable women, not lust. At times, a rape was another expression of low intensity feuding.

Banditry: theft and violence. The activities of robber bands, constituting a different type of gang violence, also occurred in rural areas far from the seat "of centralized power from the sixteenth century on into the nineteenth. In form, banditry had its medieval antecedents in the robberies and kidnappings of merchants as they passed on roads beneath some lord's castle, and in the freebooting mercenary armies of the fourteenth century. These men have been lauded as "primitive rebels," the precursors of modern political revolutionaries, who robbed the rich while protecting the poor, who sang their praises.

A neat distinction between violence and theft is not possible in every case, because theft is often accompanied by violence. In early modern Europe, violence usually accompanied theft in the countryside, where highwaymen employed at least the threat of violence by showing a weapon, along with actual violence. In cities, however, violence seldom accompanied thefts. The category of nonviolent crime consisted of a variety of offenses against various forms of property (everything from trade or farming implements, to money, merchandise, and land with and without buildings).

Common types of theft included pickpocketing, burglary of homes and businesses, and theft from markets. The first two were usually the work of professionals, who were constantly on the move between one location and another, although, on occasion, the records reveal the existence of a criminal gang led by a young rogue aristocrat.

Other, more sophisticated forms of theft occurred in the world of business. Usury, for example, was both a crime and a sin. Because profit

was the inevitable outcome of a good business transaction, merchants devised numerous clever schemes for hiding profits that rose above the levels deemed acceptable by medieval churchmen. Hoarding grain for sale at higher-than-allowed prices during famine or dearth was another form of usury. From the sixteenth century on, the focus on what constituted a criminal act turned to crimes committed by the poor.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents.

Crimes against persons; crime of violence; trend in; feud; commissioned assassinations; banditry; highwayman; burglary; usury; rogue.

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents.

Имущественное преступление; кража; честь семьи; убийство; нападение; изнасилование; нападающий; бандиты(головорезы); похищение человека; ограбление.

Exercise 3. Answer the questions.

1. What are the main trends in the typology of crime?
2. What caused widespread poverty in medieval Europe?
3. Describe the main male and female roles in Mediterranean Europe.
4. What were the main reasons for violent crime?
5. By whom the commissioned assassinations were carried out?
6. What did you learn about rapes from the text?
7. Who were the victims of robberies and kidnappings?
8. Was there a distinction between violence and theft in early modern Europe?
9. What are main types of theft?
10. Speak about the more sophisticated forms of theft.

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English.

1. В средневековой Европе из-за повсеместной бедности люди вынуждены были воровать, чтобы выжить.
2. Отчаявшиеся бедняки совершали насильственные преступления против богатых и состоятельных людей.
3. Ученые, занимающиеся изучением истории развития преступлений, разработали типологию преступлений.

4. Казалось, что количество преступлений против имущества оставалось неизменным.
5. Совершение насильственных преступлений обусловлено многими социальными, политическими и экономическими факторами.
6. Честь семьи была главной ценностью кланов, являющихся основой европейского общества 16 века.
7. Защищая честь семьи, вынуждены были совершать акты насилия.
8. Бандиты грабили и похищали торговцев в пригородах.
9. Разбойники с большой дороги совершали преступления с применением насилия.
10. Ростовщичество было одной из форм грабежа и считалось не только преступлением, но и грехом.

THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS AFFECTING CRIME IN THE 20TH CENTURY

Pre-reading tasks:

1. What the most important factors affecting crime in the 20th Century can you name?
2. Why do you think people steal things?
3. Have you ever been the victim of a crime?
4. Have you ever committed anything illegal? If so, what did you do?

The big question in this Strand is about how much crime has changed over the centuries. There are several factors which affect crime in any period.

The 20th century saw big changes in almost every one of them: The economy. By the early 20th century many of the old industries on which Britain's industrial supremacy had been based were in decline. In the 1930s depression they were hit hard: national unemployment in 1933 was 22%, but in parts of northern England, Scotland and Wales it was much higher. Some people did not have a job for twenty years. At the same time, new industries: electricity, radio, cars, household goods sprung up in new areas. There were thus huge contrasts of wealth and poverty between areas and between classes for much of the century. In the search for work, people increasingly moved around the country/ making communities less stable and people more unknown to each other.

Technology. Several new inventions had effects on crime, but the greatest of these by far was the motorcar. Aeroplanes made international transport and smuggling easier. The impact of new forms of entertainment, particularly the cinema and TV, worried many people. By the end of the century, the widespread use of computers created new kinds of crime. Government. In the twentieth, century governments took on new roles: the "Welfare State", begun by the Liberals, 1906 -14, and continued by the Labour governments of 1945 - 51, gave greater security to all citizens. For the first time in History, there was no danger of starving or death, or dying in total poverty. There was free medical care on the National Health Service and universal free education to 16. The government also created laws intended to change attitudes, such as outlawing sex and race discrimination.

War. The two World Wars, 1914-18 and 1939-45, brought all kinds of changes.

Apart from the destruction of homes and towns, family life was disrupted by conscription and evacuation. The government acquired all kinds of new powers to intervene in people's lives. Beliefs. At the same time, religious belief declined. Attitudes were shaped more by TV and newspapers than by the churches.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents.

Outlawing sex; smuggling; evacuation; to affect crime; starving or death; household goods; supremacy;

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents.

Расовая дискриминация; бесплатные медицинские услуги; религиозная вера; крайняя нищета, воинский призыв.

Exercise 3. Answer the questions.

1. Enumerate the most important factors affecting crime in the 20th Century?
2. Did crime change over the centuries?
3. In what way did the economy affect crime in the 20th century?
4. What contrasts were in that century?
5. What new roles did the government take in the 20th century?
6. What new inventions had effects on crime?

7. What kind of changes did the two wars bring?
8. Did belief change?

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English.

1. Из-за упадка в экономике Европы, многие люди стали безработными и вынуждены были пойти на преступление, чтобы прокормить свою семью.
2. Значительный контраст между бедными и богатыми стал причиной повышения уровня преступности.
3. Телевидение и широкое распространение компьютеров стали причиной возникновения новых видов преступлений.
4. Новые социальные программы обеспечили благополучие граждан.
5. Проблемы бедных людей частично были решены благодаря введению бесплатной медицины и всеобщим бесплатным обучением детей до 16 лет.
6. Были созданы новые законы, которые должны были изменить отношение к внебрачным отношениям и расовой дискриминации.
7. Люди стали прислушиваться к мнению телевидения и газет, а не церкви.

THE PURPOSE OF 20TH CENTURY PUNISHMENTS

Pre-reading tasks:

1. What do you think was the main purpose of 20th century punishments?
2. Does prison help rehabilitate criminals? (Should it?)
3. What makes some people become criminals? Is it poverty, upbringing, lack of education, unemployment or something else?
4. Is prison an effective punishment? (Why? or Why not?)

By 1900 the worries the Victorians had about the uneducated masses in the cities and about crime had dwindled. There was universal education, better housing, the police were an accepted part of British life and the crime rate was lower. The big question in this strand is about the purposes of punishments. British governments in the first two thirds of the 20th century felt able to embark on new penal policies which emphasized reform rather than punishment.

Young offenders were removed entirely from the adult justice system. Efforts were made to keep them out of custody, through probation, begun in 1907. Borstal schools were started in 1902, with the aim of turning young offenders into better citizens. The same aims were applied to adult prisons. Punitive rules were relaxed so that prisoners could lead more normal lives. In an attempt to deal with unemployment and family breakdown, which often led ex-prisoners back to crime, they were given meaningful work, with pay, and family visits were made easier. Even more controversially, capital punishment, the ultimate punishment throughout all history, was abolished in 1965.

However, times changed in the last decades of the century. Crime was increasing, young people were involved in violent crime, often associated with football hooliganism. There was less sympathy with trying to reform offenders, more sympathy for the victims of crime and more desire to punish. Borstals were closed and Detention Centres, giving a "short, sharp shock" were started. From 1972, offenders could be given Community Service

Orders. This meant doing many hours of socially worthwhile work to show that the offender was repaying a debt to society. In the 1990s tagging was introduced for offenders as a way of keeping them out of trouble. In some areas offenders have been brought face-to-face with their victims in an effort to help both get over the crime and move on.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents.

The uneducated masses; penal policies; custody; abolish; dwindle; punitive rules; Detention Centres; Community Service Orders; tagging.

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents.

Уровень преступности; начинать (что-либо); испытательный срок; хулиганство; отдавать долг обществу; преодолеть последствия преступления; система правосудия.

Exercise 3. Answer the questions.

1. Enumerate the main purposes of 20th century punishments?
2. What were the reasons of British governments' decision to embark on new penal policies?
3. What were the new ways of punishment for young offenders?

4. What happened to punitive rules?
5. What was meant by Community Service Orders?
6. What was introduced for offenders in the 1990s? (For what reasons?)
7. Do you think that punishment for violent crimes should be the same both for juveniles and adults?
8. Do you think that capital punishment is a good idea? Why or why not?

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English.

1. Викторианцы были обеспокоены большим количеством необразованных людей в городах и увеличением уровня преступности.
2. Для правительства очень важно определить цели наказаний.
3. Дела малолетних преступников рассматривались отдельно от совершеннолетних.
4. Самое суровое наказание, смертная казнь, было отменено.
5. Молодежь участвовала в хулиганствах и других более серьезных преступлениях.
6. Преступник отдавал долг обществу отработывая часы общественно полезного труда.
7. В некоторых случаях преступники должны были встретиться с жертвами преступления лицом к лицу.

TO TELL THE TRUTH ON CRIME, OR TO WIN THE VOTES

Pre-reading tasks:

1. Why do you think politicians use all possible means to win the votes?
2. Is child abuse a problem in your country?
3. What would you do if you heard a burglar in your house?
4. Have you ever been a witness of a crime?
5. Don't you think there will be more crimes in future?

As the mayoral races in both Minneapolis and St. Paul heat up, crime is becoming an increasingly hot topic. Candidates grow more strident every day in their attempts to label opponents as soft on crime. John Derus calls for more police. Sharon Sayles Belton calls for more police, more prison space, and more prosecutors. Derus is quoted as saying "all I care about is that if you break the law, you commit violence, you go to jail." Over in St. Paul, Andy Dawkins claims that Norm Coleman "is using

outright lies to label me as soft on crime." Both Dawkins and Coleman would like to be seen as tough on crime.

What the voters are being offered, for the most part, is more and surer punishment for violations of the law. This is certainly an accepted approach to dealing with criminal behavior but, if it were effective, the crime rate would have been going down, not up, since this is exactly the approach we have been using for generations. The U.S. now has a greater proportion of its population in prison than any other industrialized nation. Common sense would tell us that this should give us a very low crime rate.

To judge the effectiveness of an increased police presence, one need only look to New York City. Former Minneapolis Police Chief Tony Bouza compared the New York City police force to an army of occupation. In many parts of New York City it is not uncommon to see more police than civilians on the street. Needless to say, this level of police visibility has not made New York one of safer cities.

The fact is that any practical approach to crime prevention that is based on punishment will not be very successful. Researchers in the area of human and animal behavior have known since the nineteen-fifties that punishment, in order to be effective, must be immediate, consistent, and unpleasant. This tells us unequivocally that prison can never be effective in preventing crime. We can make it unpleasant, but no amount of police, prosecutors, or prison space will allow us to catch a criminal every time they commit a crime and deliver the punishment immediately. One of the many failures of educational system is that it has failed to rid people of the common sense notion that punishment, in the form of prison is, or can be, an effective deterrent to crime. Firm in their belief that punishment is the answer, Americans look at the ever-rising crime rate and assume that there must be something wrong with the way we are implementing this solution: the punishment is not severe enough, it doesn't last long enough, too many criminals avoid it, etc. So strong is the attachment to the idea that punishment is the answer that anyone suggesting alternative approaches (often ones that have been proven effective) is called soft on crime and laughed out of town (or out of office). When one politician says, "I'd like to spend your money on social programs that have been shown to reduce the crime rate" and another says "My opponent is soft on crime; I hate criminals and I'm going to use your

money to make sure that every criminal gets as much punishment as possible," you don't need to be a political insider to predict which one will be elected.

Sadly, most people are more than happy to have billions of their tax dollars spent on punishment but balk whenever someone suggests programs that have been shown to be effective in fighting crime and that are less expensive in the long run; counseling for families of juvenile offenders, child-abuse prevention, drug treatment, Head Start, Big Brother and Big Sister Programs, inner-city youth clubs, job-training, education, and many others. Curiously, anyone who proposes these as the primary means to fight criminal behavior is branded soft on crime, as though supporting methods that are inexpensive and effective is something only a bleeding-heart liberal would do.

A few years ago, the City of Duluth had a 23% drop in juvenile crime in one year after requiring mandatory family counseling for juvenile offenders. Was this an expensive program? Not compared to the cost of hiring enough extra police officers to achieve the same results; not compared to the cost of imprisonment; and certainly not compared to the astronomical cost of letting the offenders become hardened criminals. Certainly there are dangerous criminals that need to be locked up but let's not imagine that this practice will do much to lower the crime rate. Extra police on the street may deter crimes in their immediate vicinity and adding prison space and prosecutors will make punishment slightly surer and swifter but the punishment will never be consistent or immediate enough to be effective.

Most of us would be happy to have our tax money go to support programs that would result in a lower crime rate for us and for our children. Some of the mayoral candidates clearly know enough about criminology to understand what it actually takes to bring crime rates down. It's sad that almost any intelligent statement by a candidate about crime triggers a vicious attack from their opponent and results in a loss of votes. Crime Efforts Misdirected.

The state planning agency's recent poll indicates that over half of the people polled thought that crime would get worse in the future. They are probably right since much of the anti-crime effort is completely misdirected.

The facts are simple enough. If you spend the majority of your crime-prevention dollars on punishment by giving longer and surer sentences, (a very expensive proposition) the crime rate goes up. If, on the other hand, you spend the majority of the money on true crime prevention with programs that promote employment, tight homelessness, prevent child abuse, keep kids in school, counsel offenders and their families, and avoid sending juvenile offenders to prison whenever possible, the crime rate goes down.

Unfortunately, the press and most politicians are doing their best to convince the public that the opposite is true. Governor Carlson's staff actually bragged about the fact that the governor wouldn't have "experts" on crime at his recent crime conference, preferring victims and people who dealt directly with victims. This is like suggesting that cars be designed by people who have been in car accidents and by tow-truck drivers. Apparently, the governor feels that spreading the traditional misinformation about crime and its solutions will help his campaign more than actually fighting crime with programs that have been proven to work.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents.

Violations of the law; police force; crime prevention; prosecutors; deterrent to crime; Head Start Program; Big Brother and Big Sister Programs; homelessness; surer sentences; brag about.

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents.

Становиться более резким; снисходительно относиться к чему-либо; понизить уровень преступности; малолетние преступники; закоренелый преступник; криминология; опрос населения; удерживать (отпугивать); консультирование семей; избирательная компания.

Exercise 3. Answer the questions.

1. How do the politicians use crime in their election campaigns?
2. Is an increased police presence effective in big cities?
3. What is the right approach to crime prevention?
4. What are the failures of educational system?
5. How can the crime rate be reduced?
6. What are the ways to obtain the drop in juvenile crime?
7. How can the crime-prevention dollars be spent effectively?
8. How can "experts" on crime help in this problem?

9. Do the politicians always tell truth on crime?
10. What is the people's attitude towards the effective methods of crime prevention?

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English.

1. Политики часто упрекают своих соперников в снисходительном отношении к преступлениям.
2. Избиратели хотят, чтобы кандидат за которого они голосуют, относился жестко и беспощадно к любому нарушению закона.
3. Одной из задач полиции является предотвращение преступлений.
4. В Америке тысячи долларов налогоплательщиков тратятся на то, чтобы снизить уровень преступности.
5. Для того чтобы несовершеннолетние дети не становились преступниками были созданы специальные социальные программы, направленные на борьбу с распространением наркотиков, на уменьшение количества брошенных детей, были организованы специальные клубы для молодежи.
6. Существует опасность того, что малолетние преступники, которые отбыли свой срок в тюрьме, в будущем станут закоренелыми преступниками.
7. Вряд ли создание большего количества тюрем и увеличение штата надсмотрщиков улучшит криминогенную ситуацию в городе.
8. По результатам опросов населения было выяснено, что никакие суровые приговоры для преступников не помогут справиться с безработицей и необразованностью и ничем не помогут бездомным людям и брошенным детям.
9. К сожалению, политики и пресса используют проблему преступности в своих целях.
10. Необходимо, чтобы никакие социальные или экономические факторы не толкали людей на преступления.

THE CRIME OF THE CENTURY

Pre-reading activity:

1. What does the word "kidnapping" mean?
2. What cases of kidnapping do you know?

3. Do you remember what was the punishment for it?

The Crime of the Century In shock value, in terms of human interest, it was the Crime of the Century: Someone had dared to kidnap and kill the infant son of the man then regarded as the world's greatest hero. No mere football hero admired by sports fans, no astronaut propelled by the machinery of modern science, but Charles A. Lindbergh, the young man who had flown the first solo flight across the Atlantic Ocean in 1927. Nicknamed Lucky Lindy and the Lone Eagle, he had almost single-handedly launched the era of transoceanic flight.

In addition to his Atlantic crossing he and his bride, millionaire heiress Anne Morrow, went on to fly the Pacific North to the Orient, pioneering the flight paths followed by jet liners even today. Mobbed by admirers and pursued by the press both here and abroad, they built a \$50,000,20-room stone house at a secluded spot in the rocky, wooded Sourland mountains of central New Jersey. The Lindberghs had spotted the site from the air, and were impressed by its isolation and potential as an airfield. During the American Revolution, Declaration of Independence signer John Hart had used the same area to hide from the British.

The Lindberghs' son, Charles Jr., was then 20 months old, and they were expecting another child. On a chill, damp weekend in March, 1932, they planned to return Sunday to the home of Mrs. Lindbergh's parents, in the posh suburb of Englewood, NJ, 50 miles away. But young Charles had a cold and they decided to stay another night or two, accompanied by the child's nurse, Betty Gow, and a housekeeper couple. Except for them and the grandparents, it is presumed that no one else knew they were staying. Yet sometime between 8 and 10 PM on the night of Tuesday, March 1, the child was taken from his second-floor nursery by a kidnapper who left no fingerprints but did leave a note demanding \$50,000 in ransom - a fortune in those Depression times. Finding the baby was gone, Lindbergh searched the grounds, and called the State Police. The Township of East Amwell, where the Lindbergh house was located, had no local police then or now. Police and press descended on the scene, trampling what might have been left of a kidnapper's footprints in the mud and a light fall of snow. In addition to the ransom note, investigators found a discarded homemade ladder and a chisel near the house.

In the days and nights that followed, a desperate Lindbergh sought help from numerous negotiators who claimed to be go-betweens with the kidnapper. Thousands of letters poured into the estate, some expressing sympathy, some with ransom demands or death threats, and a host of psychic predictions.

The newspapers initially speculated that gangsters had taken the child. Who else would have the gall to snatch the son of the Lone Eagle? Al Capone, the most notorious of them all, was so appalled at the thought, that he offered a \$10,000 reward for information that would lead to the recovery of the child unharmed. Capone also said if he were released from his Chicago jail cell, he and his henchmen would find the perpetrator. A national debate ensued on whether or not to free Capone for the task. Speculation ended when the man who put Capone behind bars, IRS agent Elmer Irey, convinced Lindbergh that if released, Capone would immediately flee the country.

One of many would-be go-betweens was Dr. John (Jafsie) Condon, a retired teacher who claimed to be in contact with the kidnapper. One night at a cemetery in the Bronx, accompanied by Lindbergh, Jafsie paid the ransom in gold certificates whose numbers had been recorded. The kidnapper gave Condon a note saying the child was on a boat off the Massachusetts coast. Lindbergh spent days flying over the area to no avail. Unknown to all, the body of little Charles Jr., dead of a skull fracture, lay in the leaves off the Hopewell-Princeton road, a few miles from the Lindberghs' home.

On May 12, 1932, the tiny remains were discovered by a truck driver who entered the woods to relieve himself. It took more than two years of following the trail of passed ransom bills to track down the man accused of the murder, a German-born Bronx carpenter, Bruno Richard Hauptmann. When he was arrested, Hauptmann had over \$14,000 worth of the ransom cash hidden in his garage. It was later discovered that a board cut from his attic floor was used in the ladder. Dr. Condon eventually identified Hauptmann as the man to whom he paid the ransom. Within hours of his arrest, press and police were clamoring for the death penalty for Hauptmann.

From what they read in the papers and heard on the radio, few doubted his guilt: Hauptmann was an illegal German immigrant with a criminal record in his past. Had not Lindbergh that night in the cemetery heard a voice with a German accent? And who in America trusted Germans,

maligned as "Huns" and "Baby Killers" so recently in World War propaganda?

Who would believe Hauptmann? He insisted the money was left by one Isidor Fisch, a fur dealer he knew who had fled to Germany and died there ...a story beyond corroboration. Who would believe Hauptmann's wife, Anna, who protested that on the night of the kidnapping she had been home with Hauptmann in the Bronx? Hauptmann was extradited to New Jersey. On January 2nd, 1935, the spotlight fell on the century-old Hunterdon County courthouse in the little borough of Flemington for the Trial of the Century.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents.

Propelled by the machinery, millionaire heiress, secluded, henchman, perpetrator, no avail, malign, extradite, spotlight, to snatch

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents.

Самостоятельно, преследоваться, место, за решёткой, требовать наказание в виде смерти, дать кличку, выкуп, отпечатки похитителя, посредник, так называемый

Exercise 3. Answer the questions:

1. Who was Charles A. Lindbergh?
2. What is he famous for?
3. How old was his kidnapped son?
4. Was his son kidnapped on Monday?
5. How much did the kidnappers demand?
6. Who was Dr. John Condon?
7. Press and Police clamoured 10 years penalty, didn't they?
8. Would you believe Hauptmann?
9. When was the kid found?
10. When was the trial held?

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English:

1. Вместе с запиской о выкупе полиция нашла самодельную лестницу.
2. Сначала газеты предполагали, что ребенка похитили бандиты.
3. Он самостоятельно начал эру трансатлантических перелётов.

4. Ребёнка обнаружил водитель грузовика.
5. Многие сомневались в вине Хауптмана, ведь он был обычным немецким эмигрантом, хотя и с криминальным прошлым.

THE TRIAL OF THE CENTURY

Pre-reading activity:

1. What is a trial?
2. What are the participants of a trial?

Imagine modern-day celebrities such as Dan Rather, Tom Brokaw, Peter Jennings, Ted Koppel, Larry King, Barbara Walters, Oprah and Geraldo descending on one small town. Imagine a swarm of 700 news and camera men, covering the final chapter of the "Crime of the Century," improvising studios in hotel rooms, homes and storefronts, as utility workers festoon downtown poles with enough additional phone and electric wires to serve a small city.

This was Flemington, NJ in January 1935, when Bruno Richard Hauptmann went on trial for kidnapping and killing the 20-month-old first-born son of world idol Charles A. Lindbergh. It was an event that author H.L. Mencken called "The greatest story since the Resurrection." Walter Winchell, Damon Runyon, Boake Carter, Gabriel Heatter, Lowell Thomas, Dorothy Kilgallen, Edna Ferber and Adela Rogers St. John were among the print and radio celebrities joining the swarm of curiosity-seekers at the 1828 courthouse on Main Street. Police estimated 16,000 cars came to Flemington the first weekend of the trial. When Sheriff John Curtiss opened the courthouse to the public one Sunday, 5,000 people, twice the population of Flemington, elbowed their way in to view the building. Walter Winchell was the leader of the media pack that, well before the trial, had decided Hauptmann was guilty. Winchell had friends and tipsters in high places, among them J. Edgar Hoover. Hoover had done his best to convey the impression that the case had been broken by the FBI, working with local law enforcement agencies. In reality, New Jersey State Police, commanded by Col. Norman Schwarzkopf, spearheaded the investigation, aided by New York police. Kidnapping was not yet a federal crime, although it would become so by a Congressional act dubbed "the Lindbergh Law."

According to trial testimony (and pretrial publicity), Dr. John F. (Jafsie) Condon, an elderly Bronx educator, volunteered his help by putting a notice in the Bronx Home News seeking contact with the kidnapper. In reply he received notes demanding \$70,000 and claiming that the child was safe. The footed winter pajamas the toddler had been wearing the night of March 1 were delivered to Dr. Condon as proof. On April 2, at a rendezvous in a Bronx cemetery, accompanied by Lindbergh, Dr. Condon gave a box of marked bills, US gold certificates, to a shadowy figure with a reputedly German accent.

Two and a half years of frustrating investigations and rumors passed before the first real clues led to the arrest of Hauptmann, a Bronx carpenter who had no regular job but who appeared to be living better than most folks did in the depths of the Depression. In September 1934 some of the marked ransom bills began showing up. One had been used to buy gasoline at a service station whose owner, thinking it might be a counterfeit, wrote the car's license number on the bill. It was Hauptmann's. Police reported finding a stash of Lindbergh ransom money in Hauptmann's garage.

On the witness stand, Hauptmann denied any involvement in the kidnapping, insisted he made money by playing the stock market, and said a fur dealer, Isidor Fisch, had left the bills at his house. But in the 32 days of the trial in Flemington in January and February 1935, the jury found the Lindbergh money to be one of the most compelling pieces of evidence produced by prosecutor David Wilentz. They also believed seven handwriting experts who said the kidnap notes matched Hauptmann's handwriting.

Woodwork and forestry experts said North Carolina pine from a lumberyard near Hauptmann's home, and a board cut from his floor, were used in the crudely built kidnapping ladder. Hauptmann said no "real carpenter" could produce such rough work. Rounding out Wilentz's case were eyewitnesses who placed Hauptmann in the area of the Lindbergh estate on the day of the crime.

Defense counsel Edward Reilly was a flamboyant, hard-drinking attorney from Brooklyn. He was hired by the Hearst newspapers to add some color to the trial, which looked to be an open and shut case. Reilly scoffed at the circumstantial evidence against Bruno. "There is no such thing as a wood expert," he asserted. He suggested that the true culprits were the

Lindbergh's servants, or gangsters, or Hauptmann's friend Fisch, or Dr. Condon. He attacked the police as inept bunglers who had planted evidence and botched the investigation. In his prime, Reilly was known for his unflappable courtroom demeanor and ability to convince a jury to disregard the most damning of evidence. Unfortunately for Hauptmann, Reilly was on the downside of his career, suffering not only from alcoholism, but also syphilis. Post trial jury comments described Reilly as an arrogant dandy who did little to help Hauptmann's cause.

Prosecutor Wilentz in his five-hour summation urged the jurors not to bring a wishy-washy recommendation of mercy. Their choice, he said, was to acquit "his animal, this Public Enemy Number One of the World" or find him guilty of murder in the first degree.

Thomas Trenchard, the presiding justice, dismissed the jurors for the night. They passed down a line of police through the crowd outside the courthouse, and crossed Main Street to their rooms on the third floor of the Union Hotel. Hauptmann returned to his cell in the county jail, at the rear of the courthouse. His wife Anna, once more spent the night in the rooms she had rented for herself and their year-old son. Next morning, Feb. 13, 1935, Justice Trenchard reviewed the evidence and told the jurors' their duties. Some observers had speculated that the Lindbergh child died when accidentally dropped from the ladder. But the jury was told: Even an accidental death, during commission of a burglary, meant "felony murder" and the death penalty.

The jury of eight men and four women took 11 hours to reach a unanimous verdict: guilty. Despite appeals, despite stays of execution by a new governor, Harold Hoffman, Bruno Richard Hauptmann, refusing to confess, went to the electric chair at Trenton State Prison on April 2, 1936.

Exercise 1. Find Russian equivalents:

Storefront, enforcement agency, trial testimony, rendezvous, winter pajamas, counterfeit, fur dealer, lumberyard, an arrogant dandy, recommendation of mercy

Exercise 2. Find English equivalents:

Толпа, здание суда, проталкиваться, заострённый, совещание суда с адвокатами сторон, доброволец, идти крадучись, золотой сертификат, выкуп, непреодолимый

Exercise 3. Answer the questions:

1. What famous people were present at the trial?
2. For what did Hauptmann go on trial?
3. Who was Walter Winchell?
4. Did the kidnapper demand \$177000?
5. The investigations were frustrating, weren't they?
6. How did Hauptmann make money?
7. Defense counsel Edward Reilly was a flamboyant, hard-drinking attorney from Denver, wasn't he?
8. What was the other disease of Reilly?
9. How long did the summation last?
10. How many people were there to make the verdict?

Exercise 4. Translate from Russian into English:

1. Согласно показаниям Доктора Джона Кондона, он вызвался помочь и поместил объявление в газету.
2. Второго апреля на встрече на кладбище Бронкса Доктор Кондон отдал помеченные банкноты похитителю.
3. Человек в темноте говорил с отчётливым немецким акцентом.
4. В зале суда Хауптманн полностью отрицал свою причастность к этому делу о похищении.
5. В своей заключительной речи обвинитель просил присяжных не принимать поспешных решений.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Dworkin. Taking Rights Seriously/ Dworkin, Ronald. – Harvard University Press, 2005. – 136 p.
2. Garoupa, Nuno & Klerman, Daniel. (2002). "Optimal Law Enforcement with a Rent-Seeking Government". American Law and Economics Review Vol. 4, No. 1. pp. 116-140.
3. Virginia Evans. Enterprise Intermediate/ Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley. – Express Publishing, 1997. – 152 p.
4. Virginia Evans. Enterprise Mission 2/ Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley. – Express Publishing, 1996. – 125 p.
5. Virginia Evans. Upstream Intermediate/ Virginia Evans, Jenny Dooley. – Express Publishing, 2002. – 215 p.

Заказ № _____ от « _____ » _____ 200 _____. Тираж _____ экз.
 Изд-во СевНТУ

