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Preface

The preservation, replication, and indexing of over 3,000 verbatim trial transcripts from the criminal courts of New York County exemplifies the bounty that can flow from the cooperation and hard work of far-sighted public agencies, scholars, technicians, and all manner of support staff. The office of the County Clerk of New York County and the Library of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice worked together to design a project that would reintegrate previously dispersed court records while also assuring maximum access for social and historical research; the North East Document Conservation Center guided the filming process with care and skill; many members of the John Jay College faculty and staff participated in the arrangement and preparation of the collection and of the accompanying computer-generated microfiche index. We are, all of us, justly proud that the product of our efforts can now be shared with a wide community of students and scholars, initially through this printed introduction and its appended microfiche indices, and ultimately through Interlibrary Loan of microfilm reels from the John Jay College Library.

Special notes of appreciation are due Professor Dolores Grande of the John Jay College faculty whose commitment to and responsibility for the project began with the arrival of the transcripts at the college in 1972; to Edythe Lutker, a historian who donated many hours of enthusiastic assistance in the early days of the indexing project solely for the intellectual rewards of handling and perusing the materials; to Janice Quinter, the project archivist, for her unflagging attention to each and every fragile page and binding. Special thanks are also due Elysabeth Kleinhans, a comparative latecomer to the project, for her imaginative and successful pursuit of provenance mysteries that her colleagues had given up on.

And, of course, enduring appreciation and gratitude are due the National Endowment for the Humanities for the vision and fiscal support that made it possible to transform a hope into a reality.

Eileen Rowland
Chief Librarian
John Jay College of Criminal Justice/CUNY
Historical Introduction

The present collection of more than 3,000 transcripts of criminal trials conducted between 1883 and 1927 in New York County, primarily from the Court of General Sessions of the Peace, preserves in microfilm a priceless form of source material that is almost never retained for the later use of historians or scholars in other disciplines. Because of their unwieldy length, deterioration, bulkiness, and, to many, seemingly trivial value, the verbatim transcripts compiled by court stenographers during the course of trials are usually destroyed not long after a case’s final disposition. Storage space, always at a premium in courthouses and county archives, is often not available for the obscure burglary, arson, theft, prostitution, and murder trials of bygone decades and centuries. The researcher can often reconstruct the operations of the criminal justice process before and following trial, but documentation for what transpires in court is sorely lacking. Our knowledge of the behavior of judges on the bench, of the skills of attorneys, of the composition of juries, or of the rules of evidence in actual use may at best be described as sketchy. The unusually large collection of trial transcripts available here will therefore prove to be of incalculable value in addressing these and similar problems.

Aside from the workings of the criminal court and its personnel, much can be learned from these transcripts about the lives of the ordinary people who participated as witnesses and as defendants at trial. Court proceedings are a rich but untapped source for studying the inarticulate: the great majority who did not leave behind diaries or letters or newspaper interviews, but whose voices are here to be heard, giving evidence or under cross-examination. Thousands of such individuals are represented in the transcripts, from a moment in time when the nation’s largest metropolis underwent some of its most complex development. The closing years of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth witnessed the creation of the Greater City and the influx of millions of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. The impacts of galloping urbanization, industrialization, immigration, and increasing ethnic diversity, and the crimes and conflicts engendered by these profound social changes may be
measured in the testimony and statements offered in court by countless ordinary citizens. As for the testimony proffered during the last ten years represented in the collection, it too can shed substantial light upon ordinary lives in extraordinary years, for these were years of world war, of post-war economic dislocation, and of the advent of Prohibition.

Legal and social historians will thus find here abundant opportunities for fruitful research. So too will criminologists, sociologists, anthropologists, students of urban development, of public administration, of criminal justice, of social psychology, and those whose interest is speech and rhetoric. The Court of General Sessions of the Peace, the principal court represented in the collection, brought together the high and the low, the accuser and the accused, the normative and the deviant. Access to its trials, as they were conducted for a period of forty years, is now possible for scholars in a wide array of disciplines.

The Court of General Sessions of the Peace of New York County

New York County consists of Manhattan Island. The latter is the site of the original settlement of New Amsterdam in 1625, later renamed New York City when it was captured by the British in 1664. Originally a small town at the southern tip of Manhattan Island, New York City grew steadily northward during the next two centuries, until it encompassed the entire island. In 1898 the legislature of New York State created the Greater City, as it was then styled, consisting of New York County and the four neighboring counties of Kings, Queens, Bronx, and Richmond. The jurisdiction of New York County's General Sessions of the Peace thus extended to New York City before the amalgamation of 1898 and to that part of New York City situated upon Manhattan Island after that date.

The county Sessions of the Peace was an institution which seventeenth-century Englishmen knew well. It was composed of several of the county's justices of the peace, who sat together several times each year as a county court. They disposed of county business, tried more important offenses than those heard by the single justice who sat alone to dispose of minor business, and transferred capital offenses to a higher court. The Sessions of the Peace introduced by the British to the colony of New York
Nicky Arinstein, the defendant in Case 2082 A (June 1915), is pictured here with his wife, Fannie Arinstein, and their two children some time in the mid 1920’s. Arinstein’s extended career as a gambler, stock swindler and all-around flamboyant con man, earned him a fair amount of notoriety. His wife’s fame as a Ziegfeld Follies star so sweetened the mix for the press that The New York Times (March 25, 1920) complained in an editorial of “Too Much Nicky.”

New York County’s Court of General Sessions of the Peace is thus to be dated to 1683 and 1691, making the court at its demise in 1962 one of the oldest institutions in continuous existence in the United States. Records of its proceedings, in the form of volumes which list the cases tried before it, date from 1683 and are available for the duration of the colonial period. In criminal matters the Court of General Sessions of the Peace, like its counterparts in the colony’s other counties, continued to try issues which were non-capital. In one important respect, however, New York County’s General Sessions differed from those of the other counties. The Dongan Charter of 1686, which established New York City’s form of government and its rights as a
corporation, conferred the powers exercised by justices of the peace upon the city's mayor, aldermen, and recorder, the latter an English municipal official who specialized in advising the city corporation in matters of law. Under the Dongan Charter these officials could (and did) sit as judges in the County Sessions. The Montgomery Charter of 1730 confirmed this arrangement. Under it, the judges of the New York County General Sessions of the Peace were to be selected from the city's mayor, deputy mayor, aldermen, and recorder. Any four of these town fathers could sit as a court, provided that at least one member of the bench was the mayor, the deputy mayor, or the recorder.

The advent of the American Revolution, and with it New York State's first constitution in 1777, did nothing to disrupt these procedures for disposing of serious, but non-capital, crimes. The constitution adopted in 1777 did not alter the state's existing judicial institutions, and so New York County's Court of General Sessions of the Peace continued to function as before. To underscore the continuity of the colonial Court of General Sessions of the Peace, the state's legislature in 1787 enacted several laws. These confirmed the jurisdiction of the Court of General Sessions of the Peace in criminal cases and the composition of its bench among the mayor, the recorder, and the aldermen of New York City, with any three empowered to sit as a court, as long as one was either the mayor or the recorder. Occasional legislative acts during the early nineteenth century introduced minor changes. In 1800, for example, the court was ordered to sit six times each year. In 1813 the terms were doubled to twelve sessions a year. In its essentials, however, the court continued unchanged from the colonial era, with the exception of one feature. By 1821 the recorder, rather than the mayor, had emerged as the court's presiding officer.

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century the court apparently enjoyed a high degree of public confidence in the legal as well as the general community. Reports of its proceedings were published—an unusual distinction for what was not a high tribunal but a county court. In 1802 Reports, compiled by Edward Livingston, the future jurist and penologist, appeared. Between 1816 and 1822 six volumes of Reports were again published, but with the
passage of another generation, the court's reputation plummeted, along with the reputations of virtually every other court sitting in New York City.

By the middle of the nineteenth century the phenomenon of the urban political machine was already well developed in New York City. Capitalizing upon the loyalties of thousands of recent immigrants, Tammany Hall, the popular name for the Democratic party's organization in New York County, had embarked upon its career as both builder and plunderer of the city. By the 1850's it had become clear—at least to reformers in the city—that Tammany's corruption of the political process had grown to encompass the judiciary. Because the city's aldermen qualified in the first instance for their positions by participating in the web of bribery, kickbacks, and the subversion of elections which had become endemic in the city, it was as corrupt politicians that they sat as judges in the Court of General Sessions of the Peace. The court, argued Tammany's opponents, had become corrupt, partial to its friends and to immigrants, accessible to bribery, and manned by judges who were generally uneducated as well as untrained in the law. Reformers, who as often as not were themselves politicians, though of the opposition, therefore launched a campaign in 1853 to purge the court of its aldermen permanently. A rally of reformers, held on March 5, 1853, called for a reform of the city's charter which would specify that aldermen were to retain only their traditional powers to enact laws for the city, but forfeit their judicial ones. The next step, in April of 1853, was to approach the state's legislature, which obliged by passing an amendment to the New York City Charter, subject to the approval of the city's voters, which proclaimed that aldermen were no longer to sit on the Court of General Sessions of the Peace. The city's voters agreed in June of 1853, thus introducing the first fundamental alteration in the composition of the court since its inception in the late seventeenth century. But to the dismay of the reformers, the charter amendment of 1853 did not for long reduce the corruption and incompetence which they perceived on the bench. With the aldermen removed from the court, the legislature next had to prescribe who would serve as judges in General Sessions of the Peace. They did so in an act.
Her beauty was as vague and intangible as that of a lily, or any other frail or delicate thing. It lay over her face like a gossamer veil... and she haunted Harry Thaw even in his cell, according to a newspaper cartoonist on the New York "Evening Journal."

On June 26, 1906, socialite Harry Kendall Thaw, pictured above on the left, murdered the distinguished architect Stanford White, above right (Case 602 - October 1906). At the apex of the triangle was the then twenty-year-old Broadway performer, Evelyn Nesbit, who had been involved with White several years prior to her marriage to Thaw. The prominence and wealth of the central players in this case guaranteed an intensive and lurid trial by media. Thaw portraits ran the gamut from distraught husband to sadistic paranoiac; White’s from innocent victim to lecherous cad; Nesbit’s from naive waif to wily seducer.

Only Thaw’s first trial, which ended in a hung jury, is represented in this collection. A subsequent trial found him not guilty of murder. However, the whole affair was to have a far-reaching influence upon which he had

passed on June 14, 1853, directing that either the recorder or the city judge could hold the court. In practice, recorder and city judge thereafter alternated one with the other in holding sessions of the court. The recorder, of course, had originated during the colonial era. The post of city judge was a new one, created by the legislature in 1850. Its incumbent possessed the same powers as the recorder. What compromised the new arrangement in the thinking of reform elements was the fact that these were elective positions. New York State had shifted in 1846, in its third constitution, from an appointive to an elective judiciary. Recorders and city judges, therefore, were as apt to be creatures of the political machine as the aldermen had been.

The decade of the 1850’s witnessed yet another major change in the court’s contours. Perhaps of even greater significance in shaping its character than the elimination of the aldermen was the extension of its jurisdiction to encompass all crimes, including, for the first time, the most serious of them. By statutory fiat, the legislature in 1855 empowered General Sessions of the Peace to try crimes punishable with imprisonment for life in the state prison and crimes punishable with death. A stay of execution or a stay of commitment to life imprisonment were declared matters of right for individuals convicted by General Sessions of the Peace, until their cases could be reviewed by the state’s higher courts of appeal, but the greater jurisdiction thus bestowed upon General Sessions marked a decisive break from the limitations which dated to the late seventeenth century, and, before then, to the English County Court system. It is because of this expanded jurisdiction that the transcripts of trials conducted before General Sessions of the Peace between 1886 and 1927 are rich with trials of serious felonies and not just relatively minor crimes.

Thus altered in the middle decade of the nineteenth century, the newly reshaped bench of New York County’s General Sessions of the Peace had to process an increased load of cases because of its expanded range of jurisdiction. Clogged calendars became another criticism directed against the court. Indeed, to the familiar and recurrent allegations of corruption, critics by the end of the nineteenth century and in the first quarter of the twentieth
In 1897, the octogenarian Texas oil millionaire, William Marsh Rice, hired Charles F. Jones as a secretary-valet. Two years later Rice employed attorney Albert T. Patrick to contest the will of his ex-wife, which would have had the effect of diminishing a planned posthumous bequest for the establishment of an educational center in Houston called Rice Institute. Within a year of meeting one another, Jones and Patrick were arrested for forgery in connection with a check made out to Patrick and purportedly signed by Rice. In quick order, Jones turned state’s evidence and confessed not only to having participated in the forgery scam but also to having murdered Rice on Patrick’s instructions. Patrick was tried, convicted, and sentenced to death for first degree murder (Case 284 - January 1902); Jones was never brought to trial.

A steady stream of unsuccessful appeals (e.g., Case 588 - February 1906) and publicity led first to postponements of the death sentence and finally to its commutation to life imprisonment by Governor Higgins in December, 1906. Six years later another Governor, John A. Dix, granted Patrick a highly controversial unconditional pardon.

A portrait of William Marsh Rice, which currently hangs in the Rice Institute's administration building.

Charles F. Jones.

Albert T. Patrick, right, in custody.

added a new, broadly formulated charge: inefficiency. Reformers of the Progressive Era made efficiency in government one of their favorite causes, and it is hardly surprising that they were able to discover extensive inefficiency in the administration of New York State’s courts at all levels. New York County’s General Sessions could not escape this assessment, for in addition to crowded calendars, impediments to rational administration abounded.

For a start, judges within the court were free of any supervision whatsoever. Neither they as individuals nor the court as an entity was subject to any centralized direction or management. Consequently the district attorney, rather than an administrative judge within the court, created the court’s calendar and directed cases to one courtroom rather than the other. There was no coordination with the work of any other court nor with any other segment of the criminal justice apparatus. Perhaps most confusing of all, General Sessions’ jurisdiction, which since 1855 encompassed capital and life-imprisonment crimes, duplicated the jurisdiction of the state’s Supreme Court. Both courts—which were entirely separate institutions—enjoyed and exercised the right to sit in any and all criminal cases. Because of this overlapping jurisdiction and without prescriptions established by statute or by the state’s constitution, no one knew which court ought to try which case. In practice, as one commentator reported in 1938, most criminal cases in New York County were handled not by the Supreme Court but by the General Sessions of the Peace. Again, however, the district attorney could exercise unrestrained latitude in deciding where to present his cases.

To address these problems, notably the one of overburdened calendars, the state reorganized New York County’s General Sessions of the Peace in 1907. The legislature in that year abolished the positions of recorder and city judge and provided, instead, for the election of seven judges by the electorate of New York County. Thereafter further suggestions for reform surfaced between 1915 and 1923. One proposal would have consolidated General Sessions with the Supreme Court, eliminating the
problem of duplicative jurisdictions. Another plan posited the consolidation of New York County's General Sessions with all the county courts of the other four boroughs of the Greater City. This unified court would handle both civil and criminal cases as one great court for the entire city. A third concept called for the extension of the criminal jurisdiction exercised by New York County's General Sessions to the entire Greater City, a proposal defeated in the legislature in 1923. The opposition of the political leaders of the city's other four counties doomed this effort, for they feared that New York County's politicians would quickly establish dominance over court patronage in their respective domains. Nevertheless, reform, however modest, did come in 1925. In the election of that year the state's voters overwhelmingly approved extensive changes in the state constitution's judiciary article. Many tribunals were affected, including New York County's General Sessions of the Peace. The provision affecting it declared that the court was to continue with its existing jurisdiction, that its judges were to be elected by the voters of New York County, that they were to be chosen for terms of fourteen years, and that the state legislature at its discretion could expand the number of judges by authorizing the election of additional ones. The term of fourteen years, in contrast to the terms of six years enjoyed by county judges in other counties of the state, made for increased stability and continuity on the bench. Then, too, the authorization of additional judges could resolve the issue of overburdened, delayed calendars.

The constitutional amendment of 1925 did not, of course, address the issues of administrative centralization within the court, coordination with other segments of the criminal justice system, and the problem of confusing, overlapping jurisdiction with the state's Supreme Court. Accordingly, attempts at court reform revived in the middle of the 1950's. This time they were more successful. New York County's General Sessions of the Peace ceased to exist in 1962. It was absorbed by the State Supreme Court. It faded away quietly, with a small ceremony to mark its demise, after almost three centuries in which it had served symbolically as an institution linking the worlds of seventeenth-century England, colonial America, and the American Republic.
The 1912 trial and 1914 retrial of Lieutenant Charles Becker (Cases 3198 and 3232) were the sensations of the time. The issues that emerged encompassed virtually every major and minor public and private vice, and the key players included public officials, media stars, and Tenderloin district gamblers and gunmen with names like “Whitey,” “Lefty Louie,” and “Gyp the Blood.” The principal participants in this extended urban drama were Herman Rosenthal, a gambler turned newspaper informant, who was shot down by hired gunmen; Charles Becker, the New York City Police Department lieutenant whom Rosenthal accused of shaking him down and who died in Sing Sing’s electric chair; Herbert Bayard Swope, the young reporter for The World who used Rosenthal’s information for a blistering series of articles on police corruption; and Charles Whitman, the New York County District Attorney who won the Becker conviction and who was subsequently elected Governor of New York State.

Although the transcripts preserved here on microfilm are overwhelmingly of trials before the Court of General Sessions of the Peace of New York County, slightly more than 200 of them are transcripts of trials and proceedings before other tribunals. Because they were included among the General Sessions transcripts when they were delivered to its present repository and because of their intrinsic interest and value to researchers, the decision was made to file them as an appendix to the body of the collection. An assiduous researcher later discovered a handwritten index that explained the seemingly arbitrary inclusion of these unrelated transcripts with the General Sessions materials.

The assumption had been made that the overwhelming preponderance of General Sessions materials indicated that the collection took shape in that court. The reality was that the collection had been assembled at the appellate level rather than in the originating courts. These additional materials are distributed as follows:

1) Approximately 160 cases tried before the Supreme Court of New York State between 1896 and 1922. The state’s Supreme Court was created in 1691 by the same act which separated the County Sessions Court into the Court of Common Pleas and the Court of General Sessions of the Peace. During the colonial era New York’s Supreme Court tried the capital offenses which were excluded from the jurisdiction of the Court of General Sessions of the Peace. The various constitutions adopted by the state during the nineteenth century specified that the Supreme Court possessed original jurisdiction in all criminal matters. It is from the combination of these sources, coupled with the extension in 1855 of the jurisdiction of General Sessions of the Peace to include capital and life-imprisonment crimes, that the problem of overlapping jurisdiction described previously arose.

2) Approximately 30 cases of trials before the Court of Oyer and Terminer between 1886 and 1895 (sic). The Court of Oyer and Terminer was the criminal circuit of the Supreme Court. Criminal proceedings before the Supreme Court and before the Court of Oyer and Terminer were in fact proceedings before one and the same court. The Court of Oyer and Terminer was abolished by the state in 1894 (sic).
3) Approximately 10 cases tried before various District Police Courts and the City Magistrates’ Court. Most occurred between 1887 and 1899; one is dated 1926. The police justices, analogous to justices of the peace in their capacity to resolve minor issues, sat as a Court of Special Sessions and possessed jurisdiction primarily over misdemeanors. The police justices were abolished in 1895 and replaced by the city magistrates.

4) Approximately 10 transcripts of proceedings of Grand Juries between 1883 and 1920. Several are from the Grand Juries of General Sessions of the Peace of New York County; one is from the Supreme Court’s Grand Jury; and several others do not indicate from which court they emanated.

5) Transcripts of miscellaneous items from the Department of Public Works, the Sheriff’s office, and the Coroner’s office. These number fewer than ten.

Eli Faber
Department of History
John Jay College of Criminal Justice/CUNY

Guide to the Use of the Microfilm Collection of the Trial Transcripts of the County of New York (1883-1927)

Stenographers are traditionally present in a courtroom to prepare verbatim shorthand minutes of the proceedings. Not every set of such minutes, however, is transformed into a full transcript. While a judge may request a transcription at any time, unappealed cases are rarely represented by this level of documentation. Where full transcripts are part of the record in New York County courts and their libraries, access to the material is either through a “Stenographic Number” or indirectly through an index linking a defendant’s name to that number. In the case of the present microfilmed collection of transcripts, this customary legalistic arrangement and access method has been replaced by an approach that invites a broad range of social, historical and humanistic study. The microfiche index appended to this introduction provides name access to defendants, judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys, as well as subject access in the form of “Charges.”

Researchers have several options for consulting the 425 reels of microfilm represented by these indices (see Table I for contents of the microfilmed collection). An archival set of microfilm masters of the collection is on permanent deposit at the New York State Archives (The State Education Department, Cultural Education Center, Albany, New York 12230). Full sets of the film are available for on-site use at the New York Supreme Court Library (100 Centre Street, New York, NY 10003) and at the library of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice (445 West 59th Street, New York, NY 10019). Additional sets held by John Jay College are reserved for Interlibrary Loan.

With the exception of Reel #425, all the materials in the collection are original stenographic trial transcriptions, occasionally handwritten but most often a first carbon copy. Most of the transcripts are in good to excellent condition. For transcripts in poor condition the skills of the camera operator have in many instances overcome the ravages of time. Notations drawing attention to missing or mis-numbered pages have been inserted where appropriate.
While there is some variation, most transcripts are complete and include all examination, cross-examination and re-examination. The judge's instructions to the jury, the verdict, and the pronunciation of sentence are often present. A handful of cases include the examination of jurors and another small grouping consists solely of abstracts. Within each case, the filmed copy duplicates the original arrangement with but two exceptions: information from volume covers was transcribed to title pages but the covers themselves were discarded and where an index to testimony was present it was filmed at the beginning of a case. To facilitate use the assigned case number appears on each frame of the film.

Reel 425 reproduces a handwritten index from the files of the Appeals Bureau of the New York City Criminal Court. This volume, "Stenographers Minutes through 1929," is the authority for the "Old Number" in the microfiche index, a number that reflects the original order at the appellate level rather than in the originating court.

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reel Numbers</th>
<th>Court</th>
<th>Inclusive Years</th>
<th>Case Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-371</td>
<td>Court of General Sessions of the Peace</td>
<td>1886-1927</td>
<td>1-3106B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372-410</td>
<td>New York Supreme Court</td>
<td>1896-1922</td>
<td>3107-3267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411-414</td>
<td>Court of Oyer and Terminer</td>
<td>1886-1895</td>
<td>3268-3296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-418</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Tribunals: (Police Court; City Magistrates' Court; Sheriff's Office; Coroner's Office)</td>
<td>1883-1907,1926</td>
<td>3297-3309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419-421</td>
<td>Grand Jury</td>
<td>1883-1934</td>
<td>3100-3226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Unspecified Court</td>
<td>1895-1897</td>
<td>332-3425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Index of Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Unidentified pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Appeals Bureau of the New York City Criminal Court, &quot;Stenographers Minutes through 1929.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Index: Notes on Arrangement and Access Points

The main index to the collection is arranged chronologically within each originating court. A full entry consists of a number assigned by the archivist to reflect this chronology; an old number assigned by the Appellate Division; date; collation; the name of the defendant(s), judge(s), prosecuting and defense attorney(s); charge; and, where appropriate, a brief “Notes” section. Data elements on the title page and cover of the bound transcript volumes were accepted as authoritative for purposes of compiling the index; no attempt was made to verify what appeared to be misspellings or name variations such as those due to the absence or presence of initials. When title pages were missing, damaged, or incomplete, only a modest attempt was made to find internal evidence that justified the filling in of gaps. Information from the appellate court’s “Stenographers Minutes through 1929” (Reel 425), however, was accepted as fully valid and inserted.

Main Entry Data Elements

Case Numbers

The assigned case numbers in the collection form one continuous sequence from 1-3326. Interspersed in the sequence are occasional duplicate numbers with appended letters. This variation has no substantive significance. It was simply the device chosen to permit the insertion of initially misfiled volumes in their proper position.

Since assigned case numbers are in a single sequence, the chronology breaks as one moves from court to court. Users interested in gathering time-based information, therefore, should refer to Table I in this introduction to identify the case numbers associated with the shift from one court to another. A word of warning: the case table that appears at the start of each reel of microfilmed transcripts is not a replication of Table I but is, rather, an earlier unedited version.

The term “Old Number” that follows the assigned number described above refers to the “Stenographic Number” given to the case when it reached the appellate level. The appended index (Reel 425) links these numbers to defendant’s names. This linkage should prove useful for identification of trial fragments on Reels 423 and 424.

Names

Due to a programming idiosyncrasy the order of names in the entries differs from title page order. Where there is more than one entry for a particular category the program has produced an alphabetical sort. The major significance for researchers is that they must not rely on the index for citation verification but should take care to obtain the full information from the microfilm reel the first time around. Defendants, wherever possible, are identified by sex as well as by name.
The same programming glitch that produced the alphabetic sort for defendants' and attorneys' names also worked its magic for charge order. Intentional variations, however, also account for departure from strict title page transcription for this data element. An effort was made to use standard phrases derived from the penal law even though this meant violating the precise language of the title page. In only a very few instances did this approach prove problematic. Where a charge was noted as a violation of a particular part of the penal code, the information was converted wherever possible to the more explicit language used in the vast majority of the collection's cases. In addition, there is some inversion of natural language for purposes of convenience and indexing clarity, e.g., "Attempted Grand Larceny" is entered as "Grand Larceny, Attempted."

**Notes**

This data element has both specific and non-specific functions. It always includes aliases, the names of other persons involved with the charges, and variants from the general trial format (e.g., "Abstract"). In addition, wherever possible, data on related cases or notations concerning adjournments or recesses has been entered. For especially compelling or notorious cases, the "Notes" section sometimes includes brief descriptive information.

**Charges**

**Supplementary Indices**

There are separate alphabetical indices linking defendants, prosecuting attorneys, defense attorneys, judges, and charges to case numbers. It is in these indices that the vagaries of the source data are most apparent. For example, it is not possible to establish whether the variations in the spelling of "Giuseppi/Guisepi/Giuseppe" represent accurate presentations, careless transcriptions, or a particular stenographer's preconception as to what the correct spelling ought to be. The Defense Attorney R. F. Adams is in all probability the very same person as the Defense Attorney Richard F. Adams, but without external confirmation who's to really know; again, the numerous variations of the name of Judge Charles C. Nott, Jr., raises similar questions.

The "Charge" index seems entirely straightforward at first glance; it is a simple list that attaches a string of relevant case numbers to a particular offense. It is useful, however, to be aware that many serious offenses go through our judicial system as a group of charges. The charge of "Rape," for example, is very often accompanied by a charge for "Abduction"; "Larceny" charges tend to share the honors with "Receiving" and or "Robbery." Indeed, of all the major crimes represented by these trials, only "Murder" and "Manslaughter" seem to consistently shun such patterned attachment to other charges. Keeping such patterns in mind should eliminate duplicative work for researchers studying types of offenses such as crimes against property or crimes of violence.

Eileen Rowland  
Chief Librarian  
John Jay College of Criminal Justice/CUNY