norman report 5.22 (5 files)

norman report 5.22 (5 files)

which was designed for such measurements. I note that Feehan used nothing more esoteric in the measuring instrument line than a low-power binocular and a hand magnifier. I wonder how he determined the depth of a typewritten impression with such primitive equipment? We would certainly have used a very elaborate piece of optical micrometer equipment for such a purpose!

4. Solder on Keys

Youngberg, Aff. C, p. 1. Hokanson, Aff. D, p. 1, and Schmitt, Affidavit W, p. 1, all state explicitly that "the excess solder was ground and filed from the bars and type". I maintain, and the photographs back me up, that a substantial number of the soldered type on #99 show no evidence of ever having been ground or filed.

Although Youngberg and Hokanson examined my pictures of the type faces, they do not appear to have examined the pictures of the solder, or at least they do not mention them. Schmitt has looked at them and claims they were normal for Woodstocks "in 1929". None of the other Woodstocks we have examined show such "abnormal" soldering, but we must admit that (due to Woodstock's unbusinesslike methods) we cannot be sure that any of them represent the work produced in 1929.

The one thing Myles Lane says with which I can agree completely is at p. 25, third line from end--"We have no assurance that his standards are reliable". It does not appear to me from the record that any Woodstock we could lay hands on could be considered a reliable standard.

Mr. Schmitt's statement, however, appears to imply that such work was characteristic only of that year 1929.

The statements made about the nickel plating technique are very interesting. Certainly a rough solder joint, such as those in #99, are normally considered very poorly prepared for plating, and would not take nickel plate well. We can readily check on whether or not these solder joints were nickel plated and I will do so next Monday as soon as I can get #99 out of the vault. So far as I can tell from the photographs I have with me the solder does not present the appearance of having been plated.

5. Typeface Defects.

Mr. Hokanson, Exhibit D, p. 1, paragraph 4 "believes that the typefaces could reflect more abnormal use". What the devil is "more abnormal use"? Has Mr. Schmitt ever seen deliberately altered type? Mr. Youngberg, in Exhibit C, p. 1, paragraph 4, does not "recall any change in dies for the letter "t"". Has he any records? When and how often were dies changed? When, if ever, did they make a change in dies?

NEW ENGLAND SPECTROCHEMICAL LABORATORIES
Research in Physical Chemistry
COUNTY ROAD
IPSWICH, MASSACHUSETTS

April 26, 1952

Mr. Chester T. Lane
Beer, Richards, Lane & Haller
70 Pine Street
New York 5, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Lane:

In accordance with your request we are enclosing herewith a complete additional set of the photographs which accompanied our April affidavit plus six photographs of the envelope taken at the FBI laboratory in Boston (the negatives of which are in my possession) and an approximately life-size photograph of the interior of the envelope. This last photograph clearly shows the marks of three of the four microfilm containers and the location of the spots in the lower interior of the envelope.

When you have the printed affidavits ready we would appreciate receiving at least two sets because there are a rather large number of people hereabouts who would like to see them.

With best personal regards,

Very truly yours,

NEW ENGLAND SPECTROCHEMICAL LABORATORIES

Daniel Norman

Daniel Norman
Director of Chemical Research

DN:as

May 22, 1952

REPORT of Daniel P. Norman to Chester T. Lane

RE: Government's Answering Affidavits on Motion for New Trial in U. S. v. Hiss

(Dictated by Dr. Norman to Margaret L. Burton over telephone from Toronto, Canada, May 22, 1952)

1. Age of Paper

I agree that the degrees of bleaching, lignin content, iron content and the like (Myles Lane, p. 23, and Cadigan Affidavit B-1, pp. 5 and 6) are very important in determining the rate of yellowing and staining of paper. But these papers, as far as we have carried the analyses, are all very closely comparable in their rosin content, sizing and the like. Our argument is that papers which are as closely related as the Baltimore papers appear to be and which were confined as closely together as the Baltimore papers were alleged to be for much of their existence, would either (a) all show much the same markings (possibly varying uniformly and systematically in degrees as a function of their position in the envelope) or (b) would vary erratically, with adjacent sheets being alternately badly stained and not stained. We would not expect all the sheets of the Type A documents to behave one way and all the sheets of the Type B documents to behave in quite a different way, unless the two groups were not stored together. If it the Government's contention that all the documents of each type are of identical sizing, degree of bleaching, etc.? This is hardly a tenable conclusion in view of the fact that we have found more than one class of manifold paper in each group of documents. It would be interesting possibly, and we can check, all the sheets of Baltimore No. 8.

2. Folding of the Documents

We have always assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that the Baltimore Documents were all placed flat (opened out) in the envelope (if they were all in it). Cadigan Aff. B-1, p. 6, apparently believes that the documents were stored folded in the envelope. If you remember, the documents were a tight fit in the envelope, opened out, and I do not believe that they could have been jammed into the envelope along with the microfilms if they were folded. I agree with Cadigan's description of the stains and folds on Baltimore No. 8 and suggest the following possible explanation: This document was stored for some time in a folded condition in someone's pocket or some other container in which they were subject to heat, perspiration, fumes or the like, and were

either stained then, or the cellulose was degraded to a degree where it was later stained on normal storage.

I do not have with me the list Miss Burton made of the differing folds in the various documents, but I certainly remember that a very substantial number of the papers were folded in 6, 8 or 10 different places. If we follow Cadigan's logic, we would be justified in arguing that these documents must have been stored in the envelope in such a folded condition. It would be infernally difficult to stuff all those accordian pleated papers into a single envelope even without the microfilm containers, and the creases in the sheets would all have been pressed flat instead of only partially flat. You may remember that in a large number of cases we found that the fibers in the creases had not been broken.

3. Typewriter Ribbons

I feel that Cadigan's statement on page 8 of his affidavit is deliberately misleading. The latest Federal specification of which we have a record is DDD-R-311C (the January, 1952, index of Federal specifications does not list any later edition of this specification). The specification C and its prior specifications B and A, which were the governing ones in the 1935-38 period, read: "Section D-2, Thread Count: There shall be not less than 133 warp and 133 filling threads per inch; but the sum of the warp and filling threads shall be not less than 270." No other specification is given anywhere. I fail to see how this specification can be reinterpreted in the way that Cadigan does. Assuming for the moment that there is a brand new D specification which has not yet penetrated to the provinces (incidentally, we are still testing for the General Services Administration ribbons according to the C specification in accordance with the Boston G.S.A.'s Office rulings) and that Cadigan is quoted correctly (which I doubt), you will note that the specification which I quoted verbatim (and is a specification which was applicable from November 8, 1935 on) says "not less than" 133 threads in either direction, and that in at least one direction there must be more to assure a total greater than 270. Nothing in this specification can be construed to imply that the thread count of a single ribbon would vary over its length or width (except of course the small degree that variable machine tension produces). Normal textile operations do not yield fabrics of varying thread counts.

I do not know what equipment Myles Lane or his assistant expert used for thread counts. The textile industry's practice is to use a magnifying glass with a scale incorporated in its base, in contact with the sample to be measured. Because the documents were not always distinct, we improved the situation by taking high-contrast pictures at carefully controlled magnifications, and then measured the negative with a high-powered magnifier with built in scale,

When did they change from a stamped to a rolled type?

I have an old typewriter on which I have for many years been striking the heel of one type with the face of another. Many of these types show the kind of markings we find on #99.

I note that Hokanson, Affidavit D, paragraph 5, says that the type in stock varied from one month to a few days supply of "the more commonly used types". Surely, a factory making machines would use all type equally. If not, wouldn't the "t" and the "y" be among the commonly used types?

All Woodstock's business operations and records appear to have been so incredibly slack that I doubt that any credence can be put on any statement made by its managerial personnel. Can you locate in any way a Woodstock machine which can be proved unambiguously to have been manufactured, or at least purchased from the factory, specifically in 1929 or 1928 or 1930?

Youngberg's description, in Affidavit C, p. 3, is somewhat at variance with that of his two collaborators, of Tytell, and of Crucible Steel's ad. It is incredible to me that the typebars would be assembled in the segment, the type fitted and then the typebars would be removed, plated and replaced in the segment (they could not be plated in place on the segment as the type bars would be cemented in place. Crucible's ad states that the type is hardened, then plated, and then soldered.)

Did Woodstock harden its typefaces after it was soldered to the bar?