

more documents and the known standards together with some early products of the Hiss machines and states that early developments of type peculiarities indicate that all three sets of documents were produced by the Hiss typewriter (Ex. II-F, p. 4).

16. In summary, it will be noted that the defense affidavits contain disputable findings, unfounded and false conclusions; and despite these claims and the various side issues raised, the defense has still not produced one person, expert or no, who challenges the principal contention of the government and will say that the Baltimore papers and the known standards were not typed on the same machine. Although the defense experts can detect forgeries, and although they theorize that the Baltimore documents might be forgeries, they do not conclude, and present no evidence, that they are forgeries.

554

AUTHORSHIP OF BALTIMORE PAPERS AND
CORRECTIONS THEREON.

17. The defense has also introduced a series of collateral suggestions and theories which will be considered here. In her affidavit attached to the Second Supplemental Affidavit of Chester T. Lane, Elizabeth McCarthy expresses the opinion that there were two typists who produced the Baltimore Papers and that neither was Priscilla Hiss. To begin with, this entire subject is totally irrelevant. The government's case in no way and to no degree hinges upon who the typist was. Chambers, when asked, specifically stated that he had no recollection of seeing Mrs. Hiss or anyone else type any of the Baltimore papers (R. 580). Hence, the [148] affidavit of McCarthy in this connection is without significance. In addition this conclusion is unworthy of belief for no expert has or can so identify a typist from typing which is merely mechanical copy-work,

555