

---

 ANALYSES OF PAPER USED FOR BALTIMORE DOCUMENTS  
AND ENVELOPE WHICH HELD THEM.
 

---

8. The defendant submits two affidavits of Daniel P. Norman who is described by Chester Lane as, " \* \* \* an expert in physical and chemical analysis of paper, metals and other materials" (p. 11 of Second Supplemental Affidavit). Norman describes his qualifications in similar terms. Norman submits a series of conclusions which stem from chemical analyses, as well as some opinions in the field of typewriter construction and wear, in which subject he is not even alleged to be an expert. The former deal with a paper analysis of the Baltimore Documents and envelope which held them from 1938 to 1948. This line of opinion really goes to Chambers' testimony that the envelope held all the Baltimore Documents, and is distinct from any theory raised in the original motion papers. However, it is readily refutable and will be recited here for convenience. The sum total of these conclusions adds nothing to this issue, as will be demonstrated.

572

9. Norman cut a portion of paper from each of the Baltimore documents as well as from the envelope which contained those documents for ten years. This opportunity was given the defense at their request although they previously had had a paper analysis made during the second trial.

573

10. Norman notes that physically the Baltimore papers, with the exception of Nos. 9 and 10, fall into two groups. Group "A" sheets are 8½" by 11" and are more yellow [154] than Group "B" sheets which are 8" by 10½". Norman notes that sheets of both groups are of the same general class of paper. From these facts Norman concludes that both groups could not have been stored together for ten years. But Norman assumes that all the sheets

---

were of the same age in 1938 when typed, which premise is supported by no proof whatsoever. Further, the speed of yellowing depends upon the rosin, iron, lignin and bleaching in the sheets of each group. Thus, two different sheets of paper of the same general class under identical conditions will vary greatly as to the degree of yellowing where one is rosin-sized (Ex. B-1, p. 6). Hence the conclusion of Norman as to the impossibility of both groups of sheets being in the same envelope for ten years begins with an unsupported premise and proceeds upon an erroneous generality. The conclusion can therefore bear no weight. Moreover, Norman ignores persuasive inherent proof that the Baltimore Documents were folded into quarters while aging, as would be the case if they were in Chambers' envelope (Ex. B-1, p. 5).