

slow fire

Another incident: I dug out Frazier's statistics on the test firing he had done to determine the accuracy of the rifle and the scope. He simply did not tell the truth. The rifle itself was hardly more accurate than the scope. He got a dispersion pattern of 5 inches diameter at 100 yards. The National Rifle Association 100 yard target has a central circle for top score which is only 1.9 inches in diameter. A rifle which is both accurate and accurately aimed and furnished with accurate ammunition, will place all shots within that 1.9 inch circle. Mr. Frazier's circle allows for a 2 1/2 inch miss at 100 yards while the target only allows for a 0.95 inch miss. This is not exactly what a rifleman who knew what he was doing would call accurate.

The error of the scope is not "slight" but a maximum of 5 inches high and 5 inches to the right, more than 7 inches off the aiming point. Add this to the 2 1/2 inch error of the rifle and we have an inbuilt miss potential of the two of more than 9 1/2 inches which cannot be called accurate. And again Mr. Frazier is wrong when he says the shooter could compensate for the error by aiming low and to the left. That last could be true only if the errors happened to be consistent but they vary. Thus there is no way the shooter could select an aiming point that would put his shots on the target except by accident.

The scope has the same setting for 100 yards as for all lower ranges just as do fixed sights. There is a lot of talk about lead but Frazier finally admitted the obvious - no lead would be required at those short ranges... The final shot would require some lead to the right.

I'd like to find something of significance that is right in this mess of garbage but I can't. I wonder if the account of the trip from Ft. Worth to the Parkland Hospital is true?

CC Bar Naber