

# WARREN FINDINGS AGAIN QUESTIONED

But Trevor-Roper Concedes  
an Error on One Point

NYT-44/6

Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Jan. 3 — Hugh Trevor-Roper, the distinguished Oxford history professor who has criticized the Warren Commission's version of the assassination of President Kennedy, answered his own critics today.

In a 2,000-word article in The Sunday Times, he restated his original objections that the commission accepted with too little question material from prosecuting agencies and did not provide sufficiently for the cross-examination of witnesses.

He said he did not believe that a vast police conspiracy existed. Neither had he found any "positive evidence," however, that Lee Harvey Oswald, the assassin, had brought the murder weapon into the Texas School Book Depository or fired it.

In an earlier article in the same newspaper, the 50-year-old professor cited several "discrepancies" between the report and the evidence published with it, and suggested that the Warren Commission had put up a "smokescreen."

## 'Inaccuracies' Charged

He was severely taken to task by a number of critics in both the United States and Britain.

In an article published two weeks ago in The Sunday Times, John Sparrow, warden of All Souls College, said his fellow Oxonian's reasoning was "marred by bias and blotted with inaccuracies."

Mr. Sparrow, who was a

lawyer for 14 years, wrote that "nothing is easier to create than an atmosphere of suspicion, nothing—so long as the crackpots and the credulous abound—more difficult to dispel."

It was to this attack in particular that Professor Trevor-Roper replied. The Sunday Times, with a circulation of 1.3 million has no relationship with The Times of London.

For the most part he maintained his original criticism, restating "discrepancies," such as between original medical evidence and police theory, and examining the question of motive.

"Why should a Marxist, who expressed admiration for Kennedy, have laid so deep a plot to kill him?" he asked.

## One Point Retracted

On one point, though, the professor said he "must eat humble pie." This related to his suggestion that the police had destroyed the paper bag used, according to the commission, to cover the murder weapon when it was brought to the book depository in Dallas, where Oswald worked.

Mr. Sparrow pointed out that the police had not destroyed the bag, but had handed it in, with a replica, to the commission as an exhibit. A captioned photograph of the bag appears on page 132 of the report.

Professor Trevor-Roper, an authority on the 20th and 17th centuries, said he had "neglected the cardinal rule, 'Always check your references,' and must pay the price."

Although the professor wrote in today's article that there was no positive evidence that Oswald had fired the rifle, he said later in the article: "We do not know whether Oswald had accomplices."

Professor Trevor-Roper was a central figure in an academic dispute in 1961, when he tangled

with another Oxford historian, A. J. P. Taylor, over the role of Hitler in the origins of World War II.

## Article Is Disputed

J. Lee Rankin, who served as counsel for the Warren Commission, said yesterday that "there was no credible evidence" to support a theory that more than three shots had been fired during the assassination of President Kennedy.

Mr. Rankin rebutted the view put forward in a magazine article by Vincent J. Salandria, a Philadelphia lawyer, and consultant to the American Civil Liberties Union.

Mr. Salandria, writing in the January issue of Liberation, an antiwar monthly, disputed the idea that a single bullet had hit both President Kennedy and Governor John B. Connally J of Texas. To do this, he contended, the bullet would have had to change direction in mid-air.

"Once we conclude that a separate shot hit Governor Connally," Mr. Salandria wrote, "we are confronted with an extra bullet, which puts the commission theory of just three bullets from one gun into the limbo of historical myth."

Replying to a reporter's questions on Mr. Salandria's article, Mr. Rankin said "there was an alignment" between President Kennedy and Governor Connally, which made it possible for one bullet to hit both men.

The contention that the bullet would have had to change direction to hit both men was "not very reasonable" in light of the evidence presented by the commission, Mr. Rankin said.

Even if the same bullet had not hit both men, he added, the President could have been hit by two bullets and the Governor by one, without requiring the firing of more than three shots. E 110