

## Timings

Sir,—Bertrand Russell in his letter repeated Professor Trevor-Roper's innuendo about the Brennan evidence in the much more specific form that "Oswald's description was circulated in connection with Tippit's murder more than thirty minutes before Tippit was shot."

Brennan gave a generalised description of the man he saw, which was first broadcast at 12.45. At 1.15 Tippit was shot. At 1.22 and 1.29 descriptions of Tippit's murderer were broadcast, and all these descriptions are compared with each other and with Oswald himself on pages 133 and 134 of the Report.

Lord Russell may have concluded that, because the descriptions at 12.45 and 1.22 were similar, the reason for transmitting them was identical. If so, the idea is an elementary logical blunder. But it is false in any case that the broadcast of 12.45 was "in connection with Tippit's murder"; it concerned only the assassination.

The point is important, because it was not until roughly 1.15 that Captain Fritz first considered Oswald as an assassination suspect, and then only due to his absence from the Depository. (Brennan *never* claimed to identify Oswald conclusively.)

Serge Zvegintzov

London W6

## Inconsistency

Sir,—The Warden of All Souls has exploded Professor Trevor-Roper's thesis, but is it possible that in his eagerness to do so he himself has closed his eyes to an inconsistency in the Report? He points out that on page five the police message is clearly stated to have been "based primarily on Brennan's observations," as if this cancelled the statements on pages 144 and 649 respectively that "This [Brennan's] description most probably led to the radio alert sent to police cars" and "The information for the initial broadcast most probably came from Howard Brennan." The implication of these two statements is clearly that the Commission does not know what was the basis of the description, and we are surely justified in asking why it does not know. Also, why on page five in the introduction to the Report, which contains a summary of its conclusions, has the Commission altered "most probably" to "primarily."

P G McC Brown

Oxford

## Identifying Oswald

Sir,—The twenty-six volumes of verbatim interviewing show the Warren Report to be astonishingly inaccurate in some of its conclusions drawn from them, quite apart from the Commission's exclusion of the responsible witnesses who testified elsewhere that the shots came from in front of the President's vehicle. They are too numerous not to throw doubts on the Warren case, when supported by the original evidence of the Parkland Hospital doctors (given to interviewers at the time) and technical inefficiencies of the Italian gun alleged to have been used.

The Report states:

In evaluating Mrs Markham's identification of Oswald, the Commission considered certain allegations that Mrs Markham described the man who killed Patrolman Tippit as "short, a little on the heavy side," and having "somewhat bushy" hair. The Commission reviewed the transcript of a phone conversation in which Mrs. Markham is alleged to have provided such a description. A review of the complete transcript has satisfied the Commission that Mrs Markham strongly reaffirmed her positive identification of Oswald and denied having described the killer as short, stocky and having bushy hair.

The tape recording of this phone conversation was played in my hearing by Mr Mark Lane at a New York lecture on June 26, 1964, before he sent it to the Warren Commission. In this Mrs Markham definitely described the man as above, maintained she had given such a description to the authorities, and gave no indication whatsoever of thinking it was Oswald. Moreover, her interrogation as recorded in the twenty-six volumes gives no base for the Summary's account or "positive identification."

Audrey Williamson

London SW3

## Palm print

Sir,—Mr Kenneth Tynan's letter is typical of the current attempts to cast doubt on the findings of the Warren Report that Oswald, acting on his own, was the assassin.

Mr Tynan says that the Warren Report "fully confirms" that no finger prints of Oswald "were found on the rifle." In fact, the Report states that only one identifiable print was found on the rifle; this was identified by experts as the right palm print of Oswald.

Simply to say that the Report confirms that Oswald's *finger* prints were not found on the rifle is one of those half

truths which, if stated with full knowledge of the facts, is in some respects worse than a downright lie.

John Sparrow

Oxford

## Crackpots ?

Sir,—When President Kennedy went to Texas it was recognised that he took a calculated risk of assassination by Right-wing extremists. To our profound sorrow he was indeed assassinated—and the Dallas police arrested a Left-wing extremist who was himself murdered while in police custody before he could be brought to trial. Many of us at the time found this extremely odd—and if we still find it odd I do not think that this entitles us to be stigmatised as "credulous" and "crackpots."

Alfred W Mason

Newtown, Montgomeryshire

---

THE SUNDAY TIMES

---



---

JANUARY 3 1965

---