

# Assassination Investigation to be continued for six months

The investigation into the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is set to continue for a period of six months, according to a report from the Justice Department. The report, which was released on Monday, states that the FBI is currently reviewing the evidence and the testimony of the individuals involved in the case. The investigation is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

The report also mentions that the FBI is currently reviewing the evidence and the testimony of the individuals involved in the case. The investigation is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

## Kennedy assassination study poses questions, few answers

WASHINGTON (AP) — The Senate intelligence committee voted Wednesday to make public a report that two senators said could "raise more questions than answers" about the assassination of President Kennedy.

Sen. Richard Schweiker, R-Pa., who headed the committee's investigation, said he expected the report would be made public in "a week or two" after the CIA and FBI have had a chance to review it for the possible disclosure of sensitive intelligence secrets.

Vice chairman John Tower, R-Tex., one of two senators who voted against release of the report, indicated that it would rekindle the controversy surrounding the assassination without any hope of settling it.

Schweiker said the 172-page report would "raise some very serious questions" about the relationships of the CIA and FBI to the Kennedy assassination. But he agreed with Tower that "we may raise more questions than answers."

A committee investigator stressed that Schweiker's remarks were not

meant to suggest there was any evidence that either agency had been involved in the assassination. The investigator, Paul Wallach, said the report would focus on the performance of the intelligence agencies before and after the assassination and would go into the question of Lee Harvey Oswald's motive.

Tower, who has been briefed on the report, said "I don't think the Warren Commission was wrong about who pulled the trigger."

The commission headed by the late Chief Justice Earl Warren concluded in 1964 that Oswald was the sole assassin and said it could find no evidence that he was part of a foreign conspiracy.

Tower and Sen. Barry Goldwater, R-Ariz., voted against releasing the report.

The committee could still decide not to release it if by Friday a majority of the 11 members raise objections to its release. But Tower, noting that eight members already have voted to make it public, said "I do not anticipate that will happen."

*file under Szulc*

Dear Jim,

5/30/76

Tad Szulc's New Republic piece headlined in the 5/28/76 Star "The FBI-CIA Cover-Up of JFK Slaying Data" is a clever bit of propaganda the purposes of which are carried forward by the unfactual lead. There is no "slaying data" in the story nor is there the allegation that any evidence of the slaying was withheld by anyone.

Only the possible explanation of motive was allegedly withheld. Szulc could infer this by assuming the correctness of the Commission's conclusions about the lone assassin. So he merely assumed them.

I've made a few notes on the story but I'm not going to take time for more.

It is an effort to stifle all Kennedy and LBJ politicians hidden as an exposure.

It is remarkable for its indefiniteness, as on almost all dates, and for its simple but important factual error, like there was no prior knowledge of the LHO note and it was to the Dallas police, not the Dallas FBI.

It is consistent with what has been the line of virtually all recent stories. They are all so consistent one wanders. They not only assume the lone assassin bit - they assume the anti-Castro angle (sometimes inferring maybe ~~perhaps~~ both sides could have been involved or the other one) which has JFK responsible for his own offing; and they assume the innocence of the Warren Commission. I can't think of a single story of this kind that did not assume the Commission's purity.

Szulc was fed this stuff. He lacks knowledge of basic fact. I'm inclined to think not from the Senate unless from Hart. What does this leave as his source of the quoted CIA documents?

The continuing question about Szulc is where does he come from. I don't mean Poland via Brazil.

If you see the full NR text it may be longer than this story.