

12/22/72

Dear Larry,

We are old-fashioned, pre-ecology-kick believers. Each year we get and later plant a living evergreen. Having been told it is on its way just as I got the mail, I'll at least begin comment on the very interesting Squires piece from the Tribune service, 12/16/72. If this is the Squires from Tennessee, he is a good reporter whose digging is better than his understanding. He had a contract on a Ray book for immediate publication, couldn't do it, and provided that part of Siegenthaler's disgusting bomb, where the lack of understanding was congenial.

What Squires does not say and may be the most significant part of the whole thing is that this proves the FBI was onto the real dirtworks of which the Watergate was but a minor part long before anyone knew of it or that development. He is right in picking the two Calif. lawyers as most likely to have placed the call to Hunt. Both connect firmly with this dirtier business in which Segretti figures. More, it shows closeness between them and Hunt, for they knew when he'd be where and when he hadn't been to Chicago for so long. So, as I believed from the first, Hunt was an intimate part of the Segretti part, and my belief is in a supervisory way.

The lead errs in saying after Hunt's involvement. For timing, I suggest it means after his involvement was reported. His involvement is from the first, which makes Carlstead's later quote, that August 1971 was before the WG mess, wrong. Hunt was then in it, I believe has now been established. He does place the date of FBI investigation of himself at late June. They may well have been looking into him before they spoke to him. Late June was almost right away.

Carlstead's denial is limited to the WG and he did know what surely did not come from hearing Hunt's end of the conversation that Hunt was talking a California lawyer.

I think the FBI's knowledge of who placed the call fingers Segretti. I doubt they'd have been onto Kaimbach, the President's personal lawyer, that closely. And if they knew from phone-company records instead of a tap, there also is no legal sanction for that.

The FBI's visiting a Calif. relative of Carlstead's indicates more than casual interest in him and a closer relationship suspected between him and Hunt than merely being a relative, <sup>by marriage</sup> his California relations are not in his readily-available records.

Carlstead's saying "they knew all about my telephone calls" is saying they knew about him, not Hunt, and not only this one call to Hunt. I'd guess this means they were working with phone-company help long before Segretti's bills were made up or were tapping his phone or both. If he made calls not from his own phone, they'd not get them from a tap. And he did get around.

It seems a bit odd that Carlstead knew had was in on a deal with Hunt but did not know when or that Hunt was anteing up, more so when he first broached his "plans for an 'investment opportunity' with the Hunts in August of 1971", more than a year earlier, although Mrs. Hunt's visit "had been planned for some time." Transacting this kind of open and above-board business with cash, and that cash in \$100 bills, to this accountant, is "not as unusual 'as some people think.'"

If that is not the reason IRS "is now considering placing a lien on the \$10,000", it hardly seems more likely this is "to prevent the money from being claimed" until the feds are sure "the claimant owes no federal taxes". This means until it is sure Hunt owes nothing. They know if he does or does not as soon as the computer is consulted. If this means has he paid taxes on the \$10,000, for a man of his age it is impossible for them to prove nothing about whether or not taxes were paid on it without going back more into his tax pass than the law allows. If then.

The more an effort is made to explain the less is explained and the more questions remain without answer.

If it was Hunt's money his wife was carrying and it was for a legitimate business deal, why should the money not go to Carlstead for that part of Hunt's obligation to it? Why should the crash influence a legitimate deal?

Maybe no claim has been made for the money? Until it has been made, there can be no claimant fro IRS to investigate. It should assume Hunt would be the claimant and should have known before 12/15 if it had a claim against him.

The Chicago IRS office may have something else in mind. Or the headquarters.

Thanks,