

Dear Larry,

12/30/72

If you put the clipping in The Plot to Kill the President as a marker, I'll not read those pages until I work my way to them. But the clipping addresses many of the question's I've raised.

You do not identify or date the paper. I'll assume accuracy.

"Police yesterday found a package containing \$10,000 in \$100 bills while sifting through the debris of Fraday's United Airlines crash."

Wrgo, Sunday paper, cash found Saturday, which is important to know. It also addresses and debunks ~~an~~ alibi I've noted from the NYTimes unsigned interview, that "ee" had immediately informed UAL "representatives", in the plural as I recall, if immaterial. What the hell else could he do with all that moola gone?

Bear in mind that I'm assuming accuracy, I'm aware of possible inaccuracy and I'm merely theorizing on the assumption of accurate facts.

Hunt rushes out, rushes back, no money, so he does the obviously necessary thing, says my wife was carrying all this money.

If it seems unlikely that the money didn't turn to ashes and was found in the ashes, that can be attributed to the writing.

Let us skip the "containing" instead of "of" for the moment and note merely that in this account the money was not in the purse but in a package. It is an interesting distinction, particularly if what follows is not wrong and may address some of my baser suspicions. However, unless she was carrying an evening purse or had it overloaded with

much other stuff, I don't see why tightist packages of a total of 100 bills would not have fit in her purse. It would have been less conspicuous and more secure there. And if it jammed, most women have large, over-the-shoulder jobs.

This is a short piece. If the use of "containing" is not sloppy writing, this says the package contained more than the bills. Why else not say "found a package of \$10,000 in \$1000 bills"?

Next, "The money belonged to Mrs. Dorothy Hunt of Washington, according to the police."

This, two days after Hunt was there, or a day in terms of police talking?

Didn't Hunt tell the police the money was his and his wife was carrying it for him, to bind of consummate this mysterious business deal that, if I forgot to note it in my comment on the Times piece, he described as "confidential"?

This does not say it was in her possession or that she was carrying it but that it "belonged" to her, a description supported by the police keeping it and not giving it back to him.

From the next graph, that wierd description of Hunt as "author and longtime American Diplomat", over which we both laughed, I take it this was Chicago Today. They don't believe in water or gates, huh? Hydrophobiacs?

This also says that Carlstead, unnamed, identified the body and, as with all but one story I can remember, removes that as a reason for Hunt's trip, the brevity of which, in my view, limits the other possible reasons.

But unless this is serious error, it concludes with still another version of what Carlstead said of the money, "he had no idea of why she was carrying so much cash".

I'd eliminate the possibility of Hunt's not having told Carlstead. Am I wrong in thinking that it was right after this that C changed his story and said that while he did not know she was carrying the money for that mysterious deal before she got there, he did know it and more or less gave the impression that it was at some point due him?

With this afback description of Hunt and no ref to that sensational case, I'd be unwilling to profess confidence in the reporting, but if any one of these things enumerated above is true, it gets more fascinating, I think.

"One of the stories accounting for the refusal to return the money to Hunt makes sense except this one, that there was some reason to believe the money was her property as distinguished from his or theirs. In Maryland, what they own jointly goes to the survivor. However, if it were clearly hers alone, then the children have legal rights to shares.

Add this to my list of odd-seeming things, like her long delay returning when he was in a jam, his strangely speedy trip to and fro, Carlstead's ever-changing quotes, all of it, and surely some requires further inquiry. If you can get the genius with the phone to use his horn. And all Hunt's inconsistencies when in a friendly interview (which I suggest also means he knew it would be). Hastily,

Dear Larry,

12/30/72

If you put the clipping in The Plot to Kill the President as a marker, I'll not read those pages until I work my way to them. But the clipping addresses many of the question's I've raised.

You do not identify or date the paper. I'll assume accuracy.

"Police yesterday found a package containing \$10,000 in \$100 bills while sifting through the debris of Praday's United Airlines crash."

Hrgo, Sunday paper, cash found Saturday, which is important to know. It also addresses and debunks alibi I've noted from the NYTimes unsigned interview, that "ee" had immediately informed UAL "representatives", in the plural as I recall, if immaterial. What the hell else could he do with all that moola gone?

Bear in mind that I'm assuming accuracy, I'm aware of possible inaccuracy and I'm merely theorizing on the assumption of accurate facts.

Hunt rushes out, rushes back, no money, so he does the obviously necessary thing, says my wife was carrying all this money.

If it seems unlikely that the money didn't turn to ashes and was found in the ashes, that can be attributed to the writing.

Let us skip the "containing" instead of "of" for the moment and note merely that in this account the money was not in the purse but in a package. It is an interesting distinction, particularly if what follows is not wrong and may address some of my baser suspicions. However, unless she was carrying an evening purse or had it overloaded with much other stuff, I don't see why tightist packages of a total of 100 bills would not have fit in her purse. It would have been less conspicuous and more secure there. And if it jammed, most women have large, over-the-shoulder jobs.

This is a short piece. If the use of "containing" is not sloppy writing, this says the package contained more than the bills. Why else not say "found a package of \$10,000 in \$1000 bills"?

Next, "The money belonged to Mrs. Dorothy Hunt of Washington, according to the police."

This, two days after Hunt was there, or a day in terms of police talking?

Didn't Hunt tell the police the money was his and his wife was carrying it for him, to bind or consummate this mysterious business deal that, if I forgot to note it in my comment on the Times piece, he described as "confidential"?

This does not say it was in her possession or that she was carrying it but that it "belonged" to her, a description supported by the police keeping it and not giving it back to him.

From the next graph, that wierd description of Hunt as "author and longtime American Diplomat", over which we both laughed, I take it this was Chicago Today. They don't believe in water or gates, huh? Hydrophobiacs?

This also says that Carlstead, unnamed, identified the body and, as with all but one story I can remember, removes that as a reason for Hunt's trip, the brevity of which, in my view, limits the other possible reasons.

But unless this is serious error, it concludes with still another version of what Carlstead said of the money, "he had no idea of why she was carrying so much cash".

I'd eliminate the possibility of Hunt's not having told Carlstead. Am I wrong in thinking that it was right after this that C changed his story and said that while he did not know she was carrying the money for that mysterious deal before she got there, he did know it and more or less gave the impression that it was at some point due him?

With this afback description of Hunt and no ref to that sensational case, I'd be unwilling to profess confidence in the reporting, but if any one of these things enumerated above is true, it gets more fascinating, I think.

"One of the stories accounting for the refusal to return the money to Hunt makes sense except this one, that there was some reason to believe the money was her property as distinguished from his or theirs. In Maryland, what they own jointly goes to the survivor. However, if it were clearly hers alone, then the children have legal rights to shares.

Add this to my list of odd-seeming things, like her long delay returning when he was in a jam, his strangely speedy trip to and fro, Carlstead's ever-changing quotes, all of it, and surely some requires further inquiry. If you can get the genius with the phone to use his horn. And all Hunt's inconsistencies when in a friendly interview (which I suggest also means he knew it would be). Hastily,