

Election-cancellation rumor/ your 7/12. The Chron 6/15/70 piece from the Times/Post service JUL 18 1973  
is close to enough for my purposes. Thanks for it and the list. Of the items, if the Scanlon's  
facsimile looks good, maybe I'd like to set it, not the piece, which I wouldn't quote. There  
is a certain and a possible to be considered along with this. First is timing. It could not  
more precisely coincide with GL's domestic-intelligence scheme, approved shortly after this  
leaked and surely in the works prior to it. This also fits with the paranoid fear of demon-  
strators of any kind, by GL and his Hustons. What may fit is the change in heads at Rand. My  
file has a strange void. A local man, whose father and brother I know, was made head of  
Rand some time ago. I don't know when Rowen left or why. Maybe coincidence. But GL is a very  
vindictive man who surrounded himself with very vindictive men. He/they are the kind who would  
have offed Rowen for the leak, perhaps not the day after the story appeared. I do not recall  
any Post story on this. In fairness to GL, it is the kind of thing that can't be refuted. In  
fairness to everyone else, it is the kind of thing he'd have pondered and could pull. So, if we  
have no answer, the reason given exactly fits what didn't come out for three years and could  
not be more credible than it is in the Ervin hearings. This tends to make it credible. If you  
knew about such a thing, wouldn't you leak it?...Full files: dropped the story on the local man  
making good. In local paper 3/30/72. It also said Rowen was leaving after five years at Rand.  
GL's patience that long?...Odd thing that it took more than three months for the story to be  
denied. Perhaps less odd that Mitchell denied, although one assumes he let no Rand contracts.  
Would you not say that this also is consistent with GL's apparent unwillingness to believe  
that he had the election sewed, his super-concentration on it to the exclusion of Congressional  
seats, his needless dirty-works, his hiding even his name from his re-election committee, even  
his divorcement from the Rep. Nat Com.? HW 7/17/73



Your 7/10 and tapes: check. I know the problem. I'm not even taping the hearings any more. I JUL 18 1973  
might want to with Ulasewicz tomorrow. I have the Craig at the ready but watch on TV. If I feel I  
need to tape, I throw the switch. I've reused most of those I had used. The stuff on spooking is  
what I've saved. And the refs to Bailey by Kalm. today make Alch much more interesting. K knew B  
was the lawyer. Don't know what kind of lawyer K is to not know Bailey by name and rep. But he  
mentioned him as McCord's lawyer, not Alch. Much more interesting! Anyway, we haven't time with  
the heavy content of the hearings to listen to tapes! HW 7/17/73