JPARS, JWHR

CONFIDENTIAL. Note to GRS: example of some of my inability to communicate with personages, establishmentarians, etc.

11/10/71

Hon Charles McC Mathias Room 460 Sen<sub>C</sub>te Office Bldg., Washington, D.C.

Dear Mac.

If you feel called upon to respond, please do not feel you have to do it personally, either to dictate the letter or to read and mign it. I know how large the stack at the end of the day must be when I consider the size they used to be in the 30s and the proliferation of public responsibilities and public expressions. While we appreciate your taking the few moment, we also know you do not have them.

I do hope that you and Ann can sometimes soon find the time. I'll be away for about two weeks beginning the end of next week. I'd much prefer to show you rather than tell you, and showing is a matter of from 10 muntes up, depending on the time you have. Or interest. Hairy as is some of what you've seen, you've seen nothing like this. You would then better understand the feeling of futility I have when those whose names I'd like to help them save are either mute or non-responsive.

Thanks for speaking to Marshall. Sid told me. If you can ever get him to overcome his paramoid attitude to the subject and to me, you'll do him and the country a favor. He should know some of what I know, and all I want in return is that he keep his mouth shut. Unless he feels it necessary to do something. If it is with my work, I'd stipulate only my agreement, and that would depend on whatever the intended use might be. I want nothing from him. If and when you come, you'll understand.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, you might be interested in knowing my experiences in having what I want considered on Powell considered. I wrote and said I'd like a brief opportunity. After the lapse of some time I got what to me was an unclear letter and asked precisely what was wanted in advance and the deadline. I have just gotten by mell from Western Union in Baltimore a copy of the telegram it got from Holloman 12:20 a.m. Sunday. They read it to me later in the morning. That gave me until 5 p.m. the next day, "onday, to get it into the Committee's hands. In turn, that meant a trip to Washington for me. But if I lived farthur away, what it really meant is that I could file nothing. I delivered it about 3 p.m. Monday, dropped a copy off for Sid, and came home. Yesterday morning I got three calls from Western Union, no one in time to comply. The first, at 9:30 a.m., gave me until 10:30 to appear in the Committee's chambers if I wanted to be heard (and I had already left a letter saying either way, the Committee's wishes would satisfy me because I do not seek personal publicity). This, in any real terms, made it impossible. But even worse, there were twom others, one phoned to me at 10:30, the time I would have been due, the second just before 13:30, when it was already too late. I don't know the normal level on inefficiency in your Committee's staff work, but were the design to prevent the appearance of witnesses who might be anticipated to be adverse to the chairman's desires, it could not have been more neatly accomplished. In this case I do not care because I had no special desire to appear and testify. I would have been willing had the Committee desired

to question me. But How about a citizen in Los Angeles? Or Honolulu, or Anchorage, or even

Please don't feel you have to answer.

New York or Richmond?