

11/14/68 - a.m. - A court with candidate as  
an American prisoner is John Jay  
who understands why what he feels  
"authority", but is in control, and  
usually unresponsive and unresponsive.  
He has his own misrepresentations with  
certainty and justice. He is by his  
satisfactory method, then, when he  
makes a denial, is that a year  
ago he had gotten that \$500,000 from  
life is not possible to know  
what he got nothing at all  
but that ~~is~~ \$498,999.90, which  
is not \$500,000. He does acknowledge  
getting more than the \$25,000 he mentioned  
in his testimony, and he acknowl-  
edges he had before his death  
just in any. But he is satisfied  
that in saying what was why a  
payment he had said enough.  
He is very concerned about the details -  
etc. description involved and finally  
says it is nobody's business, that is.  
The "authorities" were satisfied, just being

the matter. As that any strong feeling or  
emotion becomes good kind of the proper  
with official knowledge.

He would not allow me to type.  
He slipped from one position of his  
posture into another & without any  
without visible concern or embarrassment.

Nothing, in fact, embarrassed him. He  
was in a state of great calm.

He readily admitted that having told  
most of things that he had heard from  
behind me & that later on the basis  
of what he had seen filed by others  
(presumably by friends) by some way  
that there was some on part of him to  
do his left. First he expressed this by  
saying "My own father says I do",  
then by saying "it made no  
difference because the President was  
dead any way".

He is the kind of man who would  
not out qualify say any thing added of  
him by any "authority" which he  
also was instead of "officer".

life of Winn & the Barrett report  
which he acknowledged having told the  
N.Y. Times had not happened, &  
called it "nonsense" but "rough news".  
But, like the Phillips & his parti-  
sanship, he is entirely unimpaired by  
misreading of what Winn said &  
false reasoning. Again he asked  
what difference it made if what he  
had just said & would not have  
said was in an official report attributed  
to him.

When I called him to see him he  
assured me & others of "muck wing"  
the assassination. That he got on  
morning same for his part was what  
I have been without in time to have gone  
into detail to do this work does not concern  
him. The money he got is not "stealing".  
The word he used several times in person  
at the time he got into each argument, during  
which I worked out on him.

He is anything but the generous,  
kindly, unselfish man he presents

man only as - not only in this money  
but. While I was with him - he got a  
case apparently with employer who  
nothing to do with to be paid. He told  
wherever was in the same kind of case  
"If they get paid, they get paid;  
if they quit, they can leave."

He always' Billings would have been paid  
that Life had paid him about \$50,000 a  
year ago & denied hearing but long  
period of his interview with lawyer,  
he might just have said that - then was,  
that he had gotten \$40,000 by then. He  
asked me to see Billings, Mrs. I still  
think was no help with Life's story  
upward when I challenged him to see  
lawyer at Life's & still more he had a  
best case with Life & it would show the  
basis of payment. He showed up produce  
it in some grade pay it. He went  
further & said his lawyer told him  
he did not have to see the W.C. how  
much he got. He insisted he "give"  
the plan to the government, particularly

he did not see it, to leave, in Madison, on  
the basis that he gave the name of  
not using SS offices before the  
original left town. He says he  
often showed police the original in  
the office in Madison he then knew.  
If this is true - and who can tell  
whether anything he says is - there  
was then no real damage done  
it by its being shown, the later official  
story. From his account, this was  
prejudicial to the point of the operation.

I read here his testimony, that  
he had sold the right not to use his  
film, although one usually gets paid for  
use, not reuse. He pretended not to  
know the meaning of his own words,  
"not use". I must not be too quick  
in saying it was not used, but he pretended  
not to understand. Then, apparently  
not realizing the subject, he insisted  
it was his desire that the film not  
be used.

not letting anyone see the film

is not suppression - as long as the govern-  
ment has seen it - "as a matter of fact"

No one else has any right to, nor has  
anyone else the right to comment on  
my private opinions.

The book said that as long as the  
false account of the President's murder  
is, spreading it is perfectly okay for it to be  
false. Nothing, spiritual can be false.

He says he has never read his father's  
memoir - only "part" of it (it is very  
short) and has no copy of it.

When I showed him the most important  
parts of the original were missing  
he at first denied ~~it~~ it, telling me  
a lie. Then again said it made  
no difference.

He even made no he didn't  
know Phil Willis! I that he  
knew nothing of Willis' presence.

The unproven lies & the most  
transparent, selfish deceptions  
with out concern for how utterly  
obvious they were and, leaving

uttered many words, seemingly promising  
himself that they 'were free', he seemed  
so credulous I would not blame him.  
There was nothing so impossible for him  
to utter, nothing so ridiculous  
for him to utter as his unquestioned  
belief.

In his long interview agreement,  
there was not a single comment I  
made to which, in answer, he did not  
manufacture such a response. He had  
been insisting that writers have no  
responsibilities or proper limits, that  
the only ones that had meaning were  
officials when I asked him if he knew of  
any ~~any~~ writers. He said he did. I  
asked him about Zola, the writer who  
had testified the official lies of the  
by the authorities. He was silent. I  
asked what the Dreyfus case did to the  
Jews of France & elsewhere. He remained  
silent. No other point was he. He  
would always mouth some kind of  
drivel. It finally got so bad I

old man straight & should be  
estranged of himself, a grown  
man speaking such nonsense,  
talking so irresponsibly.

He is almost entirely bald, with  
a thin fringe of graying hair around  
the back of his head. He is well  
dressed, yesterday afternoon he took  
me to play golf. He is about 55-60,  
perhaps 5-7-5-4, well built but not  
fat, perhaps 155-160 with a slight  
bent. He was not badic when he  
greeted me at the small (6x8) reception  
room into which the <sup>steel</sup> door of the  
large - paper elevator opens, ~~the~~ he  
had gone that way into his office  
before he said by surprise he should  
open me his study which he did  
without a scintilla. He just was not  
happy to be interviewed & he not help it.

He did not care that folks & mis-  
leadingly featuring had been  
shut out from him & did not  
deny that he had seen



The President must suffer from the  
Report says, because, to him, if it is  
official it is okay & he is not at  
fault. Can embassy morality?  
Or leadership lacks of it.

I have never, ever, met anyone  
as unconcerned about lies, false  
swearing, misrepresentations, or  
as thoroughly persuaded that  
"let's just do it" can do no wrong &  
that whatever they do is right only  
if because they do it.

Seven hours later if still seems  
unreal seems that they just could  
not be an American people.