

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
justice and justice feed 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 looking
cash note becomes good kind of the paper
with official knowledge.

He would not allow me to type.
He slipped from one position of his
foot on my note another + without me
without visible concern or embarrassment.

Nothing, in fact, embarrassed him. He
was in a habit of that feeling.

He readily admitted that having told
most of things that he had had some from
behind him & 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 explained 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 assumptions. Again he asked
what difference it made if what he
had Winn said & would not have
said Winn is 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 Winn argument, during
which I worked out on him.

He is being but the generous,
kindly, non-selfish 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 way of the
same "If they get paid, they get paid;
if they quit, they can have."

He always, Billings, told me, was paid
that Life had paid him about \$50,000 a
year ago & denied hearing that long
period of his interview with anyone,
he might just have said that Person was,
that he had gotten \$40,000 by then. He
asked me to see Billings, who said
there was no deal with Life since
before when I challenged him to see
anyone at Life & all that had a
handout 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 tell the W.C. how
much he got. He insisted he gave
the money to the government, including

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 from, he says he
after showed police the original in
the office in Madison he then went.
If this is true - and who can tell
whether anything he says is - there
was then no real damage to
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 - "Le Monde"

No one else has any right, 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 held.

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
sentences of the original were missing
he at first denied ~~the~~ 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 unprovoked lies & the most
transparent, selfish deceptions
with out concern for how utterly
obvious they were could, 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
official when I asked him if he knew of
any other writers. He said he did. I
asked him about Zola, the writer who
had testified the official lies of
by the authorities. He was silent. I
asked what the Dreyfus case did to the
Jews of France & elsewhere. He was again
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 ^{steel} 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?
A leadership lacks of it.

I have never, ever, met anyone
as unconcerned about lies, false
swearing, misrepresentations, or
as thoroughly persuaded that
"let them do" 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.