

Dear Dave,

4/4/00

With all that has taken my attention in recent days, particularly a new nephrologist and what he has in mind for me, peritoneal dialysis (which Hank Tranch suggested some time ago) and with my reading before I see him tomorrow what Gambro's suppliers provide on it, I am not as clear as I should be in making suggestions for what I think you should have at the beginning. Or what you might want of it. Or you think a publisher would not automatically reject now. But, in haste, here it is.

The peritoneal dialysis is done at home every 4 to 6 hours, and with the greatest of care being necessary to avoid infection. I've not even seen any pictures of it but a catheter is placed in the peritoneum and inserting what helps the peritoneum replace the kidneys is placed in and then, the beginning of the first cycle, is taken out or allowed to come out, at the end of that cycle, for 20 minutes.

It would mean that after the first couple of weeks I'd be at Gambro only once a month and that would be a blessing!

I hope I am a suitable candidate for that means of eliminating 18 or more hours of Gambro a week.

Please excuse the haste,

Harold

The assassination of President John F. Kennedy was ~~immediately~~ immediately called by the media "the crime of the century." It was at least that, although most readers would not easily perceive this in ~~most~~ most of the books written allegedly about it. ~~Allegedly~~ "Allegedly" because most of ~~those~~ those who posed as scholars, and were not, ~~and because~~ and because most of those ~~who~~ ^{those who} believed they were Sherlock Holmes returned, were not that ~~at all~~ either. And most of the books were written by those who did not demean themselves with the ~~spit~~ ^{soil} of the hard labor required to ~~master~~ ^{obtain and} master the actual official evidence produced by the inadequate official investigations. Those authors had more confidence in what they imagined about the crime ~~to~~ than in the established official evidence. With which most were ~~entirely~~ ^{largely} unfamiliar.

As we also see, it was an almost instant determination, on the highest official level, not to investigate the crime itself. Incredible as this may seem, it was sufficiently recorded in those days before the Congress enacted that most American of laws, the Freedom of Information Act. That Act states the the people have the right to know what their government does. While the government resisted compliance with that ~~an~~ Act, too often too successfully, because of ~~FOIA~~ ^{officially} FOIA much that ~~was~~ ^{officially} was not intended to see the light of day was, ~~if~~ ^{exposed to the} albeit in less degree than would be preferred, ~~did have the right~~ ^{did have the right} of disclosure ^{to} make it available ^{to} the people.

But most of those writing books supposedly on the assassination and supposedly on its investigation ^{2/} found that foreign to their concepts of the crime and of less significance than what they, in their ^{faith in what they} concepts of ^{made up} about the crime ~~and they wrote about~~ ^{it} writing centered ^{INC} on what they imagined.

The assassination of any ~~of~~ President is, whatever the intent of any ~~assassin~~ ^{it} assassin or assassins, a de facto coup d'etat. Under our ~~our~~ ^{it} system ~~to~~ inevitably has that effect and becomes an actual ^{it} coup d'etat. Not that any of those ~~claiming~~ ^{claiming} to be scholarly and experts told the people this or anything

like it in their book. Or made any effort to bring that kind of information to public attention. Or even used it when others did compel it to be made public under that law.

Because of the ~~uniqueness~~ ^{effect if not} uniqueness of an assassination and because of its inevitable consequences, understanding this effort to put together for the people what is known and can be included within the limitations of a single book, we begin by going back to the antecedents ~~of the assassination~~ and purposes of that ~~the~~ essentially political trip to Texas by means of which the President hoped to be able to ~~excite~~ interest the people in his changed policies and to

make his party a stonger party in the Congress and in the nation *in support of those*

changed policies
It is a little -recognized fact that there were two Kennedy presidencies, that John Kennedy was a different man, a different President and with different policies after *he* faced the unprecedented potential disaster of the 1962 Cuba *which could have unbalanced the world* missile crisis, the crisis from which both he and Soviet premier Nikita Khrushchev both emerged as different men and *d*ifferent leaders.

Perhaps the future will tell us more about that but contemporaneously and more recently scholars largely ~~ignored~~ what was apparent then and has become more apparent since then.

However, whether or not *this* changed Kennedy policy was a factor in the Kennedy assassination can be conjectured but there is no known proof that it was a factor or could have been. What is apparent, however, is that although those in political ~~life~~ knew very well that the ~~assassination~~ assassination was, de facto, a coup d'etat, they also saw to it *that* no official investigation was made in any effort to determine whether the assassination was, by intent, such a crime, a coup d'etat.

These considerations should be kept in mind as we relive some of those painful, *and beginning with* those tragic days, in this effort to report what can be reported of the ^{official} fact of the crime, going back to the first plans for that most tragic of presidential political trips in which he also ~~was~~ sought to inform the people more about his changed policies.