

Dear Roger

11/27/83

Sylvia tells me you've been busy, as I supposed I should have assumed by your silence. I hope it is productive and that you are happy.

So, don't interrupt anything important to try to get the info about which I'm curious. But I'll explain.

It is atypical for publishers not to disclose info about authors, at least what is in Contemporary Authors. They have been refusing, not just failing, to say a word about Jean Davison, ~~XXXX~~ and her book makes this more provocative. It is deliberately dishonest, deliberately untruthful about Oswald and his security clearances.

She taught in Georgia, which is where Alexis Davison, of Oswald notebook/ Penkovsky case fame. However, her husband is John, a sociologist, now apparently teaching at Univ. Vt., Burlington, where the phone is in her name, not his. Alexis' father Hal had another son, Peter, but no indication of any John. However, Hal could have had a brother, etc. And there is no apparent explanation for not disclosing any biographical data about an author, especially one plugged by the combo of Norman Mailer, Dan Schorr and Tom Wicker.

Davison repeats that Oswald had only a low clearance. ^{He} in fact was crypto, which I am told requires also top secret, and on checking I find that all of his Marine assignments after Keasler were associated with the CIA. Those at bases with U-2s are obvious. But what his personnel records hide is the fact that in between he was part of two operations against Sukarno (Indonesia) and in between them spent six months at Cubi Point (not his one mention, Subic bay), which also was an important CIA base.

What is not less than astounding, given all he wrote and said and all the people quoted on what he said is that Oswald apparently never made any mention of any of this highly-classified work, always associated with the CIA. I recall no mention and only his squib about being at Subic bay as any mention at all. Incredible that the Oswald of the official portrait would be this tight on security, would have no mention in some political comment about the effort to overthrow Sukarno, or about the CIA and its operations, even U-2, at all. Makes no sense except in a very limited sense that is obvious.

In going back over Marine testimony, even the less sophisticated ones, it is apparent that the Oswaldovich, comrade stuff is limited and atypical. The reasonable descriptions, of quite a number, is of a serious man who did not bait officers, was quite responsible and trusted, especially during emergencies, was anti-Batista more than pro-Castro, did not take what the Russians said at face value, and really deal with what a 1966 anonymous source told me was "black box stuff." The actual descriptions of Marines with personal knowledge includes only highly-classified work and that includes early warning, which was then quite secret.

In brief, these are my interests, and I'm curious about the appearance of this book for the 20th anniversary, with indications that it was delayed and rushed, and with all this steam behind it, with the provocative sidelights partly indicated here.

Excuse the haste. I'm overdue on other things but wanted you to understand my interest but yet not to let anything important go to help.