

This document is made available through the declassification efforts  
and research of John Greenewald, Jr., creator of:

# The Black Vault



The Black Vault is the largest online Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) document clearinghouse in the world. The research efforts here are responsible for the declassification of hundreds of thousands of pages released by the U.S. Government & Military.

**Discover the Truth** at: <http://www.theblackvault.com>

**CONFIDENTIAL**

INSPECTOR GENERAL

77-1184

31 May 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Security

FROM : John H. Waller  
Inspector General

SUBJECT : [REDACTED]<sup>03</sup>

REFERENCE : Your 29 March 1977 memorandum; Subject: Allegations Regarding Lee Harvey Oswald File

RETURN TO CIA  
Background Use Only  
Do Not Reproduce

1. Pursuant to reference, representatives of this office interviewed Mr. [REDACTED] extensively on 30 and 31 March regarding what he thought happened vis-a-vis the Oswald file. When the incident happened in approximately May 1975 Mr. [REDACTED] was a GS-4 file clerk, brand-new to the Agency and working in the Security Records Division of OS. Further, during the time in question Mr. [REDACTED] was reading a popular book entitled "They Have Killed the President" by Robert Sam Anson.

2. Mr. [REDACTED] convinced us that he was confused and there is no reason to believe that a name was erased from SANCA or that a file was destroyed. It is quite possible that he became confused over the reference to one L. Oswald in a covert file on Raymond E. Wright. Mr. Wright was investigated by the Agency in 1955 and contained in that file, as a part of a San Francisco Field Office investigation, was a police report listing 66 persons who on January 6, 1941 signed a petition in Los Angeles protesting the prosecution of a left wing labor leader. All 66 names, including L. Oswald were indexed. Since Lee Harvey Oswald was 2 years old in 1941 they were obviously not one and the same. However this may not have been apparent to a brand-new GS-4 clerk. Attached hereto are copies of 3 separate statements prepared by Mr. [REDACTED] which further explain how his confusion may have been caused. <sup>03</sup>

3. Representatives of this office have spoken to all participants in the 22 March farewell dinner in which Mr. [REDACTED] made the statements about the Oswald file. Finally, Mr. [REDACTED] was convinced of the need in the future to report such concerns officially rather than at a social gathering. The purpose of this memorandum is to enable you to close your records on the matter and to advise that no further action will be taken. <sup>03</sup>



John H. Waller

Attachments:  
a/s

E2 IMPDET  
CL BY: 055636

0571526 1A

**CONFIDENTIAL**

8/17

STATEMENT OF

03

First of all I can't sit here and relate exactly what happened. Its been almost two years and the incident is very vague.

In my mind it appears a name was possibly deleted from SANCA. There are a number of explanations as to why the name appears to have been deleted but actually wasn't. SANCA could have failed--it was failing quite regularly at that time. I could have typed the name on SANCA incorrectly--if [redacted] is entered into SANCA, it would show 'No Hits'. It would show "No Hits" because in the middle name the E and A are transposed. Its also entirely possible that, as a new employee at the time, I didn't completely understand the situation and jumped to an erroneous conclusion.

In SRD, from Mr. Tom Cole on down, they would not be party to anything irregular. There's absolutely no way Mr. Cole would stand for anything irregular.

I believe there were three separate incidents:


1. A covert security file was returned inadvertently to SRD. The file either made reference to Lee Harvey Oswald or was in one of his AKA's. I don't remember. I say 'returned inadvertently to SRD' because the file was on a permanent 'charge out' to OS/SAG. I checked with SAG and they wanted it back. I believe I checked SANCA to ascertain the correct name for the 'charge out slip' also. The name on the file was, possibly, WRIGHT and the name on the 'charge out slip' was L. OSWALD. (This is possible and probable because if L. OSWALD is entered on SANCA, the file number on WRIGHT will appear because an 'L. OSWALD' is referenced in WRIGHT's file.)
2. A short time later Joyce (I don't recall her last name) from the 'Freedom of Information' staff asked me to do a name check for her. (I was sitting at SANCA so I offered to do the name check for her.) The name check was on OSWALD and his AKA's. (I had just recently finished reading a book entitled "They've Killed the President"--the names I checked on SANCA appeared in that book as AKA's for OSWALD.)
3. A short time later, and I don't recall why, I checked SANCA again for that same file that referenced OSWALD. This time it wasn't there. I checked it several times and asked the Chief/Indicies about it. She said the name should be there. I asked Mr. [redacted] if he could check the original FOIA case. He did (I was

3/W

with him) and he explained why I was wrong. I didn't really understand but accepted it as I was a new employee. In retrospect, I can see there are any number of explanations for what happened but as a new employee at that time, I just didn't understand them.

Mr. Tom <sup>COX 2/7</sup> ~~Gote~~ has shown me a Covert Security file that's relatively small, does make reference to an OSWALD, and is not in OSWALD's name. The name on the file is RAY EARL WRIGHT and the SFN is 116942. The name 'RAY EARL' means nothing to me but the last name, WRIGHT, seems to ring a bell. This security file seems also to match the description of the file I, at one time, couldn't locate; it's a Covert Subject file in a name other than OSWALD's and does reference him. I believe this is the file I couldn't locate two years ago.

I have probably inconvenienced quite a few people today as a result of a misunderstood situation two years ago. At the time I did believe something irregular had happened and the explanation I received didn't completely satisfy me. This has bothered me for quite some time now and I'm finally relieved to get an explanation that clears my mind.

03  


March 30 - 1977  
Date