

DATE: 5 April 1971

*Final
310 DTD 5 APR 71*

MEMORANDUM FOR: Capt. C. E. Redman, AFINF
SUBJECT : Results of Photo Comparison,
Case No. 12,769
REFERENCE : Request from NOK of Major Richard K. Allee

1. Transmitted herewith are results of photo comparison analysis between the Christmas 1969 film of American PWs in North Vietnam and photographs submitted with reference.

2. The evidence cited in the attached report does not constitute definitive proof of the status or identity of individuals portrayed in the questioned photographs.

3. Since the Agency's participation in this program is classified, the fact of such participation must not be revealed. This report, therefore, may not be used in an unclassified arena, and the Agency cannot be responsible for any action or decision based in whole or in part on the judgments expressed in the report.

4. All materials received from your office in connection with subject request are returned herewith.

[REDACTED]

Attachments:

- (1) Christmas 1969 comparison No. _____
- (2) Materials submitted with request:
 - (a) Overlay
 - (b) 1 precapture photos + 1 copy
 - (c) Other: _____

[REDACTED]

0001

Date of Report: 5 April 1971

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 No. _____

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: _____)

a. Please compare the attached 1 pre-capture photographs of Major Richard K. Allee with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA _____ USN _____ USAF 24, 36, 37

b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:

a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: _____

b. 1 technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.

3. _____ Results of analysis:

a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: Adequate/~~inadequate~~ for analysis of recognizable features.

b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: Adequate/~~inadequate~~ for analysis of recognizable features.


c. _____ The following features were considered similar:


(1) Occipital ridge

(2) Hairline

(3) Skull shape

(4) Nose shape

- D  B
- (5) _____
 - (6) _____
 - (7) _____
 - (8) _____
 - (9) _____

d.  The following features were considered dissimilar:

- (1) _____
- (2) _____
- (3) _____
- (4) _____
- (5) _____

e.  Conclusion:

- (1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, _____ could be the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features, _____ probably is not the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (3) In view of the quality of photography and the small number of distinguishable features which could be compared, no conclusion can be reached.

f. (U) The same image has been compared with pre-capture photographs of _____ Air Force, _____ Navy, _____ Marine, _____ Army, and _____ civilian personnel.

D [REDACTED] C

8. Comments: Although there appear to be the similarities noted, the picture quality (Christmas film) makes a definite conclusion impossible.

4. [REDACTED] WARNING: This photo comparison analysis was performed utilizing the best available techniques; however, the quality of the photographs in question precluded positive identification. There may be other overriding factors concerning the individual's case which could confirm or invalidate the photo comparison analysis.

Attachments:

- (a) Post-capture photographs, with overlay or other exact identification of image to be compared: _____
- (b) Pre-capture photographs: 1 _____