DATE: 14 December 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Capt. Charles Redman

SUBJECT : Results of Photo Comparison, Case No. ____

REFERENCE : Request from NOK of Clifford W. Fiezel

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.

FOR THE CHIEF: [redacted]
CIA Rep., IPWIC

Attachments:
(1) Christmas 1969 comparison No. ____
(2) Materials submitted with request:
(a) Overlay
(b) 7 precapture photos & 7 enlargements
(c) Other: 2 unident. photos

310 DTD 14 Dec 71

[redacted]

Approved for Release
Date OCT 78

[redacted]

Date of Report: 14 December 1971

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 No. _____

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

   a. Please compare the attached 7 ~~6~~ 7 enlargements pre-capture photographs of Clifford W. Piezel with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA _____ USN _____ USAF 24-5 and 25-5

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

3. [redacted] 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. [redacted] The following features were considered similar:

      (1) _____

      (2) _____

      (3) _____

      (4) _____

[redacted]

(5) _____

(6) _____

(7) _____

(8) _____

(9) _____

d. [redacted] The following features were considered dissimilar:

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

e. [redacted] 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 perscnnel.

[redacted]

[redacted]

g. Comments: Clifford W. Fiezel photo comparison case: The images selected, USAF numbers 24-5 and 25-5 in the 1969 Christmas film, were inadequate for comparison analysis. In some cases it has been possible to identify otherwise inadequte images by tracing them throughout the film. Regrettably the effort has been fruitless in the cases of 24-5 and 25-5.

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: 7 & 7 enlargements

(c) Two unident. photos

[redacted]