

12 FEB 1971

DATE: 1 Feb 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: *May*

SUBJECT: Results of Photo Comparison,  
Case NO. \_\_\_\_\_

REFERENCE: Request from NOK of *Lt. James E. Woolley*

*use this form*

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. Therefore, the report is not sufficient evidence for basing legal or administrative action involving rights of missing or captured personnel, or their next of kin. This Agency will accept no responsibility for any such action based on this evidence.

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

FOR THE CHIEF: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments:

- (1) Christmas 1969 comparison NO. \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) Materials submitted with request
  - (a) Overlay
  - (b)        precapture photos
  - (c) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

27195

[REDACTED]

Date of Report: 1 Feb 1971

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 NO. \_\_\_\_\_

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: \_\_\_\_\_)

- a. Please compare the attached 2 pre-capture photographs of H. O. E. Hooten with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA \_\_\_\_\_ USN 46 USAF \_\_\_\_\_.
- 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: 46
- b. 2 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]

- [REDACTED] 2
- (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 appearance and significant differences in similar features, [REDACTED] could be the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features, [REDACTED] 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.

[REDACTED] 1

**PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS INDEX SHEET**

NAME: *Dooley, James E.*

SERVICE: *USN*

STATUS: *Missing*

DATE DOWNED: *22 Oct 67*

	I	II	III	IV
<i>14</i> <b>NUMBER</b>				
<b>DATE OF REPORT</b>	<i>12 Feb 71</i>			
<i>15</i> <b>IDENTIFIED PHOTO</b>	<i>2 PRE-CAPTURE</i>			
<b>UNIDENTIFIED PHOTO</b>	<i>James 1969 film USN #46</i>			
<b>RESULTS</b>	<i>6</i>			
<b>STORAGE</b>				

SPECIAL COMMENTS:

- 1 - Certain
- 2 - Highly Probable
- 3 - Possible

- 4 - Unlikely
- 5 - Certainly Not
- 6 - Unable to Judge