[redacted] [redacted]

SANITIZED COPY

DATE: 29 January 1971

MEMORANDUM FOR: Bruce R. Greisen Capt. USMC/G-2 Division

SUBJECT : Results of Photo Comparison, Case No. 12, 558

REFERENCE : Request from NOK of LCpl J. W. Jackson

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:

Attachments:
(1) Christmas 1969 comparison No. DIA 44, 52, 56; USN 68, 69, 67
(2) Materials submitted with request:
(a) Overlay
(b) 3 precapture photos
(c) Other: _____

SANITIZED COPY

[redacted] [redacted] SECRET

Date of Report: 29 January 1971

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 No. ___

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: 16 Dec. 70)

   a. Please compare the attached 3 pre-capture photographs of LCpl. J. W. Jackson with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA 44, USN 67, 68, 69 52, 56 used for comparison 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: ___

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

3. (~~CONFIDENTIAL~~) 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. (C) The following features were considered similar:

      (1) Face shape

      (2) Nose shape

      (3) Lip development

      (4) Hairline

(5) Ear shape

(6) Mouth musculature

(7) _____

(8) _____

(9) _____

d. (C) The following features were considered dissimilar:

(1) _____

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

(5) _____

e. (U&O) Conclusion:

(1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, LCpl. Jackson probably is xxxxxxxxx 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 precapture photographs of ____ Air Force, ____ Navy, ____ Marine, ____ Army, and ____ civilian personnel.

CONFIDENTIAL

g. Comments:

4. (OUO) 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: 3