

## The Problem with the Announcement Stories

Two items have been offered as evidence of Barack Obama being born in Hawaii: an online COLB image which the HDOH has indirectly [confirmed](#) in 2 different ways as a forgery, and online images of birth announcements in the Hawaii papers shortly after Obama's birth. This post will explain why I believe we've been fed – and swallowed – a lie about where those images came from. Later posts will give a glimpse of just how far it seems somebody was willing to go in order to have something – anything – that would suggest Obama was born in Hawaii, a critical need since Hawaii Governor Neil Abercrombie told Mike Evans ([transcript and audio link](#)) he had gone into both hospitals (Kapiolani and Queens) with a search warrant but found no birth certificate for Obama.

### First the claims:

Shortly after Barack Obama's campaign website posted what they said was Obama's Certification of Live Birth (COLB) and questions arose regarding its authenticity, Lori Starfelt decided to see if there was a newspaper birth announcement for Obama in Hawaii. She [contacted](#) the HDOH and was told that on Fridays they printed out a list of the week's births; "The Honolulu Advertiser" used that list to print birth announcements in their Sunday paper. So Starfelt calculated that if Obama was born on Friday, Aug 4<sup>th</sup> 1961, his birth would have been on the list the following Friday, Aug 11<sup>th</sup>, and should appear in that Sunday's paper – Aug 13<sup>th</sup>. She contacted the Hawaii State Library (hereafter HSL), asking for a copy from the microfilm of the Advertiser's birth announcements on Aug 13, 1961, and was sent an e-mail with an image that had Obama's announcement on it. She posted that image, along with her story, at Texas Darlin' Blog around July 21, 2008. (See [Post 7679](#) )

Several days later "Infidel Granny", posting at Atlas Shrugs Blog, [said](#) she had asked a woman at the Advertiser office about birth announcements and was told to check the HSL. She asked the HSL for a copy of the Aug 13, 1961 "Advertiser" birth announcements and the librarian sent an e-mail with the image, saying she had it handy since somebody had just asked for it a week earlier.

On Aug 13<sup>th</sup> "Koa" at Texas Darlin' Blog [posted](#) an image for the Aug 14<sup>th</sup> Star-Bulletin announcements, which he/she had [copied](#) directly from the HSL archives.

Around Oct 21 a poster at Prius Chat also [posted](#) an image of the SB announcement, [saying](#),  
*"Here's a copy I made today of the August 14th (could have been the 15th or 16th), 1961 Star Bulletin newspaper showing Obama's birth announcement stored on microfilm at the Hawaii State Library in Honolulu. I had to enlarge it to the point of losing the top of the page with the date and day in order to make it readable. The microfilm is stored in the basement of the library and was in the box marked Star Bulletin Aug 1, 1961-Aug 16, 1961. ..."*

On [Oct 29th](#) Whatreallyhappened.com posted images of both the [Advertiser](#) and [Star-Bulletin](#) images, which were [said](#) to be directly from the Star-Bulletin and [Advertiser](#) – which both had their microfilms stored at the Advertiser building. Note that he was not told to contact the HSL, as "Infidel Granny" says she was told.

Texas Darlin' Blog archives, Atlas Shrugs Blog archives, the original article on Whatreallyhappened, and the [Wikileaks](#) page which also posted a copy which was a text-searchable file, have all been removed from the web, and the page at Prius Chat requires registration first; neither I nor several others who tried to register were allowed to do so. So the whole story of these claims and the images themselves

have been scrubbed, except for fragments (such as the ones I link to) where others discussed and/or copied material, some of which have now been scrubbed from the web also.

I got Starfelt's Advertiser image from a [link](#) referenced [elsewhere](#) as being Starfelt's image, when the image was still available ("Infidel Granny" was given the same image). What really happened still has their images posted. The Prius Chat Forum still has the link to their Star-Bulletin image. I copied Koa's image from Photobucket when it was still available as linked to from the original post at TD Blog. (In my analysis links below I cite where each image came from.) So the images I have used come directly from the original sources.

To verify that I have not altered the images, here are some other places that still have images (as of today), although not necessarily saying the source: [Both](#), [Advertiser](#), [Advertiser](#), [Star-Bulletin](#).

### **And next the documents themselves:**

When a person looks at the documents and claims about the documents, and compares them to what is actually in the Hawaii State Library microfilms, it is obvious why somebody would want these claims buried – although I am not making any specific allegations about who has done what. That should be investigated by someone with subpoena power. Here is a concise summary of what we have:

The Advertiser image that Starfelt and "Infidel Granny" supposedly got from the HSL is pristine. But in reality the HSL microfilms are so scratched up they are nearly unreadable. When a colleague asked the HSL librarian in late April, 2010, for a copy of the Aug 13, 1961 Advertiser birth announcements – the exact image that Starfelt and "Infidel Granny" supposedly got from there - this is what she was told about the condition of the microfilm (emphasis mine):

*"As for your request for the Aug. 13, 1961 Honolulu Advertiser birth announcement page, I looked it up, but unfortunately, the microfilm is so worn down **on top of being poorly microfilmed**, that it is hardly legible. You might be better off asking another library that has a better, less used copy than ours. Or does it have to be the Advertiser? I checked the Star-Bulletin and that date and that film is fine. Let me know."*

The Starfelt and "Infidel Granny" images are pristine, with no sign of being "poorly microfilmed", which would be a constant state for the microfilms, not affected by usage. Those images are clearly not from the HSL microfilms as claimed. However, they match perfectly the images WRH got from somebody at the Advertiser office (with the exception of one C&P line in the left margin below the Asing announcement, which disappeared by the time WRH got a copy). A comparison of the images is [here](#).

Conversely, the Star-Bulletin image – which is the exact same image for WRH, Koa, and the Prius Chat poster (right down to the same piece of hair caught in the viewer when the copy was made and the same waviness in the page being scanned), even though they each claim to have acquired their copy independently, and WRH even claims a different source - has a large scratch down the column of text. But the HSL's Star-Bulletin microfilms are pristine, including the copy from Aug 14<sup>th</sup>, where there are no extra marks or scratches anywhere. A comparison of the images is [here](#). To believe the stories of Koa and the Prius Chat poster, you'd have to believe that scratches disappear over time.

**Summary:**

It is clear that what we were told about where these images came from is not true.

It appears that somebody at the Advertiser office gave out images to select people with the instruction that they were to peddle them off as genuine – the Advertiser image to the librarian at the Hawaii State Library, the Star-Bulletin image to “Koa” and the Prius Chat poster (who may have been the same person), and both images to Whatreallyhappened.com.

This is according to the statements already made and images already made public, which show glaring discrepancies in the stories. There are other discrepancies in the claims which stand out to those who have researched the microfilms as well, and those will be addressed later.

But for now the question is this: Why would somebody at the Advertiser office deceive the public into thinking their birth announcement images were actually copies made directly from the Hawaii State Library microfilms by individuals acting on their own? Why intervene at all, rather than letting these individuals get what really IS in the HSL microfilms? And who was in on this deception?

Those are questions that deserve an answer. Those like Bill O’Reilly and certain “news sources” who cite these images as their reason to ridicule “birthers” would do well to find out exactly why somebody worked so hard to deceive them on where those images actually came from.