

**From:** Palin, Sarah (GOV sponsored) <govpalin@alaska.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 13, 2009 8:47 AM  
**To:** McAllister, William D (GOV) <bill.mcallister@alaska.gov>; Perry, Kristina Y (GOV) <kris.perry@alaska.gov>; Leighow, Sharon W (GOV) <sharon.leighow@alaska.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Sarah Palin pregnancy photos proven to be digitally altered - your factcheck reporting from Sept 2008

---

Ok, my new attitude on this is "I love it"!!! This proves the nuts are still at it! Gotta' embrace it at this point.

---

**From:** McAllister, William D (GOV)  
**To:** Palin, Sarah (GOV sponsored); Perry, Kristina Y (GOV); Leighow, Sharon W (GOV)  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 13 07:43:02 2009  
**Subject:** Fw: Sarah Palin pregnancy photos proven to be digitally altered - your factcheck reporting from Sept 2008

The nuts are still at it.

-----  
Sent using BlackBerry

---

**From:** Patrick W  
**To:** Gusty, Andrea  
**Cc:** 11news@ktva.com; Ldemer@adn.com ; editorsblog@adn.com ; Brendan.Kelley@anchoragepress.com ; McAllister, William D (GOV)  
**Sent:** Tue Jan 13 07:37:09 2009  
**Subject:** RE: Sarah Palin pregnancy photos proven to be digitally altered - your factcheck reporting from Sept 2008

Andrea,

thanks a lot for your answer and your report on KTVA about the two □infamous□ pregnancy pictures from 13 April 2008.

As I mentioned in my previous email, which is below, I am a contributor to the palindeception blog, which is edited by Audrey. I was mentioned several times in Audrey's blogpost, and my flickr profile is here:

<http://www.flickr.com/people/32527116@N06/>

I acknowledge that you would like to □set the record straight once and for all□.

However, it is surprising to see that your report contained several inaccuracies, and it is in fact a piece of sloppy reporting in many respects.

The inaccuracies start already right at the beginning of the report. You state that there are □at least two websites devoted to proving that this picture is fake□.

As far as palindeception.com is concerned, this statement is untrue. This blog is devoted to discussing the pregnancy of Sarah Palin with Trig, and A LOT of issues have been discussed there during the last months. I have even mentioned this in my previous email. The validity of these two pictures are just one of many issues which were discussed there. The statement that our blog is □devoted□ to these pictures is simply untrue, and as you are also showing a screenshot of the palindeception blog in your report, it gives the viewer the wrong impression.

What you are showing several times in your report are screenshots from a website which has just been online for a few days and which is not in any way connected to the palindeception blog (I am talking about this website: <http://palinpics4truth.t35.com>). The □ tests □ that have been performed on this particular website in respect to the infamous pregnancy pictures are pretty meaningless and worthless and have not been carried out by a verified photo forensic expert. This site makes no valid contribution to the controversy about the pictures whatsoever.

In contrast, the palindeception blog had instructed a professional photo forensic expert. I mentioned the link to his report in my email below, and attached to this email you will find the report. Interestingly, you had not shown any screenshots or mentioned any details of this particular professional report in your broadcast on KTVA.

You will find Audrey □'s blog about this forensic report here:

<http://www.palindeception.com/blog/2008/12/photoshop-report.html>

What originally alerted us about these pregnancy pictures was for example the fact that in the shot which included yourself and Scott Favorite, Sarah Palin □'s necklace was missing - it □'s simply not visible at all:

<http://flickr.com/photos/32527116@N06/3093518201/>

Even with a professional photo zoom program, no necklace appears:

<http://flickr.com/photos/32527116@N06/3098875940/in/set-72157611103159527/>

Interestingly, the photo forensic expert we had instructed came to the conclusion that in the neck area "pixels lack edge definition resulting in murky details" and "pixels cloning is evident in redundant tonal values and pattern". He continues to explain that this was "the result of cloning pixels from another region of the image". Therefore he comes to the conclusion that the "neck region clearly appears to have been altered".

Which also concerned many people was the fact that the photo which includes yourself has a very bad picture quality, and that Sarah Palin appeared fuzzy and unsharp for no apparent reason.

You mention that □ local photographer □ Dan Carpenter took the picture. First, isn □'t Dan Carpenter actually a videographer for the KTUU network? Second, why would somebody who should have known how to handle a modern 9 megapixel camera like the Fujifilm FinePix S9000 make such a bad picture?

We know from the exif data of the picture with yourself and Scott Favorite and which is here:

<http://flickr.com/photos/30076181@N02/2814199887/meta/>

□ that the original size of the picture, as recorded in the exif data, was:

Image Width: 3488 pixels

Image Height: 2616 pixels

The picture which was uploaded by Erik99559 to flickr unfortunately has only 1024 x 768 pixels as the largest possible size to download.

In the interest of a full resolution of this matter, I would be very grateful if you could send me via email a copy of the picture in its original size, which certainly should not be no problem for you.

I would also be grateful if you could also make available a copy a the 8-minute report which originally appeared

on the KTVA website for just about one hour, and which is now not available any more and seems to have been replaced by your current report which last 2:46 minutes.

Also, I would be very interested to know who posted the pictures on flickr under the username [erik99559] on 31 August 2008, two days after Sarah Palin's nomination. You mentioned in the report that Dan Carpenter took the picture as a favour for yourself. You also mentioned that you then took a picture of Dan Carpenter with the Governor and Bill McAllister. Were the pictures taken with your camera or Dan's camera and which of you uploaded the pictures onto flickr?

Finally, two more things I would like to point out:

a) You mention at the end of your report that the [conspiracy theorists] say that [it was actually Sarah Palin's daughter Bristol that had Trig]. Just for the record, the palindeception blog has never claimed to know who actually gave birth to Trig. It is true, however, that we claim that it is not Sarah Palin who is the biological mother of Trig.

b) You said in the report that [four days later], Sarah Palin gave birth to Trig. Four days later would have been the 17th April. However, according to the official story, Sarah Palin gave birth on the 18th April 2008.

By the way: You said that you are reporting the facts. I would actually be very interested to know more facts about baby Tripp. Maybe you could do a report about him soon?

I am looking forward to your reply.

Copies to:

1. KTVA News
2. Editor of the ADN
3. Lisa Demer, ADN
4. Brendan Kelley, Anchorage Press
5. Bill McAllister

Yours sincerely

Patrick

--- On Sun, 1/11/09, Gusty, Andrea <agusty@KTVA.com> wrote:

From: Gusty, Andrea <agusty@KTVA.com>  
Subject: RE: Sarah Palin pregnancy photos proven to be digitally altered - your factcheck reporting from Sept 2008  
To: "Patrick W" <patrick12344@yahoo.com>  
Date: Sunday, January 11, 2009, 11:00 PM

Tomorrow on our 6pm and 10pm newscasts, I will be answering the allegations that the picture is fake, and providing the live interview video and more pictures from that day. After the newscasts, it will all be posted on our website at [www.ktva.com](http://www.ktva.com) under "I-Team."

Andrea Gusty  
Anchor, Investigative Reporter  
CBS 11 News  
Direct: (907) 273-3146

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Patrick W [mailto:patrick12344@yahoo.com]

**Sent:** Sunday, December 28, 2008 11:49 AM

**To:** Editor@FactCheck.org

**Cc:** 11 News

**Subject:** Sarah Palin pregnancy photos proven to be digitally altered - your factcheck reporting from Sept 2008

Dear Sir,

my name is Patrick, I am a contributor to the palindeception blog, which you will find here:

<http://www.palindeception.com/blog/>

On 16th September 2008, you reported under the headline "Muting the Mummy Melodrama" the "fact" that Sarah Palin had indeed given birth to Trig Palin because the KTVA-reporter Andrea Gusty had provided you with a picture showing Sarah Palin pregnant in "mid-April 2008". Therefore, according to your report, there could remain no doubt that Sarah Palin was pregnant with Trig in April 2008.

<http://wire.factcheck.org/2008/09/16/forget-it-jake/>

You also explained this "fact" in this video:

[http://www.factcheck.org/just-the-facts/this\\_little\\_piggy\\_went\\_to\\_the\\_makeup.html](http://www.factcheck.org/just-the-facts/this_little_piggy_went_to_the_makeup.html)

As you will certainly be aware, the controversy surrounding Sarah Palin's pregnancy with Trig touches on several complex issues, for example the flight from Texas to Alaska after Sarah Palin's water had broken, the strict refusal by Sarah Palin to present medical documentation supporting the assertion that she gave birth to Trig (Andrew Sullivan on the "Daily Dish" has blogged extensively about this point), the fact that a premature down-syndrome baby was released by the hospital one day after the birth etc. These and many other points have been extensively discussed during the last months in the palindeception blog.

You have based your report mainly on the fact that Andrea Gusty had given you the picture in question.

Many doubts had been raised in the past about this picture, as several people were certain to have detected signs of digital alteration.

In order to be sure, the palindeception blog had now instructed a professional and highly regarded expert in the area of the forensic examination of photos in order to detect alterations and manipulations.

The expert came to the conclusion that the photo which Andrea Gusty had presented to you as evidence for the pregnancy "shows some signs of alterations consistent with an image that has been composited from different sources".

You can download the full report here:

<http://www.palindeception.com/imageanalysis-report-12262008..pdf>

The blogpost on the palindeception blog about this issue is here:

<http://www.palindeception.com/blog/>

The discussion about the blogpost is here:

[https://www.blogger.com/comment.g?  
blogID=4091845104881454109&postID=6932752815927369158](https://www.blogger.com/comment.g?blogID=4091845104881454109&postID=6932752815927369158)

Therefore, the evidence presented to you by Andrea Gusty does not stand.

Furthermore, I would like to point out the following:

The behaviour of Andrea Gusty as a supposedly "independent" journalist raises a lot of questions, for example: What was the motivation for her to give the picture to you in the first place? Why was she so adamant that the picture was "not photoshopped"? Why was she surprised that the picture was published on the flickr "erik99559" account on 31st August 2008? Why has she never explained who took the picture and how it came into her possession?

I suggest that you should get in touch with Andrea Gusty in order to clarify these and other points and that you should begin your own investigations regarding the alteration of the picture.

As Audrey has explained in the latest palindeception blog, the identity of the photoshop expert will be revealed to the media if requested. Please write to:

[info@palindeception.com](mailto:info@palindeception.com)

I have also attached the report with this message.

KTVA News receives a copy of this email.

Yours sincerely

Patrick