

September 10, 2004 *CBS Evening News Report*

Rather: There were attacks today on the CBS News *60 Minutes* Report this week raising questions about President Bush's Vietnam time in the Texas Air National Guard. The questions included in our report were:

Did a wealthy Texas oilman, friend of the Bush family, use his influence with the then Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives to get George W. Bush a coveted slot in the Texas National Guard keeping him out of the draft and any probable service in Vietnam?

Did Lieutenant Bush refuse a direct order from his commanding officer?

Was Lieutenant Bush suspended for failure to perform up to the Air Force standards?

Did Lieutenant Bush ever take the physical he was required and ordered to take?

If not, why not?

And, did Lieutenant Bush in fact complete his commitment to the Guard?

These questions grew out of new witnesses and new evidence including documents written by Lieutenant Bush's squadron commander. Today, on the Internet and elsewhere, some people, including many who are partisan political operatives, concentrated not on the key questions of the overall story but on the documents that were part of the support of the story. They allege that the documents are fake.

Those raising questions about the CBS documents have focused on something called superscript, a key that automatically types a raised "th." Critics claim typewriters didn't have that ability in the 1970s. But some models did. In fact, other Bush military records, already officially released by the White House itself, showed the same superscript. Here's one from 1968.

Some analysts outside CBS say they believe the typeface on these memos is New Times Roman which they claim was not available in the 1970s. But the owner of the company that distributes this typing style said that it has been available since 1931.

Document and handwriting examiner Marcel Matley analyzed the documents for CBS News. He says he believes they are real but he is concerned about what exactly is being examined by some of the people now questioning the documents because deterioration occurs each time a document is reproduced and the documents being analyzed outside CBS have been photocopied, faxed, scanned, and downloaded, and are far removed from the documents CBS started with which were also photocopies. Document and handwriting examiner Marcel Matley did this interview with us prior to the *60 Minutes* broadcast. He looked at the documents and the signatures of Colonel

Jerry Killian comparing known documents with the colonel's signature on the newly discovered ones.

Matley: We looked basically at what are called significant or insignificant features to determine if it's the same person or not. There was no problem identifying them. I would say based on our available handwriting evidence, yes, it's the same person.

Rather: Matley finds the signatures to be some of the most compelling evidence. We talked to him again today by satellite.

Rather to Matley: Are you surprised the questions came about these? We're not, but I wonder if you were surprised?

Matley: I knew going in that this was dynamite one way or the other and I knew that potentially it was far more potential damage to me professionally than benefit to me. And I knew that. And uh, but we seek the truth. That's what we do. You know you're supposed to put yourself out to seek the truth and take what comes from it.

Rather: Robert Strong was an administrative officer for the Texas Air National Guard during the Vietnam years. He knew Colonel Jerry Killian, the man credited with writing the documents, and paperwork like these documents was his specialty. He is standing by his judgment that the documents are real.

Rather: When you read through these documents, is there any doubt in your mind that these are genuine?

Strong: Well they are compatible with the way business was done at that time, they are compatible with the man that I remember Jerry Killian being, I don't see anything in the documents that are discordant with what were the times, what were the situations, and what were the people that were involved.

Rather: Strong says the highly charged political atmosphere of the Guard at the time was perfectly represented in the newly revealed documents.

Strong: It verged on outright corruption in terms of what would be the favors that were done, the power that was traded. It was unconscionable. From a moral and ethical standpoint, it was unconscionable.

Rather: It is the information in the new documents that is most compelling for people familiar with President Bush's record in the National Guard. Author Jim Moore has written two books critical of President Bush and his service in the Guard.

Jim Moore: There's no doubt in my mind that these documents are stating accurately what we know took place from the records that are available.

Rather: Put it in context and perspective for us, the story and what we'll call the counterattack on the story. Where are we right now?

Jim Moore: Well I think what has happened is that some incriminating documents have come out. The White House you should remember has not discredited the documents. They're relying on the Blogosphere and other people to do that, because the White House probably knows that these documents are, in fact, real.

Rather: The *60 Minutes* report was based not solely on the recovered documents but on a preponderance of evidence, including documents, that were provided by what we consider to be solid sources and interviews with former officials of the Texas National Guard. If any definitive evidence to the contrary of our story is found, we will report it. So far, there is none.