

EXHIBIT 8

Dan Rather Interview with Marcia Kramer of WCBS in New York, September 20 2004

Marcia Kramer of WCBS	How could you have been so misled that these documents were put on TV?
Dan Rather	I made a mistake. I didn't dig hard enough, long enough, didn't ask enough of the right questions. And I trusted a source who changed his story. And it turns out he misled us, lied to us about one thing. But there are no excuses. This is not a day for excuses. I made a mistake; we made a mistake and I'm sorry for it.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Do you feel betrayed?
Rather	Sorry?
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Do you feel betrayed? Betrayed by your source?
Rather	No. No. Sorry, I didn't hear the word. I feel sorry that we made a mistake and if I had known then what I know now I wouldn't have included the documents in the report. But I didn't know then what I know now but again, no excuses. It was a mistake and I really regret it.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	So you say if I knew then what I know now, I wouldn't put the documents, I wouldn't put that part of the story on TV. The question I would ask you is what do you know now, what new information do you know now that led you to make that decision?
Rather	About the documents? About what I know now...I believed in the authenticity of the copies of the documents we had. I believed what the source told us. What I know now that I didn't know then is that the source changed his story. And once a source changes his story, it doesn't mean that everything else he told us is untrue but it certainly raises questions about it. So I wouldn't have put the documents on if I had known the source misled us, had lied to us, about where he got the documents.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Some critics have pointed out that CBS had four different sources that were verifying the documents. Two said that the documents were true, reportedly, and two raised questions. What about those two that raised questions? Did they give you any pause before you decided to go on TV?
Rather	I think that is a fair criticism, that when you're looking for experts to verify signatures as best they can, and verify as best they can the integrity of the documents, you know that you're not going to get definitive answers because this is not like DNA, it's not like fingerprints. It's a very crude art as opposed to a science. I was told that we had four who by and large had agreed that they were not forgeries, that they probably weren't fake. Now two of those, it's my understanding, came back later, and either changed their story, or the story that I got, and a lot of us got at the time was not true. But again I come back to, it's our job to square all that away in advance and we did

	not, we were not able to prove the authenticity of the documents. It's one thing to say the documents could be authentic. What we should have been in a position to do, and this is where we made our mistake, is say "We can prove that they are authentic" and if we couldn't prove it we shouldn't have put it on the air. That's why I say I made a mistake, we made a mistake and I'm sorry.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Did we, did you have, feel any pressure to rush to air this story?
Rather	We always feel some pressure to rush to air but that's in the nature of journalism. But I felt no unusual pressure to rush to air. We believed at the time, that the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence, not just the documents. The overwhelming preponderance of the evidence, supported the story. The documents were offered to support the information in the story. Now I wouldn't have put the documents in support of the information if I had known that the source had lied to us about it. But we were confident. It turns out we were more confident than we should have been. Partly because we were so confident, we had a wealth of information, we knew the basic information was true. What we didn't know is that the question of the authenticity of the documents had not been pursued as strongly or as long or as well as I now know we should have.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	So what you're saying basically is that you could have done the same story without the documents and it would have had the same effect?
Rather	Well, what I'm saying is that we shouldn't have used the documents in support of the story.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Now Bill Burkett, apparently the source of some of the documents, why were you unable to verify the documents with the second source that he had, his source?
Rather	Well the original story he told us, was that a person whom he named, asked his confidence be kept, and we agreed to that. It was someone who we knew could have had access to the documents. But that person was outside the country. We tried to find that person but we couldn't find that person. But it was believable had we said we made a mistake in believing you, believable that the chain of possession would have included this person that he named at the time and later changed his story about.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Now White House spokesman, Scott McClellan said that Bill Burkett is a person who had been, in some circles, already discredited. Why did CBS choose to believe him in this circumstance?
Rather	I found him believable, I think that any open-minded person that sat down with him would find him believable. Perhaps not everybody. I have no argument with Scott McClellan, he has to do what he has to do or say. This person supported John McCain before he supported John Kerry, we took that into consideration. We looked at what his motive could be, what his _____ could be. We came back in another day to talk about Scott McClellan at the White House saying that we should

	<p>be interested in the facts. I want to make it clear, we are interested in the facts. We're fact-finders and we tried very hard to be fact-finders in this case. But we made the mistake of being more trusting in the source than we should have been. And once we found out that he misled us, we came full with the public. I can't underscore too much we believe in leveling with people and total transparency. And as soon as we found out we have been misled we wanted to get our source on the record on videotape so his face and voice is on it and then play it to people and say this is what he now says.</p>
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	<p>Do you think that if he has any ties to the Kerry campaign, that that should be investigated as well?</p>
Rather	<p>I do, but I don't think he has any ties to the Kerry campaign. If he does, I certainly think that that should be investigated and be reported. We did look into it.</p>
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	<p>Do you think that there's more partisanship here at play?</p>
Rather	<p>Well there's always in a political campaign, there's always partisanship. Partisanship is a good thing within certain bounds. But I don't have any complaint about partisanship; I don't have any complaint about anything today. I'm not angry at anybody. But certainly anybody who has been in journalism as I have as long as I have, you're going to accumulate enemies. Some of those are going to enemies because they have their own partisan political agendas or ideological agendas. But we're responsible; we've made a mistake and we have to own up to it and we did own up to it today.</p>
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	<p>Did somebody try to set CBS up?</p>
Rather	<p>I don't think so. Even if they did, it was our job to find that out. No, I don't think we were set up for it. You never can rule anything completely, totally out. Beware of certitude is one of the laws of journalism. But I don't think we were set up for it, no. The mistake was ours', the wound in this case was self-inflicted.</p>
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	<p>CBS has said that it's going to do an internal investigation. Do you think any actions are warranted at the end of this investigation?</p>
Rather	<p>I welcome the independent review. It think it's a good idea. When the results are in, I'll take them seriously. It may take a little time but I hope it won't take very long.</p>
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	<p>Will heads have to roll?</p>
Rather	<p>That I don't know. But that's not a judgment for me to make. The leadership of CBS and CBS News will make that. But I do want to emphasize this, because it's true, I led a core of people, very experienced, caring people, who have a great passion for accuracy and truthfulness. We want to be truth-tellers, and they want to be truth-tellers. I am proud to have worked with them, I'm still proud to work with them. I'm sorry that I just wasn't better than I turned out to be and</p>

	in asking the right questions.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	How do you restore credibility to CBS News?
Rather	I believe, I certainly hope, credibility at CBS News has not been damaged, certainly not damaged in a lasting way here. We have a long tradition of investigative reporting, of asking the tough questions. We take our hits sometimes because we have the guts to take on the tough ones, but when you take on the tough ones, you damn sure better be right in every detail. And we were not right in every detail this time. And we'll continue to ask the tough questions, we'll continue to do investigative journalism but when we do so, humbled by the mistake we made in putting the documents on when we shouldn't have.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	How are you feeling personally?
Rather	On one hand I feel like hell because my life professionally is all about CBS News. I love this place; I love the people here. And I was reared by people who say get up early, work hard, stay late and bring honor to the people you work for. In that sense, I don't feel good about this day at all. On the other sense, I'm a pro. And if you're a pro, one thing pros know, you're going to get knocked down. And it's not how many times you get knocked down, it's how many times you get up. And I'm a get-up fighter.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	And what do you want to say to viewers today? Our viewers, your viewers and others?
Rather	There's nothing more important to us at CBS News and to me personally than the trust of our viewers. I believe that well over half a century of electronic journalism, we've earned the trust of viewers. We're not perfect. We haven't always done it perfectly. We've made mistakes before and we made one here. But it's important, absolutely key for me that viewers understand that we're dedicated and now stand rededicated to earning their trust every day and every way on every story.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Will it be a tough process to earn your way back?
Rather	That's up to the people who watch and listen to this. You know, I've learned well over half a century as a reporter to trust people. I think people understand what's happened here. I think they have it in context, I think they have it in perspective, I think they know what happened and they take our mistake into account, but they lay it against the long record and reputation for integrity and being truth tellers, and the folks who ask the tough questions and take on the tough ones.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Just one last question, do you feel that the thrust of your story, that President Bush got special treatment to get into the National Guard still stands?
Rather	Yes, but this is not the day to talk about that. This is the day to talk about the mistake that we made.

Marcia Kramer of WCBS	And to ask people to forgive?
Rather	That's not mine to ask. But you know, again I come back, I have long experience with the audience, but can't say I know everything about them. But you know, overwhelmingly people in this county were raised with the belief that you should walk humbly, do justice, have mercy. And I have complete confidence that when they look at this in the full context and perspective most people will do just that.
Marcia Kramer of WCBS	Dan, thank you.
Rather	Thank you Marcia.