

Date and Time: Tuesday, June 5, 2018 11:09:00 AM EDT

Job Number: 67833576

# Document (1)

1. Tucker Investigates State Of Race Relations; Starbucks Anti-Bias Training Backfires; Mueller Probe Has Cost Taxpayers \$17 Million; TUCKER CARLSON TONIGHT Investigates "Spygate"; MSNBC Host Joy Reid Apologizes For Hateful Blog Posts; Mike Rowe On The Future Of Boy Scouts; FAA Replaced ATC Hiring System With Diversity-Friendly Version; Dem Strategy On Race: Divide And Conquer

Client/Matter: -None-

Search Terms: Tucker Carlson Tonight

Search Type: Natural Language

Narrowed by:

**Content Type** Narrowed by News -NoneTucker Investigates State Of Race Relations; Starbucks Anti-Bias Training
Backfires; Mueller Probe Has Cost Taxpayers \$17 Million; TUCKER
CARLSON TONIGHT Investigates "Spygate"; MSNBC Host Joy Reid
Apologizes For Hateful Blog Posts; Mike Rowe On The Future Of Boy
Scouts; FAA Replaced ATC Hiring System With Diversity-Friendly Version;
Dem Strategy On Race: Divide And Conquer

Fox News Network TUCKER CARLSON TONIGHT 8:00 PM EST

June 1, 2018 Friday

Copyright 2018 Fox News Network LLC All Rights Reserved

Section: NEWS; Domestic

Length: 7054 words

Byline: Tucker Carlson

Guests: Peter Kirsanow, Jason Nichols, Jonathan Turley, Dan Bongino, Larry O'Connor, Mike Rowe, Michael

Pearson

# **Body**

## TUCKER CARLSON, FOX NEWS HOST: Good evening and welcome to TUCKER CARLSON TONIGHT.

If you've been paying attention to the news recently, you may have noticed that many of the big stories revolve around questions of race. Increasingly, in this country, race is the headline.

Just this week, Roseanne Barr was fired and her show canceled on ABC after she tweeted an attack on Valerie Jarrett that many described as racist.

Starbucks, the coffee retailer, closed more than 8,000 of its retail stores in order to reeducate its white employees about their unconscious racism.

Meanwhile, a bar in Portland, Oregon hosted a reparations happy hour, where non-white patrons drank for free.

Over in cable news land, MSNBC aired an hour-long primetime special that not only attacked racism, but also engaged in it by stereotyping an entire group of people based on their skin color. Here's a selection from that.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

TIM WISE, ANTIRACISM ACTIVIST: The gentrifiers of today, their parents or grandparents ran away from the city to get away from black and brown folk. And now, their children and their grandchildren are saying, oh, the suburbs, there is so many olive gardens I can go to. So, I need to go back to the city and get my life in the city.

But when I do that, I need to have my hot yoga studio and my pottery studio and my stuff represented. And if you intrude on that, I will then call the police.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

**CARLSON**: Well, more and more it feels like racial division is the subtext of virtually everything in this country. Even topics that seem unrelated to ethnicity suddenly are racially fraught.

The effect of all that is a deeply angry and divided nation, but also you may have noticed, a terrified one. Many Americans are scared to say what they really think about just about anything. One false word and you could be denounced on Twitter and lose your livelihood. It happens. We see it all the time.

Best just to smile and nod and hope the witch-hunt passes. How long do we have to live this way? And how did we get here in the first place?

Joining us now is someone who has paid attention closely for a long time, Peter Kirsanow, a lawyer who serves on the US Commission on Civil Rights and has written a new thriller called "Second Strike," which I can tell you firsthand is excellent.

Peter, thanks a lot for joining us.

PETER KIRSANOW, US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS: Always my pleasure, *Tucker*.

**CARLSON**: So, there's something strange going on. Even as the country becomes much more diverse, and that was a trend that we were promised would make the country more harmonious, the country seems much more on edge about questions of race. What is going on?

KIRSANOW: Well, I think several things are going on, but the overriding thing is a political narrative that's driven to enhance one argument, or the side of one particular side, and it has its genesis in two things.

First is the political imperative of getting Democrats elected chiefly.

## CARLSON: Yes.

KIRSANOW: And so, we have a lot of this division on the basis of race because there are no policy prescriptions anymore. If you listen very closely, you don't hear any workable policy prescriptions, or very few workable policy prescriptions, but what you hear a lot of it is identity politics.

I've been on US Commission on Civil Rights for 17 years. And in that 17 years, we haven't had more lucid conversations about race or identity. They've gotten increasingly sophomoric, they've gotten increasingly opaque, and they're driven by an ahistorical narrative, one that doesn't have, or very little, bearing on what truly happened in the United States of America.

Look, the fact of the matter is that in my lifetime, matters of race and racial discrimination have gotten demonstrably better, in ways that we could never even imagine.

If you look at the interaction between individuals of various races today, they've never been better. Individuals of races. But when you come to the interaction between groups, it's become hostile and toxic, and it's a function of trying to get certain groups to have an allegiance to a certain movement or certain party for political imperative.

<u>CARLSON</u>: May I step in there and just give back up for a second to address something that you said that I had never thought of.

The conversation is increasingly general and less specific. So, whereas 30 years ago, people might say, in order to close the achievement gap in standardized testing, we need to put more money into head start, for example.

Now, the conversation is, this group is bad, it has always been bad, it will never get better. Why are we hearing fewer solutions than we used to hear?

KIRSANOW: Well, I think for a couple of reasons. One again is that political imperative because solutions augur against having a political advantage. But I think it's also because there's a tendency on the part of some to shout down others, to cast others as the other. And again, that's for political imperative.

#### CARLSON: Right.

KIRSANOW: But you're afraid to say things that are demonstrably true. To give you one example, a couple of weeks ago, we had a hearing at the US Commission on Civil Rights, all-day hearing, people from the Justice Department, police chiefs association, you name it, everybody in the world was there and the usual groups were there.

It was a hearing on hate crimes because of the ostensible spike in hate crimes since Trump has been elected. But facts are stubborn things. And when you take a look at the data, and when I asked questions of this, after everyone made these grand pronouncements about how horrible and horrific the spike in hate crimes is, we had no hard evidence of such spike.

And the best data on this comes from the Bureau of Justice statistics. What it's shown, for the last 30 years, there's been a decline in hate crimes. There's been a decline in all manner of discrimination for more than 30 years.

Yet, we have greater sensitivity, heightened sensitivity, and you have to ask yourself this, why this is the case. And I think, to some extent, it's because it helps the agenda of certain groups of certain parties, certain individuals.

**CARLSON**: So, you keep hearing that we need to have an honest conversation on race. And I'm always for conversations, particularly for honest ones. But I wonder after all these conversations if the country is becoming more divided. Maybe that's not evidence that it's not working. Do we need to talk less about race or more about race? Does the conversation idea hold up to scrutiny?

KIRSANOW: Two things. <u>Tucker</u>, I disagree that we're having conversations. We always hear that we need to have a conversation, but what we get is always harangues. And the harangues usually come from one side, and most decent people kind of duck their heads and watch out for incoming fire. They don't want to get caught in the crossfire.

And you know if you go to colleges, law schools, almost any institution of higher learning, and frankly K-12, there are only certain acceptable opinions that you can have.

There are students who are punished, and they know this, and they know precisely how to react in the context of a classroom debate ostensibly on race. There's only one acceptable opinion, and you're not allowed to offer other opinions. And that doesn't forward the conversation.

And one other point -

**CARLSON**: No. And it doesn't help anybody. It doesn't help anybody. I can see why they try to shout you down, by the way, but I'm glad that you came. Thanks you very much. Peter Kirsanow, great to see you.

KIRSANOW: Thanks, Tucker.

**CARLSON**: As we just told you, Starbucks closed its retail stores this weekend in order to reeducate employees about racism. The assumption, of course, is that Starbucks' white employees are racist simply because they're white? But isn't that a racist assumption itself? Huh?

Why is Starbucks wading into this topic anyway? Isn't this supposed to be a coffee shop? Professor Jason Nichols has been following this story since the beginning and he joins us now.

Professor, thanks for coming on. I thought Peter Kirsanow said something really interesting a second ago, which is that we talk less about solutions and more in general terms.

So, just to give you one example, if the people who run Starbucks are upset about the racial climate in the country, and it's fair to be upset about that, then why do they have so few stores in black neighborhoods?

I think the biggest concentration of black New Yorkers is Bed-Stuy in Brooklyn. I think there is one Starbucks. You go to the Upper East Side, Starbucks in every corner.

So, if they really want to make things different, why aren't they opening Starbucks in black neighborhoods? Wouldn't that do a lot more than these conversations they're having?

JASON NICHOLS, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PROFESSOR: Well, I think if you want to talk about that, I would say even better than that would be employing more African American and Latino baristas and managers.

I think that's probably a better solution rather than just placing them in the neighborhoods because, in many cases, that might actually lead to displacing some mom and pop shops and coffee shops that are independently owned, particularly ones by African Americans and Latinos and Asian Americans.

So, I would agree with you there that there are also substantive things that they can do, but I think that this is absolutely a beginning. Of course, this was just supposed to start a dialog, not supposed to solve all of the world's problem in four hours.

<u>CARLSON</u>: But it's clearly an example of something that I've noticed a lot of recently, which is collective blame, the idea that because you look a certain way, you're responsible for a certain set of historical sins, you must have a certain set of attitudes, which is, of course, a racist assumption by definition.

So, I wonder, if you're going to approach this question, why not do it with the true assumption that racism is a human problem; bias, hatred, evil, they're human problems committed by all people, not unique to one group, but that's not what Starbucks is doing at all, right?

NICHOLS: Well, I think one of the things is that's not Starbucks' experience. Starbucks had the arrest of those two gentlemen and other experiences of bias and it seems like it's pretty one-sided. So, they wanted to address that.

CARLSON: No. Hold on. Wait a second. First of all -

NICHOLS: No, no. Hold on, *Tucker*. Let me just finish this one point.

#### CARLSON: OK.

NICHOLS: One of the things that they wanted to create a dialog between people of different backgrounds. It wasn't about blame.

And I think that's one of the things that's missing oftentimes when we have these discussions, <u>Tucker</u>, is that people think that just because you want to have a dialog about race - and, yes, history matters and all these things - I think we need to think of that way that we're just going to have an open exchange of ideas and have an open dialog and it's not always about blaming.

**CARLSON**: No, no, no. I'm sorry. That's false. What our kids are being taught and what Starbucks is teaching us is that certain groups are more prone to racism than others.

And that's a lie, as you know, because all people are fundamentally the same, in that they're capable of great good and great bad, and racism is one of the great bads. But they're all capable of that. No group has a monopoly on racism in this or any other country. And to suggest otherwise is itself racist. Right?

NICHOLS: <u>Tucker</u>, here's the thing. Here's what I would say is that I do think that groups have their biases, absolutely, but the difference is some groups have the power to enforce those biases and make things more difficult for others and discriminate against other -

**CARLSON**: Well, people don't always act as groups. Hold on. That assumption is - maybe I'm the liberal here, but, I mean, groups don't act according to directives. Like, all white people, all black people, all Americans don't get some message from HQ. Individuals act as individuals. Like a lot, mostly. And people are capable - all people, regardless of color - of racism. But that's not the message that Starbucks is teaching, which again is itself racist.

NICHOLS: <u>Tucker</u>, when have two white men been arrested in a Starbucks for being white? If you can tell me that -

**CARLSON**: Well, I don't know for being white. I mean, I don't know what that means. I mean - OK. Look, the point is that, yes, you've had a lot of antiblack racism, but that doesn't mean that everyone who's white shares a special burden of racism because that assumption is itself racist.

So, to get beyond this morass, you need to acknowledge that human sin is universal, and that people aren't responsible for the actions of people who happen to look like them because that's collective punishment and collective guilt and it's wrong, right?

NICHOLS: Again, <u>Tucker</u>, I think you have inferred more from this than I think Starbucks is actually saying.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Oh, no, I haven't. Come on, professor. Let's not be disingenuous. I'm not inferring anything. I'm listening carefully to what I'm being told.

NICHOLS: OK. But there's antiblack racism. And when we're addressing that, sometimes that can come from anybody of any background. So, what we're trying to do is address some of the issues of antiblackness, anti-immigrant sentiment. We're trying to address that, but we're trying to address that for all people.

There are times, believe it or not, when African Americans discriminate against other African Americans based on the assumptions that they have.

So, I think addressing bias, and trying to be antibias, we're not trying to say that this is just white people.

CARLSON: No. Of course, you are. That's exactly what you're saying and you know it.

NICHOLS: That's not -

<u>CARLSON</u>: That's exactly what you're saying. That's exactly what Starbucks is saying. That's exactly what my kids' teachers are telling them every day.

I mean, let's be honest. I guess we can't. Professor, great to see you.

NICHOLS: Absolutely.

CARLSON: Thank you.

NICHOLS: Always great, *Tucker*. Thanks.

**CARLSON**: How safe is air travel? It's not a question you'd think you'd have to ask yourself, but government documents obtained exclusively by this show suggest that the FAA has dramatically lowered its standards in hiring for air traffic controllers. Dramatically! In shocking ways! It shocked us. And we do this for a living. We've got details ahead.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Prosecutors in the US attorney's office in Washington interviewed former FBI Director Jim Comey during an investigation in his former deputy, Andrew "Andy" McCabe.

McCabe, you'll remember, is accused of lying about giving sensitive information to the media, leaking, a number of times.

Meanwhile, the price tag on the Mueller investigation keeps rising. It is up to \$17 million in taxpayer funds. Feel safer?

Jonathan Turley is a professor of constitutional law at George Washington University Law School in Washington and he joins us *tonight*.

Professor, thanks for coming on.

JONATHAN TURLEY, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW SCHOOL PROFESSOR: Thanks, Tucker.

<u>CARLSON</u>: So, the Andrew McCabe question, from our perspective, again not knowing all the facts, but it seems cut and dry. We know very well that it's a felony to lie to a federal agent, and that's one of the reasons that - well, that Martha Stewart went to prison or Gen. Flynn pled guilty.

So, we have read accounts that he lied to investigators at the FBI. Why wouldn't he be charged?

TURLEY: Well, I think that the expectation is that he will be charged. The problem facing McCabe is the record that his own colleagues created. It was career officials at the Inspector General's Office and the Office of Professional Responsibility that concluded that he had lied.

One of the key witnesses was James Comey himself. In fact, McCabe's lawyer sort of went after Comey for his recollection. So, one of these individuals is not telling the truth or recounting the facts correctly.

It's going to be hard for them to walk this line, to pursue people like Flynn, and say that they're going to give a pass to someone like McCabe.

The \$17 million is a really huge amount, but the greater cost to the public is that we paid all this money and we don't find out the truth, that we're not going to get what we paid for.

### CARLSON: Right.

TURLEY: And so, I think the test is going to be, both in the FBI investigation and the Mueller investigation, is will we be able to see the facts because the prohibitive cost in all of this would be lingering doubts.

And McCabe is a good example of that. If McCabe is not indicted, then they need to explain to us why. And there might be valid reasons why. But we need to know where the distinction is.

**CARLSON**: Because I'm starting to sense a standard here, in which government officials get to lie, James Clapper, for example, clearly lied, committed perjury before the Congress when he said there was no spying by the NSA. He's still on cable television, yapping up a storm. He's on Twitter. He's now selling a book.

Prominent interior designer, Martha Stewart, posing no threat to anyone, goes to federal prison. So, I mean, am I imagining this or is there a double standard, and a troubling one?

TURLEY: Well, that's long been the problem in Washington. We sort of have this animal farm where everyone is equal, but some people are more equal than others, and it goes long back, before the Obama administration.

It's very hard to get Justice officials, or high ranking officials, indicted or held accountable. They often get very light treatment.

Clapper is an example of that. When Clapper was confronted with the fact that he had given false testimony, he said, well, that was the least untruthful thing I could have said.

Well, most people call that a lie. I mean, most people would say, well, that's still untruthful, right? You were in front of Congress.

A normal person wouldn't have that least untruthful option when they're trying to answer a question.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Yes. I'm going to try that with the IRS next time when they ask me why I haven't paid in full. It's unbelievable. Thanks. Just kidding, by the way. To the IRS, I pay in full. Professor, thank you for that. Thanks for that perspective. I appreciate it.

TURLEY: Thanks, Tucker.

**CARLSON**: Former Secret Service agent and NYPD office Dan Bongino has followed this investigation from the beginning, all the tangents of it, and he joins us now.

So, Dan, a question that has arisen in the last 48 hours, with I think some urgency, is when did the spying on the Trump campaign begin and under what pretext? What do we know right now about that?

DAN BONGINO, FORMER SECRET SERVICE AGENT: Well, <u>Tucker</u>, here's what we know. We know the timeline and the origin story of how this started, has changed multiple times.

We were initially told it was the activities of Carter Page that started it. Then when the Carter Page saga fell apart, then they shifted quickly to the George Papadopoulos meeting with Alexander Downer in May.

And now that that's changing again, they're trying to go back to a 2015 story about British intelligence passing information over here.

I lay that out for you, *Tucker*, to make one simple point to you. The FBI is hiding what I call paragraph one.

When I was a federal agent and I had, say, a credit card fraud case, when you write a report, <u>Tucker</u>, what did paragraph one say? Bank fraud investigator so-and-so called you on this day about a stolen credit card number and then the rest of the case follows from there.

The FBI will not and refuses to tell people what paragraph one is, and I think it's for a specific reason.

CARLSON: What do you think the reason is?

BONGINO: I was waiting for you to ask me that, *Tucker*, but I don't want to keep talking to myself.

Here's what I think the reason is. We're focusing on the pull. OK? We're focusing on the information that was pulled out of the Trump campaign. The spy-we're-not-supposed-to-name, call him an informant, I don't care, I'm not getting into the euphemisms game.

**CARLSON**: It's the same thing.

BONGINO: It's the same thing. It's nonsense. OK? And I'm glad you've been hammering people on this because it's ridiculous.

#### CARLSON: Yes.

BONGINO: But we've been focusing on how he's been interacting with the Trump sphere, trying to pulling information out. The real question here, and the next shoe to drop, and the one we've been on while I've been researching this case, is how was the email information about the Russian dirt pushed into the Trump sphere, *Tucker*.

It was fed to Papadopoulos by a Maltese professor way back in March, months before this formal investigation.

Now, let me just drop a boulder on you here. That professor has now disappeared. He was interviewed by the FBI in February. Now, if this is a Russian collusion case and this guys is the Rosetta Stone and has the keys to the kingdom and knew about this Russian dirt and fed it to a Trump low- level guy like Papadopoulos, then how come the FBI let him disappear after interviewing him in February?

**CARLSON**: So, I mean, that's kind of the key to the whole story. I mean, that's the genesis story of this investigation, of the Mueller investigation, of all this Russia stuff, which has gummed up the gears of government since day one of this administration, all goes back to the Maltese professor, I hate to say that because it sounds nutty, but it's true, and we don't know where he is.

Why don't we know where he is? And do you think it's possible that this was a setup from day one?

BONGINO: I don't think it's possible anymore, <u>Tucker</u>. If I was a betting man, I would bet my right thumb on it that this was an entrapment operation.

Now, who specifically set it up and why? It's still an open question. It would be irresponsible for me to say, but there's a lot of evidence leading to some very suspicious characters.

But you just asked, and you posed to your audience, the critical question. Stop for a second focusing on the pull. Who pushed the information into the Trump sphere that was going to be pulled out later as evidence they were colluding with the Russians?

The answer is we know the guy. So, if he was interviewed by the FBI, let's just get to the bottom of it. Yet, <u>Tucker</u>, the guy is nowhere to be found. He is in the "The Ren & Stimpy" land of the left socks. Nobody knows, but the FBI interviewed him in February.

Amazing how that happens!

**CARLSON**: The whole thing is unbelievable. And the more you know - I almost hesitate to learn more because I want to sleep at night.

Dan Bongino, thank you for that. I appreciate it.

BONGINO: Yes, sir. You got it.

**CARLSON**: Joy Reid is apologizing for blogposts that until recently she said were written by hackers surreptitiously. What about the FBI investigation into this. Where did that go? All of that's next.

<u>CARLSON</u>: All week we've been telling you about the Joy Reid you never knew. The rigidly progressive, race-hustling MSNBC anchor once had very different views, and they've been revealed by newly discovered excerpts from her long defunct blog.

For example, Reid once complained that immigrants were taking American jobs. Imagine that! She described Lou Dobbs, our friend Lou Dobbs, as her ideological twin on immigration. She told Democrats to spend less time attacking white people. Amazingly!

She also compared John McCain to the Virginia Tech shooter and she spread 9/11 conspiracy theories.

Well, in April she commented on some of those blog posts. Watch.

(BEGIN VIDEO CLIP)

JOY REID, MSNBC HOST, "AM JOY": I spent a lot of time trying to make sense of these posts. I hired cybersecurity experts to see if somebody had manipulated my words or my former blog. And the reality is they have not been able to prove it.

But here's what I know. I genuinely do not believe I wrote those hateful things.

(END VIDEO CLIP)

<u>CARLSON</u>: Well, we assumed that Reid would once again continue to blame these new set of opinions on a mysterious fake hacker because, as you just saw, she's done it before.

But, no, this time she admitted the truth and said she's sorry. Good for her. It's better not to lie so much.

But there's at least one outstanding question here, a question that hangs in the air. Whatever happened to that FBI investigation that Joy Reid and NBC News ordered up when they were still pretending that the blog posts weren't real and were committed by maybe Vladimir Putin?

Is that FBI investigation still ongoing? And what's the penalty for using federal law enforcement to perpetuate a hoax? And how much did it cost? And is NBC News going to pay back American taxpayers?

Joining us now is a man who has considered these questions. Larry O'Connor, associate editor of "The Washington Times".

So, Larry, this is a real question. And by the way, again, I just want to say, good for Joy Reid for telling the truth. It's always good to tell the truth.

LARRY O'CONNOR, "THE WASHINGTON TIMES" ASSOCIATE EDITOR: A little late.

**CARLSON**: But they did order up this FBI investigation and NBC stood behind it. Are you allowed to do that in perpetuation of a hoax, which is what they did?

O'CONNOR: Last I checked, not so much. And I actually checked with a couple of former Department of Justice officials, and they said, no, that's actually kind of a federal crime, making a knowing false report to the FBI.

And then, no one knows how much of our government resources have been spent on investigating a hoax. Now that the FBI isn't spending so much time investigating political opponents of Barack Obama, one thinks that they actually would like to chase down some serious crimes and not just Joy Reid's fantasies to cover her own butt, by the way.

Let's be clear here. Her lies, which were reinforced by her network, NBC, they were all to just cover her up, it was to make her look good, it was just to protect her job.

And apparently, she didn't have to, because NBC is going to stand by her no matter what.

**CARLSON**: Yes. And by the way, I'm all for networks standing by their anchors. I should just say. And I also think that most people are decent and forgiving.

And I think that, if you say, I'm sorry I said that or my views have changed, I think most people think that's OK. I certainly think it's OK.

What's not OK is to waste our time and the resources of federal law enforcement perpetuating a lie. Now, no one who does that, and there are a lot of people who do that, by the way, a lot of fake hate crimes, for example, they're never prosecuted. And she won't be prosecuted.

But shouldn't NBC have to repay that money? Why do they get a pass on this?

O'CONNOR: I would think so. And I think also - I mean, listen, I understand, and I'm all for radio networks forgiving their and not firing their employees - while we're at it, let's have that on the record - but I do think NBC has to answer for a couple of things here because they were part of this, *Tucker*.

They circulated this report from Joy Reid's expert - the cyber security expert that said that she had been hacked. That damages their brand because they're in the business of fact-checking everybody they disagree with. Well, it's time for them to actually come clean a little bit and say, yes, this was all bogus, it was wrong.

There needs to be some transparency there. And, yes, you're right, at the very least, whatever this ended up costing the federal government, NBC, Comcast, Universal, they should repay that money.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Well, I mean, they're liars. We know they're liars. They leaked the "Access Hollywood" type to "The Washington Post". We know that. Everyone who works at NBC knows that and they did it for political reasons and they've never admitted that.

O'CONNOR: Right. They were going to do a thorough investigation into that, though, <u>Tucker</u>. I remember, they made a lot of noise about that thorough investigation.

**CARLSON**: Still trying to find the real killer, Larry.

O'CONNOR: That's right.

**CARLSON**: Larry, thanks for coming on Friday night. Good to see you.

O'CONNOR: Thanks, *Tucker*. You too.

**CARLSON**: Well, the Boy Scouts of America are no more. They're now Scouts BSA. Mike Rowe is an Eagle Scout and he joins us next to discuss the changes and what they mean for us. Stay tuned.

<u>CARLSON</u>: After more than a century of teaching millions of American boys marksmanship and woodcraft, patriotism, good citizenship, the Boy Scouts of America have decided to change completely, starting with their name.

It's now the scouts. It's gender neutral.

Mike Rowe was an Eagle Scout. He went on to host "Dirty Jobs" and "Someone's Gotta Do It". He now hosts Facebook's number one show. It's called "Returning the Favor." We spoke to him recently.

Mike Rowe, thanks a lot for joining us. You were famously an Eagle Scout as a boy. The scouts are no longer the boy scouts, but simply the scouts. What's your response to that?

MIKE ROWE, "SOMEBODY'S GOTTA DO IT" HOST: Well, it's funny you should ask, <u>Tucker</u>, because no less than 10,000 people have asked me that very question over the last month on my Facebook page.

Distinguished eagle scouts, if you're keeping score, five or six years ago, I was awarded that. And it was very touching.

And, look, I'm watching what's happening carefully. I've sent 50,000 to 55,000 letters out over the last ten years to other Eagle Scouts. And I think the country needs the scouts. I think the country needs the Future Farmers of America and Skills USA and 4-H desperately, now more than ever.

So, it does concern me to see all the confusion swirling around the organization. But like so many wounds, I'm afraid many of these are self- inflicted.

And I also think that some of the confusion that's going on is legitimate. I read their official statement. While girls are being welcomed in, I didn't read anything about integrated camping trips or troop meetings.

I think it really is a play to compete more directly with the girl scouts. And I understand why the girl scouts are upset, but since when is competition a bad thing?

## CARLSON: Right.

ROWE: I think character development and leadership development have never been more important than they are today. So, my hope is that the boy scouts assume the opportunity that's presenting itself, and become an antidote for the safe space environment that's out there and push back a little bit.

I mean, not to sound like the angry guy on your neighbor's porch yelling at the kids on the lawn, but when I was in the scouts, in '74 and '75, it wasn't a safe space there in the basement of our church.

I mean, you'd go home with a bloody nose sometimes or a black eye. We had a boxing ring. It was a vibrant place where you really could test yourself and fail in a way that, on the one hand, made you safe enough to attempt, but, on the other hand, didn't try and check every box and please every single person.

It's a tough time. I'm sympathetic for the leaders, but I'm afraid you've got to draw the line somewhere and be very, very clear about what you stand for as well as against.

**CARLSON**: So, you don't see this as the end of something then?

ROWE: I don't know. I mean, again, you either evolve or you die. But at the same time, I think people are confused because the scouts simply haven't come out and said categorically what they're for, right?

So, I just think this conversation touches on every single hot point right now going on in popular culture, from tolerance to acceptance, which, by the way, I'm not sure what the difference between those two things is anymore, but there used to be a big difference.

People are struggling for their own identity. Look, the last time I was on, we talked about this. We talked about the idea that everything is either being informed by a safe space culture or everything is being informed by people who want to be challenged.

I think people are desperate to be challenged. And my hope for these youth- based organizations that help preach character is that they look for people who want to be challenged, and not curry favor so much with those who want a nice reassuring pat on the head.

**CARLSON**: Yes. That's how the episcopal church died.

ROWE: Yes. Wow!

CARLSON: Yes. I watched it happen. Great to see you. Thank you for that. That was really smart.

ROWE: Be prepared. Anytime.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Well, we all know that diversity is our strength. Is it also the key to being a good air traffic controller? The FAA thinks so and has changed the entrance requirements accordingly. You should know that. We have the details next.

**CARLSON**: Well, it's hard to think of a tougher or more important job than being an air traffic controller. Go ahead and try, it will take you a while.

Every day, more than 2.5 million Americans fly in or out of US airports, along with, of course, many billions of dollars of cargo. At any one time, there are about 5,000 aircraft above the United States.

On 9/11, for example, air traffic controllers guided every one of them to a safe landing in a little over an hour. Go ahead and try that.

It's the kind of job where even a small mistake could lead instantly to the deaths of hundreds of people. Not surprisingly, the hiring standards for air traffic controllers were long among the most selective of all federal jobs.

Applicants typically needed to complete military service or pass the FAA's Collegiate Training Initiative Program. After that, they sat for a specially-designed exam that tested for relevant job skills, skills like math ability and complex problem-solving.

Only those with the highest scores made the cut. The system was designed to choose the best. And for decades, it worked.

Then, during the Obama administration, activist bureaucrats decided that the pool of air traffic controllers wasn't diverse enough. They never explained why diversity ought to matter in air traffic control or why it was more important than traditional goals like competence and public safety.

The FAA, without a vote, just scrapped the old hiring system and replaced it with a diversity-friendly version. Most people have no idea this happened.

The FAA now requires many of its applicants to fill out what they call a biographical questionnaire before another other screening. Those who answer the questions in a way that diversity monitors don't like cannot be considered for hiring, not matter how much experience they have or how well they may do on the other portions of the testing.

The biographical questionnaire is all important. So, what is in this biographical questionnaire? Well, we can answer that question because we've got a copy of it and we also got information about how it is scored. And it's shocking!

For example, one question asked test-takers to name their worst grade in high school. The preferred answer for that is science. In other words, if you can't do science, the FAA is especially eager to hire you as an air traffic controller. You get 10 points for being bad at science, according to the scoring sheet.

Another question asked about work history. According to the FAA, the best answer to that question is you haven't worked at all in the past three years. You get 10 points for not working.

Apparently, unemployed people make the best air traffic controllers. This is demented, by the way, but it's real. So do applicants who played a lot of sports in high school. They're rewarded too.

By contrast, applicants who say they know a great deal about air traffic control get only five points. Trained pilots get two points.

Once again, applicants who haven't worked at all, who have been unemployed for the past three years, get 10 points. Pilots, 2 points. This is insane. And it's dangerous. It's also indefensible.

We asked the FAA's top spokesman why applicants for an air traffic control job would get more points for playing high school sports than for flying planes or knowing a lot about air traffic control.

His response, "I'm trying to find that out as well." Well, not actually trying very hard, it turns out. We still haven't heard back with a real explanation and, of course, we won't because there isn't one, other than shut up, diversity.

But we won't shut up. This is too important. Lives are at stake.

Joining us now is Michael Pearson. He's a lawyer representing a man who is suing the FAA for its updated hiring practices. Mr. Pearson, thank you for coming on.

MICHAEL PEARSON, AVIATION ATTORNEY: Thank you, *Tucker*. Glad to be here.

**CARLSON**: Why would the FAA award extra points for incompetence in science, for example?

PEARSON: Well, the biographical questionnaire and biographical assessment, the first version of it, was made to screen out people with experience. It wasn't meant in any form or function that I can find, and I've been looking at this for almost four years now, including looking over many documents we had to fight the FAA for for several years that they kept hidden to answer that question.

The test was basically meant to screen out people with aviation experience. There's even worse questions and answers on the test, but you did a pretty good job of portraying some of the questions and answers on the test.

**CARLSON**: I don't understand. I mean, just to restate for our audience who are so numb to this kind of thinking that it may not penetrate, we're not talking about hiring a sociology professor or some other totally irrelevant job like that.

Talking about air traffic controllers - OK? - who are the linchpin of public safety and transportation. Why would the FAA want people with less relevant skills in air traffic control for air traffic controllers?

PEARSON: Because a group within the FAA, including the human resources function within the FAA, including the National Black Coalition of Federal Aviation Employees, determined that the workforce was too white.

They had a concerted effort through the Department of Transportation of the Obama administration to change that. And quite frankly, they're sacrificing, and have sacrificed, safety at the altar of political correctness.

What happened offends not only the conscience, but also federal law. And we're exposing that.

**CARLSON**: But why would this go on for years without anybody in elected office saying anything about it?

Because just once again - and I'm hard to shock because I do this stuff for a living - we are lowering the standards and intentionally hiring people who are less competent for one of the most critical jobs in the federal government? Lives are hanging in the balance. Why would no one in Congress do anything to stop this?

PEARSON: Well, our law firm, along with Mountain States Legal Foundation, filed the initial lawsuit, and then the group of schools got together, over 30 collegiate training institutional schools got together and actually went to Congress.

And there have been members of Congress. Rep. Randy Hultgren, Rep. Frank Lobiondo have ally held hearings on this. The problem of it is that the union, NATCA, controls a large PAC and they fund a lot of politicians, and nothing will get past in aviation without the blessing of the controllers union.

And their position radically changed when the Obama administration came in. And my belief is that favors were changed. Now, I'm not saying that lightly. I was an air traffic controller at four of the busiest facilities in the country for almost 27 years, along with being an attorney and a professor.

So, when I say these things, it's not based only on experience, it's also based upon documentary evidence and proof I have.

At the end of the day, everyone flies, including members of Congress, who fly quite often. And I think the ones that actually heard the story were offended by it because it's in their backyard. It's a safety interest for them.

This is not a partisan issue, quite frankly, because, again, it's the safety of the national airspace that's at risk here. And I can tell you from training well over a hundred, probably 300 controllers in my lifetime as an FAA controller, that there is a difference.

This is akin to the Veterans' Administration hiring doctors and trying to tell the public that the best physician is one that never went to medical school and that the VA could train them better. And that's exactly what's occurred here.

And to be very straightforward, the mainstream media has not cover it actually and has covered up this issue and has not revealed what's going on. And it's a shame. And it's not only shameful. It again sacrifices public safety.

<u>CARLSON</u>: It goes without saying that people at the FAA we spoke to were such cowardly worms, and I don't say that lightly, that they wouldn't come on and defend this, but I hope someone forces them to.

Very quickly. In 10 seconds, a rhetorical question, did the Obama administration ever show with data that somehow increased diversity in the ranks of air traffic controllers would make the public safer? Did they make that case?

PEARSON: Absolutely not. And there's published data out there that says it's a total farce and incorrect. There's no data to support that. This is social engineering at its finest at the sacrifice again of public safety.

<u>CARLSON</u>: It's totally demented. And we're going to ride this until it's made right because lives are at stake. And we're not overstating it. Thank you very much. You're knowledgeable - the knowledgeable person on this. And we appreciate talking to you.

PEARSON: Happy to be here. Thank you.

CARLSON: We'll be right back. Thanks.

<u>CARLSON</u>: Well, we started <u>tonight</u>'s show with a segment about race. That's an uncomfortable topics and, in some ways, it's an unresolvable one. We'd probably be better off if we talked about it less. A lot of us would be grateful if we're allowed to talk about it less.

But our elites won't let us. They push racial conflict on us constantly. They never stop. The media does it. The people in charge do it. And it's bad. It make people hate each other. It's terrible for this country.

So, why do they keep doing it? Simple. It's a strategy. Divide and conquer. It's a lot easier to run a country for your own benefit when the population is distracted by tribalism, as ours now is. They do it on purpose.

But they're exposed in the new book, "Ship of Fools". The book is coming out this fall. You can order it now. It's mostly lessons learned from this show and the segments we do on it. Hope you like it.

That's about it for us **tonight**. The weekend is coming. Tune in every night, starting Monday, to the show that's the sworn enemy of lying, pomposity, smugness and groupthink. DVR it if you can figure out how that works.

But more than anything, have a great night and a great weekend. See you soon.

## Classification

Language: ENGLISH

**Document-Type: SHOW** 

Publication-Type: Transcript

Transcript: 060101cb.260

**Subject:** RACE & ETHNICITY (90%); RACISM & XENOPHOBIA (90%); CIVIL RIGHTS (77%); CITIES (72%); CITY LIFE (72%); GRANDCHILDREN (72%); GRANDPARENTS (67%); Race Relations; Russia Probe; Justice; Media; Boy Scouts; Aviation; Policies; Politics

Company: STARBUCKS CORP (93%); FOX ENTERTAINMENT GROUP INC (92%)

Ticker: SBUX (NASDAQ) (93%)

 $\textbf{Industry:} \ \mathsf{TELEVISION} \ \mathsf{PROGRAMMING} \ (78\%); \ \mathsf{PRIMETIME} \ \mathsf{TELEVISION} \ (78\%); \ \mathsf{COFFEE} \ \& \ \mathsf{TEA} \ \mathsf{STORES}$ 

(76%); RETAILERS (71%)

Geographic: PORTLAND, OR, USA (79%); OREGON, USA (79%); UNITED STATES (92%)

Load-Date: June 2, 2018

**End of Document**