

SUCR)



10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

Director of Communications and Strategy

1 April 2003

Mr Andrew

Andrew Gilligan claimed on Radio 5 that "people here are saying the Republican Guard hasn't really been damaged at all and they could be right." (R5 1220). Can you tell me who told him the Republican Guard hasn't been damaged - the Iraqi Ministry of Information?

On what evidence does he base this claim - in particular the assertion that 'they could be right'?

Was this report monitored? Does Mr Gilligan have a minder?

Would you agree Andrew Gilligan's report yesterday broke several of the BBC's own guidelines, including:

"Reports should normally make it absolutely clear where the information has come from, and be attributed accordingly."

"Reporters and correspondents in the battle areas will often be reporting what they have not themselves seen. That should be made evident."

"We will have a great deal of information from both military and various governments' briefings. That too should be made evident and tested as to its reliability."

"We should also make clear if our reporting has had to take place with a 'minder' present or our ability to travel has been circumscribed by the authorities."

"Beware of speculation, and overstated claims from all sides. Context is essential."

Since drafting this letter, I have heard that Mr Gilligan reported as follows on the subject of Saddam's son Uday: "He is a fairly wild sort of character to be honest and he is alleged to have tortured opponents of his father's and of his. He's

BBC/4/0146

144

SAC

been reined in a bit by the regime actually in, in recent years, it's fair to say". On what did he base the claim that Uday has been "reined in by the regime?"

Uday is in large part the regime. Has Mr Gilligan ever met or seen him? What independent corroboration does he have that he has been "reined in a bit by the regime actually in, in recent years, it's fair to say".

I look forward to receiving your reply.

To my

Al

ALASTAIR CAMPBELL

Richard Sambrook
Director of News
BBC

BBC/4/0147

145

From: The Rt. Hon. Gerald Kaufman, M.P.

WILLIS
CAMPBELL PAGE 01
DRA
DUNNING STREET PRESS
OFFICE - CORRESPONDENT



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

1 April 2003

Fax: 0208 576 7120

Richard Sambrook
Director
News

Dear Mr Sambrook

Andrew Gilligan claimed on Radio 5 today that "people here are saying the Republican Guard hasn't really been damaged at all and they could be right" (R5 1220)

Who told him the Republican Guard hasn't been damaged - the Iraqi Ministry of Information? On what evidence does he base this claim - in particular the assertion that 'they could be right'? Was this report monitored? Does Mr Gilligan have a minder?

Would you agree Andrew Gilligan's report today broke several of the BBC's own guidelines, including:

"Reports should normally make it absolutely clear where the information has come from, and be attributed accordingly."

"Reporters and correspondents in the battle areas will often be reporting what they have not themselves seen. That should be made evident."

"We will have a great deal of information from both military and various governments' briefings. That too should be made evident and tested as to its reliability."

"We should also make clear if our reporting has had to take place with a "minder" present or our ability to travel has been circumscribed by the authorities."

"Beware of speculation, and overstated claims from all sides. Context is essential."

Yours sincerely

BB C 4/0148

146

F
CAMPBELL
CORRESPONDENT
A

PS



10 DOWNING STREET
LONDON SW1A 2AA

Director of Communications and Strategy

2 April 2003

Dear Richard

On Radio 4 this morning, Andrew Gilligan said:

"I've seen Saddam give two televised speeches and then a couple of other silent appearances if you like just talking to ministers and the two televised speeches I saw looked completely different. Indeed you might even say it was a different Saddam, may be it was. The backdrop was different, the appearance of the President was different, the way he spoke; one he was wearing glasses the second he wasn't. one he was reading from a hand written text the second he had a prepared speech. Lots of things were different so I'm not quite sure where these intelligence assessments come from it might just be more rubbish from Central Command."

Do you believe that final sentence was justified?

Yours sincerely

P. ALASTAIR CAMPBELL
Director of Communications and Strategy

Richard Sambrook
BBC
Via fax: 020 8576 7120

BBC/4/0149 147