

Richard Sambrook-Internal

From: Barbara Kerr
Sent: 07 August 2003 01:55 PM
To: Richard Sambrook-Internal
Subject: FW: Ariel

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

From: zzStephen zzWhittle
Sent: 30 June 2003 13:06
To: Richard Sambrook-Internal
Subject: RE: Ariel

For what it is worth, just been talking to [redacted] from the [redacted]
said to stick to our guns. He had been hearing similar things!

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

From: Richard Sambrook-Internal
Sent: 30 June 2003 12:58
To: zzStephen zzWhittle
Subject: RE: Ariel

V happy

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

From: zzStephen zzWhittle
Sent: 30 June 2003 12:43
To: Sally Hillier
Cc: Richard Sambrook and PA
Subject: Ariel
Importance: High

Comment for Ariel who wanted a comment on the existing guidelines and whether we should change. Please shout if you have a problem.

"Our guidelines on the use of sources are clear and allow for situations where a credible single source is involved, as was the case here. Political journalism would be well nigh impossible if every story emanating from senior politicians required several sources. The Today story was based on someone who was in a position to know, who had been reliable in the past, and was confirming and clarifying something which was already coming to the BBC and other news organisations from the intelligence community. We remain reluctant as a general rule to rely on only one source, but from time to time a single significant source will be enough. The decision to publish must always be based on careful editorial judgement."

BBC/5/0160

437

Stephen
Stephen Whittle
Controller, Editorial Policy
333 Henry Wood House
BBC
☎ 020 7765 5655
✉ <mailto:stephen.whittle@bbc.co.uk>