

people marching on the streets of London against the war, they had a historic revolt in the Commons and they were under a lot of pressure.

Frankly it seems to me that in that position they are not really in a, able to judge whether or not we were impartial. What we were doing at the time was reflecting the wide range of views in the country.

JN: *So the word disproportionate which he used in describing the way that we dealt with critics and on this programme and others, you're suggesting that there was no disproportionate treatment of criticism as being better news than the other side of the story?*

RS: No I don't believe there was at all. I mean the way BBC's, conducts its journalism is to ask questions, raise issues and debate them openly with a wide range of views and that, that's how we've approached the war in the way that we approach everything else

JN: *And the argument that as a consequence of as he would put it having been proved wrong the, the, the tendency is to point up failures or difficulties in Iraq now by way of justifying a previous view*

RS: No, well all we have done since then is to raise questions which have been brought to our attention by people we know to be senior and credible sources in the intelligence service and it's an issue of public interest

JN: *Let's get to the crux of it, which is what happened in the preparation of the September dossier and in particular that piece of information which suggested that biological and chemical weapons could be used having been activated in a forty five minute time span. Now Mr Campbell resents what Andrew Gilligan has said about this. Here's how he described it to the Committee.*

Alastair Campbell: Privately we have been trying to seek acknowledgement about this for some weeks and it's absolutely hopeless because when you're dealing with the, the BBC I'm afraid they just will not admit that they can get things wrong.

I think there's a world of difference between political exchanges and, and the rest of it and a, a story broadcast on the BBC followed up by every single national newspaper, followed up in newspapers around the world that says the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary, with the connivance of me and the intelligence agencies persuaded Parliament and the country to go to war on a false basis

I think that is a pretty unbelievable allegation to make unless you can sustain it. And I have not see a single thing that sustains it. I've seen the Defence Correspondent change his story time and time again, talk about one source, then there were four sources, then his sources actually were journalists on other newspapers. I mean it's not that, if that is BBC journalism then, you know, God help us.

James Naughtie: *Let's talk about sources. Are you satisfied that the source is credible and reliable?*

Richard Sambrook: I'm entirely satisfied that it is a senior, credible and

CAB | 1 | 0337