

TRANSCRIPT

Programme(s)	The Channel Four News
Date & time	Friday 27th June 2003 1910
Subject / interviewee	<i>Intelligence dossiers on Iraq – Alastair Campbell</i>
Prepared by	Paul Ellis
Contact numbers.	020 7276 1080 – Pager 07659 137 572 – 24hrs, every day

Jon Snow: *Well now we are joined by Alastair Campbell. a rare moment, thank you for, for coming in. This row between you and the BBC, I mean, many will see it as a diversionary tactic to prevent people actually seeing the real issue here which is that MPs are not getting to the root of whether in fact the intelligence we were provided with was the real intelligence provided by the intelligence services*

Alastair Campbell: Well if people wish to see it as a diversionary tactic they may. The media are constantly telling people never to take things at face value. This isn't a row between me and the BBC this is an attempt by the Government to get the BBC to admit that a fundamental attack upon the integrity of the Government, the Prime Minister, the intelligence agencies, let alone people, the, sort of, evil spin doctors in the dark who do their dirty works in the minds of a lot of journalists, let them just accept for once they have got it wrong. The allegation, let's just understand what this allegation amounted to, and these weasel words in Richard Sambrook's letters, letter today (indistinct) says to me we didn't make the allegation we reported a source making the allegation. What does that say about journalism? You've been a journalism for decades, I was a journalist for quite a long time, I respect a huge number of journalists including many at the BBC.

JS: *But I have to say.*

AC: ... but they're now saying I, you can say anything you want on the television because somebody said it to you, doesn't matter if it's true ..

JS: yes ...

AC: doesn't matter if you check it, doesn't matter if it's corroborated .

JS: *however the BBC's ..*

AC: you can say it

JS: *the BBC's riposte to you is very reasoned. It is set in the context of all the other information which was in the public domain, it's entirely consistent with that information. It credits the Guardian, the Observer, the Independent, the Times, I mean, most of Fleet Street had similar accounts of what intelligence sources were telling them. The BBC doesn't seem to be out of step with anybody else*

AC: The BBC in their letter to me, and it's fascinating, they have post facto justification of a story by citing sources in newspapers which wrote stories subsequent to their, to the story that they had done. Some of those stories I know for a fact are incorrect. One of them, there's no point going through all the detail I think the public are probably bored rigid with this already, one