

Alison Blackshaw

From: Ed Owen@fco.gov.uk
Sent: 17 September 2002 15.41
To: [redacted] jscarlett@fco.gov.uk
Cc: Mark Sedwill@fco.gov.uk, dpruce@fco.gov.uk, akelly@fco.gov.uk, Edward Chaplin@fco.gov.uk, richard.stagg@fco.gov.uk, William Ehrman@fco.gov.uk, [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; Charles Gray@fco.gov.uk; Stephen.Pattison@fco.gov.uk, Tim Dowse@fco.gov.uk, [redacted]@fco.gov.uk, [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; mark.matthews@fco.gov.uk, [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; Andrew Patrick@fco.gov.uk, [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk, jmliner@fco.gov.uk; [redacted]@fco.gov.uk
Subject: RE: Iraq - Dossier



ATT02837.htm

I want to limit my remarks to the Executive Summary which I do not think reads well enough to give a sceptical reader the confidence to believe that this dossier provides the necessary information.

Para 2 should not include reference to the IISS (too defensive so early on) and should start

"A huge amount of information about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction is already in the public domain from United Nations reports and from Iraqi defectors. This shows that Iraq continues to possess chemical and biological agents and weapons from the Gulf War etc

Delete last sentence and provide new par 3 which reads

"An independent overview of this public evidence was provided by the IISS in its report, "xxx", on 9th September. This report also suggested that Iraq could assemble nuclear weapons within months of obtaining fissile material from foreign sources. We endorse the IISS's analysis

New para 4 should then begin:

"As well as this publicly available evidence, significant additional information is available to the Government ... etc.

Then there should be a new par which follows and starts

"As a result of this intelligence we judge that Iraq has

- bullet points to follow.

I think there are too many bullet points. The first one repeats what we have said already and the fifth is pretty obvious. The 10th about Ababil-100 only makes sense to Jane's Weekly. The 12th again appears superfluous

I think about eight bullet points which perhaps combine existing points would be far more persuasive

I think it odd that we only mention UNSC resolutions until the end of the exec summary. It's also rather oddly written. Shouldn't it read something like.

"In continuing to develop weapons of mass destruction Iraq has flagrantly flouted international law. In a series of SC resolutions, Iraq is under an

CAB/11/0054

obligation to destroy its arsenal of these weapons, under the supervision of UN's inspection regime. But, as this paper sets out, Iraq has a history of dishonesty, deception, intimidation and concealment in its dealings with UN inspectors which left in 1998

Hope this helpful

Ed

Surely and 3 are long and dense Par 2 is confusing and its reference to the IISS report somewhat odd

CAB/11/0055