

[REDACTED]

From: Jonathan Powell [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 September 2002 15:45
To: Alastair Campbell, Scarlett John - SEC - A
Cc: David Manning
Subject: RE:

Importance: High

Found my copy I think it is good
I agree with Alastair you should drop the conclusion.
Alastair - what will be the headline in the Standard on day of publication?
What do we want it to be?
I think the statement on p19 that "Saddam is prepared to use chemical and biological weapons if he believes his regime is under threat" is a bit of a problem. It backs up the Don McIntyre argument that there is no CBW threat and we will only create one if we attack him I think you should redraft the para My memory of the intelligence is that he has set up plans to use CBW on western forces and that these weapons are integrated into his military planning
It needs checking for typos, eg Iraqi in middle of page 27.

> —Original Message—

> From: Alison Blackshaw On Behalf Of Alastair Campbell
> Sent: 19 September 2002 12.43
> To: Scarlett John - SEC - A
> Cc: Jonathan Powell; David Manning
> Subject
> Importance: High
>
> I had a quick skim and am now out of the office until 2 30pm.
>
> Re the foreword, I don't like the first sentence which makes him sound a bit James Bond-y. Can we discuss?
>
> I don't think the conclusion works I would either revert to, and strengthen, the box idea, or drop. In a way, the foreword covers most of the points.
>
> I'm not sure about the "protest and project" his power bit.
>
> Could the Shia uprising point go in the executive summary?
>
> P.26, para 17, line 4, can we say "required for", rather than "that could be for use in".
>
> "May have" re Qusai is very weak.
>
> Sorry this is so rushed.