

## Clare Sumner

---

**From:** Daniel Pruce  
**Sent:** 14 August 2003 20:23  
**To:** Clare Sumner  
**Subject:** FW: DRAFT DOSSIER (J SCARLETT VERSION OF 10 SEPT)

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

**From:** Philip Bassett  
**Sent:** 11 September 2002 15:27  
**To:** Godric Smith, Daniel Pruce, Alastair Campbell  
**Cc:** Matthew Rycroft  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT DOSSIER (J SCARLETT VERSION OF 10 SEPT)

Agree with Godric

& also

- think it needs to be written more in officialese, lots of it is too journalistic as it now stands, with some of it (eg opening chapter as a bio of Saddam !) reading like STimes at its worst eg para 11 "emeshed", "web" or para 13
- needs much more weight, writing, detail even the stuff marked as new (section 6) is only 12 pages at best out of a bundle of 56 (& that's at best eg p35 is all old UNSCOM stuff) It needs to be at least good as IISS, which it isn't yet, and at least as good as things like *Saddam's Secrets*, the book on the hunt for Iraq's hidden weapons, by an ex-UNSCOM and ex-UNSCOM adviser, which I'm not sure it is
- pictures in the text don't get the right feel what about making them look more report-like, less journo-like, by putting them all the end, as appendices ?
- crucially, though, it's intelligence-lite It feels like this is the least possible intelligence material the intell people are prepared to let go (despite the fact that we say at a couple of points eg para 2 that it's everything the Govt knows on the issue - which it clearly isn't) All intelligence material tends to read like unevdenced assertion, and we have to find a way to get over this a) by having better intelligence material (eg by having more material (and better flagged-up) and c) more convincing material (eg by printing some of it eg as appendices, with names, identifiers etc blacked out
- it needs to end At the moment, it just stops (on p42) A conclusion, saying something - making a case which is compelling At the moment, it isn't

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

**From:** Godric Smith  
**Sent:** 11 September 2002 12:35  
**To:** Daniel Pruce, Alastair Campbell  
**Cc:** Matthew Rycroft, Philip Bassett  
**Subject:** RE: DRAFT DOSSIER (J SCARLETT VERSION OF 10 SEPT)

I think there is material here we can work with but it is a bit of a muddle and needs a lot more clarity in the guts of it in terms of what is new /old In each area we need to distinguish between the two and better source (as much as we can) to intelligence It needs to be more factual if anything, less assertion based, with the rhetoric stripped out as I think this undermines it

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

**From:** Daniel Pruce  
**Sent:** 11 September 2002 10:04  
**To:** Alastair Campbell  
**Cc:** Matthew Rycroft, Philip Bassett, Godric Smith  
**Subject:** DRAFT DOSSIER (J SCARLETT VERSION OF 10 SEPT)

It's getting there, but needs more work My initial thoughts on this latest draft

### Ownership:

- the foreword is good but whose voice is it? Do we need a minister to sign it off? Probably not Who will issue the text? Us? The Cabinet Office? Why don't we issue it in the name of the JIC? Makes it more interesting to the media,

### Saddam: