
WITNESS STATEMENT OF SUSAN WATTS,
SCIENCE EDITOR, BBC NEWSNIGHT
TO HUTTON INQUIRY REGARDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE DEATH OF
DR DAVID KELLY:

Attachment F

Confirms him and that it was campbell referring to in our previous conversation...

...flak?

They wouldn't think of me I don't think..

Is that only item where u had concerns because it was single sourced.

Have to remember I'm not part of the intelligence community - I'm a user of intelligence - alth familiar with a lot of it and asked to comment on it but not deeply embedded some cant comment cos don;t know if single sourced

But on the 45 mins?

Well that I knew because I knew the concern abt the stmt - it was a stmt that was made and it just got out of all proportion. They were desperate for information ...they were pushing hard for info which could be released...that was one that popped up and it was seized on and it's unfortunate that it was...that's why there is the argument between the intelligence services and cabinet office number ten because they picked up on it...and once they've picked up on it you can;t pull it back from them

Against yr advice that they published it?

I wouldn;t go as strongly as to say that. . that particular part, because I wasn't involved in the assessment of it...so can't say was against MY advice. I was uneasy with it - my problem was I could give other explanations, which I've indicated to you - time to erect something like a scud missile or time to fill a 40 (?) barrel multi barrel rocket launcher

All sorts of reasons why 45 mins might well be important. - I have no idea who de-briefed this guy.. quite often it's someone who has no idea of the topic - the info comes through and people then use it as they see fit...xxxx

So wasn't as if lots of pple were saying don't put it . .just that in there and seized upon rather than number ten specifically going against ?

Xxx there were lots of pple were saying that . /it was an interesting week before the dossier was put out because there were so many pple saying well I'm not so sure abt that - or in fact that they were happy with it being in but not expressed the way that it was - because the words used (?) are actually quite important - intelligence community a pretty cautious lot on the whole - but once you get people presenting it for public consumption then of course they use different words - I don't think they are being wilfully dishonest I think they just think that that's just the way they think the public will appreciate it best...I'm sure you have the same problem as journalists....

(simple)

in words pple understand and in heart of hearts you must realise that's not actually the right thing to say but it's the only way you can if got to get it over in two mins.

SJW | 1 | 0045¹

I didn't write that section...no - I reviewed the whole thing...and was involved with the whole process xx... but in the end it was just a flurry of activity and was very difficult to get comments in because people at the top of the ladder didn't want to hear some of the things..

But you expressed yr unease?

Well Yes yep yes

How feel now that no 10 denying this and AC saying was all in the intell material

Well I think it's a matter of the perception isn't it...I think pple will perceive things and there will be how shall I put it...they will see it from their own standpoint and they may not even appreciate quite what they were doing

Need an inquiry

Yes but in six months time when at end of evaluation of Iraq...too early to be talking abt the intelligence because lot of intell wd appear to be good a quality intell and takes long time to get info from Iraq - process has only just started...

One of the problems with the dossier - and you and I have talked abt this.. was it was presented in a very black and white way without quantitative aspects of it ...only quantitative aspects were figs from essentially unscm figs which in turn are iraq figs provided to unscm - xxx tonnes anthrax xx tonnes VX - all of that Iraq figs - nothing else quantitative...not qualitative - either they have weapons or they don't have weapons - that in turn has been interpreted as a vast arsenal ...I'm not sure any of us ever said that...pple have said to me that was what was implied...we discussed it as did many pple - my own perception is yes they had weapons but actually not xxxx at this point in time - but problem was one can anticipate without any form of insp and that a real deterrence then that would develop + that was the real concern - not so much what they had now, but what they would have in the future.. but that unfortunately was not expressed strongly in the dossier because that takes away the case for war...to a certain extent

(cough)

Clear and present imminent threat

Yes

Other stuff

Hope to get involved in interviewing, but not - reason is these guys are not talking

What need to open them up

War trials>

Has to be a selection of tools depending on who individ is..

etc

SJW/1/0046²

wd it be accurate then as you did it in that earlier conversation to say that it was AC himself...

all I can say is the number ten press office...I've never met AC so I can't - but I think AC is synonymous with the press office because of course he's responsible for it ..

IAEA - unmovic back in?...un will have roel but how does Un engage with the coalition forces? Difficult for them to work in harmony because of animosity...tremendous anti-US feeling at unmovic...if they had been allowed to continue job - that wd have been able to solve it...may not be the case but that's how they see it ..

as we've seen over the mobile labs - politics of that is so strong that it has deflected all practical objectivity...

has yr assessment of impt change - went from 90 went down to 45%

in terms of likelihood of it being a fermentor - i think still down in the 40s

really still that low - is

yes yes

is that because don't have the right info?

have more than had before but still don't have the right info.. until this team reports back ...xxx finished job - until they give data it's actually quite difficult to maek a determination - whatever it is it's certainly a very unusual fermentor...

where do you stand on Rumsfeld point of possibility of weapons being destroyed before war -

it IS a possibility - find it difficult to comment - it is a possibility - it may be that they had such a small arsenal that it was determined that it wouldn't be militarily effective, and therefore it would provide the embarrassment that was required to embarrass the coalition - I'm not sure - I mean that's such a trivial thing, can't think that wd be the case - v diff to rationalise why they wd be destroyed after having worked so hard for so years to conceal them - can't think that that wd be the case ..

strategic thinker?

„ Yes but I think a lot is going to come out...one thing is to talk abt hardware which is what a pple are concerned abt over weapons ...but I think it will actually either come out from individuals if they choose to talk or it will come out of documentation - I think that is more likely to provide the incriminating evidence - there will be something somewhere in a documents ...unless totally destroyed - not sure at highest level what they used to do in terms of keeping multiple copies of things - certainly lower down the chain Iraq was so bureaucratic one could virtually guarantee there wd be 6 copies of something...

SJW | 1 | 0047³

CIA report on mobile labs – funny report – looked to me as if pushed out on a whim over night – not well edited – repeated paragraphs. .cutting and pasting and things left...

ends...

SJW | 1 | 0048⁴