

(dialing tone)

(number is dialled)

(rings)

KELLY. David Kelly.

WATTS. Hi David, it's Susan here

KELLY: Oh hi. I've just left you a voice mail

WATTS: Er yes, I've just picked that up

KELLY: Oh right.

WATTS. (*inaudible*) I was just. erm, relaxing after a week of doing GM crops, so –

KELLY. (*laughs*)

WATTS: (*laughs*) Er, I was hoping I wouldn't have to cover that story much again after the previous row, but it's all come up again with the national debate starting next week. So there we are Erm, yes, I – so you've been in New York?

KELLY: Yeah, it was the UNMOVIC's Commissioners' meeting, Blix's farewell one –

WATTS: Oh, of course

KELLY: So it all went very smoothly and no-one said anything controversial Erm, of course, he gives a presentation to the Security Council next week on his report –

WATTS: Ah, right Which day is that?

KELLY: - which is actually very detailed

WATTS. Is that - ?

KELLY. Er, it's not yet been fixed, but it'll be one day

WATTS: Right, and what's that likely to contain anything interesting, or - ?

KELLY. Er, it's actually a factual account of, erm, the inspections that they undertook, but it's padded out with all sorts of – well I shouldn't say padded out – all sorts of statistical(?) stuff, but it's in there. It's erm – it's pretty – it's not – it's not controversial.

SJW/3/0001

WATTS: Right.

KELLY: Not my idea of controversial Cos it does comment on the mobile lab, it does comment on some of the finds that they have –

WATTS: Right.

KELLY And the destruction of the Al-Samouds.

WATTS: Okay Erm, have you – well, I'm sure since you've been in New York – I don't know whether you've been following the kind of – the rumpus that's erupted here over the, er, spat between the Intelligence Service and the erm –

KELLY. Well, I guessed something was up, but I read the Times this morning and I could see that there was something there. I assume that it follows on from what was happening with Bates(?) and Rumsfeld's comments.

WATTS Yes, well it's partly prompted by Rumsfeld. Two statements by Rumsfeld: the first one saying that erm – his phrase is it was possible that the weapons had been destroyed before the war started. Then he went on, I think in another speech yesterday, to say that the use of the argument over – the position of WMD was for bureaucratic reasons rather than being the prime motive for war, which is a rather amazing statement

KELLY: Yeah, yeah.

WATTS: Erm, but what intrigued me, and which prompted me to ring you, was the quotes yesterday on the Today programme about the 45 minutes –

KELLY: Yeah, yeah

WATTS: - part of the dossier.

KELLY. Er, we've (*inaudible*) about this before of course.

WATTS: We have

KELLY I think you know my views on that. Er –

WATTS: Yes, in fact you were, you were quite – I've looked back on my notes, and you were actually quite specific at that time. I may have missed a trick on that one, but er –

KELLY (*laughs*)

WATTS: (*laughs*)

KELLY. Er, and it was –

SJW/3/0002

WATTS: Er, you were more specific than the source on the Today programme.  
Erm –

KELLY. *(laughs)*

WATTS. Not that that necessarily means that it's not one and the same person.  
but – erm, in fact you actually – you actually referred to Alistair  
Campbell in that conversation

KELLY Er, yeah, yeah With you?

WATTS. Yes.

KELLY: Yeah And I did talk to Gavin Hewitt yesterday, he was over in New  
York.

WATTS Oh right

KELLY. So he may have picked up on what I've said. *(inaudible)* exactly the  
same thing.

WATTS. Mmm *(laughs)* Erm, yes And so he presumably decided not to name  
Alistair Campbell and stuff. which *(inaudible)* of Number 10

KELLY. Yep, yep

WATTS: Hmm Are you getting much flack over that?

KELLY. Me? No.

WATTS. *(laughs)*

KELLY: Not yet anyway, I was in New York, so – *(laughs)*

WATTS: Yeah, that's good timing *(inaudible)*

KELLY Erm, but I mean they wouldn't pick(?) on me, I don't think

WATTS: Right.

KELLY. *(inaudible)*

WATTS: Erm, so is that the only erm – is that the only item in the report that  
you have confirmed as being single source rather than double source  
*(inaudible)*?

KELLY. Erm, I'm – you have to remember I'm not part of the intelligence  
community(?) I mean, I'm a user of intelligence of course; I'm very  
familiar with a lot of it –

SJW/3/0003

WATTS. Mmm

KELLY: (*inaudible*) can't comment on it. But I'm not particularly buried(?) in (*inaudible*)

WATTS. Mmm.

KELLY So some of it I really can't comment, cos I don't know on whether it's single source or not.

WATTS: Mmm

KELLY: Erm --

WATTS. But on the 45 minute --

KELLY Well, that I knew, because I knew of the concern about the statement I mean, it was -- it was a statement that was made, erm, and it just got out of all proportion, you know They were desperate for information --

WATTS. Mmm.

KELLY: - which (*inaudible*) or information which could be used. That was one that popped up, and it was seized on. and it's unfortunate that it was (*inaudible*) why there is the argument that it was the Intelligence Services, Cabinet Office and Number 10 (*inaudible*). And once they've picked up on it you can't pull it back (*inaudible*).

WATTS Mmm But -- and it was against your advice that they should publish it?

KELLY: I wouldn't go as strongly as to say -- that particular bit, I -- cos I was not involved in the assessment of it. I mean, no, I can't say that it was against my advice.

WATTS Right.

KELLY: I was uneasy with it. I mean my problem was I could give other explanations, which I've indicated to you

WATTS: Yes

KELLY (*several inaudible words*) 45 minutes might as well be important. I mean, I have no idea who convinced this guy -- quite often someone who(?) has no idea of the topic. Er, the information comes through and it was then (*several inaudible words*)

WATTS. Erm, so it wasn't as if there was lots of people saying "don't put it in, Doctor(?), don't put it in?" it's just it was in there (*inaudible*) rather than --

STW | 3 | 0004

KELLY: Erm –

WATTS: - erm, Number 10 specifically going against –

KELLY: There were a lot of people saying that I mean, it was an interesting week before the document got out, because there were so many people (*inaudible*) saying, “well, I’m not sure about that,” or in fact they were happy with it being in but not expressed the way that it was.

WATTS: Right

KELLY: Cos you know, the words (*inaudible*) are actually quite important.

WATTS: Mmm.

KELLY: And the intelligence (*inaudible*) pretty cautious lot on the whole, erm (*inaudible*) putting it – presenting it for public consumption, but of course they – they used(?) different words. And I don’t think they (*inaudible*) dishonest; I think they just think that that’s the way the public will appreciate (*inaudible*). I’m sure you have the same problem as journalists, cos sometimes you’ve got to put things into words that the public will understand

WATTS: (*inaudible*)

KELLY: Erm, and in your heart of hearts you must realise that sometimes that’s not actually the right thing to say, but it’s the only way you can put it over if you’ve got to put it over if you’ve got to put it over to hundreds(?) of people

WATTS: Did you actually write that section in which (*inaudible*) the 45 minutes, or was it somebody else?

KELLY: Erm, I didn’t write that section, no I mean, I reviewed the whole thing, and (*several inaudible words*).

WATTS: Erm –

KELLY: But in the end, I mean it was just – it was just a flurry of activity, and it was very difficult to (*inaudible*) the top of the ladder would(?) want to hear some of that(?) So it was just –

WATTS: So you expressed your unease about it, put it that way?

KELLY: I – well – yes, yeah.

WATTS: So how do you feel now, given that Number 10 is seriously denying this, and Alistair Campbell specifically yesterday saying that (*inaudible*) nonsense, it was all in the intelligence(?) material?

STW | 3 / 0005

KELLY: Well, I think it's a matter of perception, isn't it? Er, I think people will perceive things(?) and they'll be – how shall I put it? Er, they'll see it from their own standpoint, and they may not even appreciate quite what they were doing

WATTS Do you think there ought to be a Security and Intelligence Committee enquiry, or - ?

KELLY: Yes, but not now. I mean, (*inaudible*) I think you – yes, that has to be done in about six month's time when we'll have actually have come to the end of the evaluation of Iraq and the information that they're(?) going to come up with. I personally think it's far too early to be talking about the intelligence (*several inaudible words*) particularly this week, with (*inaudible*) intelligence, (*several inaudible words*).

WATTS: Mmm

KELLY: And it takes a long, long time to get the information that is required from Iraq. The process has only just started. And I think one of the problems with the dossier – (*inaudible*) have talked about it in part – was that it was presented in a very black and white way, without any sort of quantitative(?) aspects of it. The only quantitative(?) aspects were the figures (*inaudible*) which again are Iraq figures presented to Parliament(?) All of that actually is Iraqi(?) figures. But there was nothing else in there that was quantitative(?) or (*inaudible*). I mean, it was just a black and white thing set out (*inaudible*).

WATTS Yes.

KELLY: And that in turn could be interpreted as being (*inaudible*) article(?) I'm not sure (*inaudible*) would accept that (*several inaudible words*) many people. But my own perception is that yes (*inaudible*) and at this point in time, the problem was that (*inaudible*) perception (*inaudible*) at your peril(?) then that would be better. I think that was the real concern was not so much what do they have now, but what are they going to have in the future.

WATTS: Yeah

KELLY: But that unfortunately wasn't expressed strongly in the dossier

WATTS: Mmm.

KELLY: Because that takes away the case for war. (*inaudible*)

WATTS: Clear and present imminent threat.

KELLY: Yeah.

SJW/3/0006

WATTS Yes. Erm, so er, did you pick up anything in New York last week as to the, er – as to whether you'll be going back in, or the chances of –

KELLY: Oh the New York –

WATTS: - UNMOVIC going back in?

KELLY: Oh, I see what you mean. Er, yeah, I think – remember I don't wear a blue hat(?) any more I mean, I go out to advise them (*inaudible*) but I don't wear a blue hat any more. I don't think UNMOVIC –

WATTS: No, but you were talking – you were hoping that you might get involved in some of the interviewing process.

KELLY: I'm still hoping for that (*laughs*). It hasn't happened yet.

WATTS: Right

KELLY: I think the reason for that is, of course, these guys aren't talking. And there's actually not a lot of (*inaudible*) actually don't know.

WATTS: Mmm

KELLY: Somehow they – once they start opening up, that's (*inaudible*).

WATTS: What's likely to make them start opening up, then? Do you think you do need to get to a stage of talking about war trials? Or is that only going to make things worse?

KELLY: Erm, yeah, well I think there has to be a whole selection of tools (*inaudible*) depending on who the individual is. There'll be some individuals where I suspect there's no option but for them to face up to the fact that they're going to be tried (*inaudible*) Iraqi court, you may need another court. There may be others who will actually hope that that's not going to happen to them, (*inaudible*) reassurances that that won't happen. Who can actually provide that (*inaudible*) I don't know. It can't be just a threat(?) So I really – I really don't know. And then of course there are all sorts of other incentives (*inaudible*): financial incentives (*inaudible*) regular (*inaudible*) give financial rewards for people who come forward (*several inaudible words*) There are forces that are against the US who are sort of Saddam loyalists (*inaudible*) maybe they're not. And they face retribution afterwards. So it's actually quite a complicated situation. So (*inaudible*) talk about those (*several inaudible words*).

WATTS: Yes

KELLY: (*inaudible*)

SJW/3/0007

WATTS: ERm, okay. Just erm – just back momentarily on the present(?) issue Erm (*inaudible*) the erm – er, so would it be accurate, then, as you – as you did in that earlier conversation, to say that it was Alistair Campbell himself who –

KELLY: I can't – I – all I can say is the Number 10 press office I mean, I've never met Alistair Campbell so I can't –

WATTS. They seized on that

KELLY. But I think this kind of thing happens (*inaudible*) press office (*inaudible*).

WATTS: Hmm. Right, okay. And erm. now that we're going to see IEA inspectors are going back in, do you feel any more optimistic that erm the replacement to Blix will lead(?) a team back in?

KELLY: Well, the IEA inspectors will be (*inaudible*). They're not. they're not going back in to do –

WATTS: A proper job

KELLY: Yeah They are doing the job that they did before they'll go in, they will check on the distribution of radioactive material, and they'll evaluate (*inaudible*) make recommendations about how that could be dealt with, and they may have a role of supervising that(?). but I don't think it'll be much beyond that

WATTS. Right So you don't feel optimistic. then?

KELLY: Well, I – I think that eventually the UN is going to have a role to play in this, but I think that the difficulty is how does the UN engage with Coalition forces? There has to be a process. But(?) they can't both do the same job(?). I think it'll be very difficult for them to work in harmony together, because of the animosity between the UN and the US. They'll have to vote for (*inaudible*) and between people who are involved It'd(?) be tremendous (*inaudible*) UNSCOM(?) (*several inaudible words*) there's tremendous anti-US feeling.

WATTS. Mmm.

KELLY. (*inaudible*) do their job that it would solve the problem

WATTS. Mmm

KELLY. I mean, they actually think that. And so they would want to be(?) (*several inaudible words*) and I think it'll be very difficult. (*several inaudible words*) of Iraq are still so strong.

WATTS: Yes.

SJW/3/0008

KELLY: Reflects an enormous(?) lack of objectivity.

WATTS: Has your assessment of whether that's -- as to how important that is -- changed from your -- I think it was 1990 you went down to 45% -

KELLY: Oh, in terms of the likelihood of being (*inaudible*) I think it's probably down to 40.

WATTS: Really, it's still that low?

KELLY: Oh yeah. Yeah, I --

WATTS: Is that still because you don't have the right information or because you --

KELLY: Well, I have more than I had before, but I still don't have the right information

WATTS: Right.

KELLY: So until this team reports back, and (*inaudible*) whether they've actually finished their job (*inaudible*) as you know (*inaudible*).

WATTS: Mmm.

KELLY: And till they come back and actually give their (*several inaudible words*) But whatever you think it is, it's certainly something(?) very unusual (*inaudible*).

WATTS: So where do you stand on the Rumsfeld point about the possibility of the weapons having been destroyed before the war started?

KELLY: Well, it is a possibility. I (*inaudible*) -- I find it difficult to comment. I mean, it is a possibility (*inaudible*) Saddam Hussein(?). Erm, I mean it may be that they had such a small arsenal that it was determined that there would(?) be (*inaudible*) and therefore (*inaudible*) required to embarrass Bush. I'm not sure (*inaudible*) such a trivial thing; I don't (*inaudible*) to rationalise why they were destroyed when they worked so hard to (*inaudible*) conceal(?) them (*inaudible*).

WATTS: Or I suppose there's some evidence that Saddam was a fairly strategic thinker, so if he decided, you know, that this was it, (*inaudible*) instruments recorded that he had nothing.

KELLY: Yeah, yeah.

WATTS: Erm, (*inaudible*) that's the only way you could make any sense out of it.

STW/3/0009

KELLY: I think a lot of it – I mean, one thing that we're(?) talking about is hardware, which is what people are certain(?) about (*inaudible*) But I think it's actually (*inaudible*) part of the Blix report was the amount of documentation (*several inaudible words*). There will be something somewhere in Saddam's documents (*inaudible*) destroyed.

WATTS: So they'd indicate it was destroyed, then?

KELLY: No, it – no, unless those documents have been destroyed

WATTS: Themselves

KELLY: Erm, and I'm not sure at the highest level what the – in terms of keeping multiple copies of things. Certainly lower down the chain in Iraq, it's so bureaucratic that you're virtually guaranteed there is a copy. But at the highest level I wouldn't(?) know.

WATTS: Good. Okay, well erm, are you around next week or are you off abroad again?

KELLY: Erm, I'm around next week. Erm, I'm going back to the States. I'm around, but I expect to be more away than I am in the country (*inaudible*) my days can change - my plans change daily

WATTS: Okay, but if – if you suddenly have a surprise in the Blix document I'll perhaps ring you, but you're not anticipating that?

KELLY: Erm, I'm not, but (*inaudible*) (*laughs*) you might find there's a surprise there. I'm certainly around Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, that's for sure

WATTS: Right, okay

KELLY: Erm, so I'm in London Monday, Tuesday (*inaudible*) my mobile

WATTS: Okay, well I'll contact(?) you if I need you, but I'll avoid doing that (*inaudible*)

KELLY: (*laughs*) Call me in the evening. That's no problem (*inaudible*) do that.

WATTS: Okay

KELLY: (*inaudible*) the day, cos I tend to be at MoD and the Foreign Office

WATTS: Yes

KELLY: (*inaudible*)

WATTS: Right, okay. Good. Okay, well –

SJW/3/0010

KELLY Okay.

WATTS: Many thanks again, erm –

KELLY: No problem.

WATTS. And I'll talk to you soon.

KELLY· Yeah Are you doing anything (*inaudible*) or are you - ?

WATTS: I'm doing – well, at the moment I'm – I've been mainly concentrating on GM crops, but Newsnight has been doing pieces the last week – the last two or three nights on the Rumsfeld situation, and I've been feeding things in, or you know, pointing people in – so the CIA's report on the mobile labs came out yesterday, make sure that's (*inaudible*). Erm, it may be next week –

KELLY· That's a funny report

WATTS Yes

KELLY: It's – to me it looks as though it's just been pushed out at a whim, (*inaudible*) overnight

WATTS. But then – well yes, that'd be interesting(?) (*inaudible*) coincide with (*inaudible*).

KELLY· Well, if you look at it, the thing's – it's not well edited

WATTS: No

KELLY. It's – the same thing is said in different paragraphs (*inaudible*) there seems to have been cutting and pasting going on, and things left(?) around the place.

WATTS And also obviously it was put on the site, and then it wasn't announced that it has been put on the site – the CIA site – for seven hours, which is kind of weird if you want to draw people's attention to it (*inaudible*) Erm, but it might be that kind of Tuesday I think, when the Commons are back, Blair is going to be under pressure to (*inaudible*) statement (*inaudible*) I might get back (*inaudible*) again

KELLY. Yeah

WATTS· So we'll see.

KELLY· Yeah. Okay.

WATTS. It kind of varies between me and the general thought(?) –

STW/3/0011

KELLY: *(laughs)*

WATTS: What I'm up to.

KELLY: Yeah.

WATTS: Okay, well thanks again. Thanks for calling back, David, and I'll keep in touch.

KELLY: Yep, okay thanks

WATTS: Cheers, bye

KELLY: Bye.

*(hang up)*

*(dial tone)*

STW/3/0012