

CONFIDENTIAL

**From:** Alastair Campbell  
**Date:** 17 September 2002

**JOHN SCARLETT**

**cc:** Julian Miller  
Daniel Pruce  
Jonathan Powell  
David Manning

Please find below a number of drafting points. As I was writing this, the Prime Minister had a read of the draft you gave me this morning, and he too made a number of points. He has also read my draft foreword, which I enclose (he will want another look at it before finally signing it off but I'd appreciate your views at this stage).

He said he thought you'd done a very good job and it was convincing (though I pointed out that he is not exactly a "don't know" on the issue).

He feels that Chapter 3 should be re-ordered, to build towards the conclusions through detail ie. start with paragraph 8 (chemical agent) through to paragraph 16, then do paragraphs 2-7, then paragraph 1. If you agree, it would need a little re-writing.

He, like me, was worried about the way you have expressed the nuclear issue particularly in paragraph 18. Can we not go back, on timings, to "radiological device" in months; nuclear bomb in 1-2 years with help; 5 years with no sanctions.

He wondered if there were any more pictures that could be used.

He thought we should make more of the "no civil nuclear" point, and list dual use products.

He felt we don't do enough on human rights, and Saddam's disregard for human life is an important point. He felt there should be more made of the points in the box on page 45

My detailed comments on the draft, which is much stronger.

CAB/11/0066

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

1. In light of the last 24 hours, I think we should make more of the point about current concealment plans. Also in the executive summary, it would be stronger if we said that despite sanctions and the policy of containment, he has made real progress, even if this echoes the Prime Minister.
2. In the summary you are clear that Saddam's sons have authority to authorise CW/BW use. In the text (Page 23) it is weaker "may have".
3. Can we say he has secured uranium from Africa.
4. Could we use the 60,000 figure in the executive summary, re aluminium.
5. Also in executive summary, can we be clear about the distances by which he is seeking to extend missile range.
6. "Vivid and horrifying", re human rights, doesn't fit with the dry text around it.
7. Re illicit earnings, how much of the 3 billion is illegally gained.
8. On page 15 can we list quantities of eg. Shells, sprays etc.
9. On page 16, bottom line, "might" reads very weakly.
10. On page 17, 2 lines from the bottom, "may" is weaker than in the summary.
11. On page 19, top line, again "could" is weak "capable of being used" is better.
12. Re FMD vaccine plant. It doesn't need the last sentence re "probable" renovation.
13. On page 24, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, you say 1991 when I think you mean 1998.
14. The nuclear timelines issue is difficult. I felt it worked better in the last draft. Julian showed me: namely "radiological devices" in months: nuclear bomb 1 - 2 years with help; 5 years with no sanctions.
15. It would be stronger if you could be more explicit about when a JIC assessment has gone to the PM, and the basis upon which it has been published.

CAB / 11 / 0067

CONFIDENTIAL

16 I've seen Ed Owen's comments, and don't agree that there are too many bullet points in the executive summary.

ALASTAIR CAMPBELL

CAB/11/0068