

DECLASSIFIED



Foreign &  
Commonwealth  
Office

London SW1A 2AH

20 September 2002

Dear Matthew,

**Iraq: Commons Debate: Supplementaries**

...

I enclose a set of the present state of the supplementaries for Tuesday's debate. Given the speed with which events are moving, they will clearly need further tweaking on Monday.

I am copying this pack to Adam Ingram's office.

Yours sincerely,  
Mark Sedwill

(Mark Sedwill)  
Private Secretary

Matthew Rycroft Esq  
10 Downing Street

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## INDEX

- I Military Action/Regime Change
- II UN route
- III WMD
- IV Terrorism
- V Sanctions
- VI Humanitarian Situation (including Depleted Uranium)
- VII Human rights
- VIII No Fly Zones
- IX Northern Iraq/ Kurds
- X Iraqi opposition/regime change/INDICT
- XI Kuwaiti missing/property issues

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## I. MILITARY ACTION

### *Military Action/Legality/Splits/Double Standards & Hypocrisy/Adverse effects*

#### **Military action against Iraq**

- No decision has been taken to launch military action. Prime Minister has said repeatedly that military action should only ever be a last resort.
- But as dossier clearly sets out, Iraqi regime has accelerated its weapons programmes since departure of inspectors. Saddam should be in no doubt about our determination to remove the threat of his WMD.
- We are giving Iraqi regime every chance to comply with UN resolutions. If it continues to defy the UN, then military action to deal with the threat it poses becomes more likely.

#### **Why pick on Iraq now – what has changed?**

As the Prime Minister said on 3 September:

*"It is not that for 10 years he has not been a problem, he has been a problem throughout the last 10 years. What has changed is one, that the policy of containment isn't any longer working, certainly without a massive change in the way that the regime is monitored and inspected; and secondly, we know from 11 September that it is sensible to deal with these problems before, not after."*

#### **Wouldn't military action be illegal**

- No decision to launch military action has been taken.
- Iraq's obligations are unambiguously set out in the relevant Security Council resolutions; and Iraq is clearly in breach of them. The UK is committed to ensuring that any military action it undertakes anywhere in the world is carried out in accordance with international law.
- Our view of legal position was laid out in more detail to the FAC and can be found in the FAC's 20 June 2002 report on the Foreign Policy Aspects of the War Against Terrorism.

#### **Isn't the rest of the world against military action?**

- No decision to launch military action has been taken. But crystal clear that the entire international community wants to see full compliance by Iraq with UNSCRs.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## Split with rest of EU?

- No. Danish PM Rasmussen set out EU position in speech to General Assembly on 12 September: "Iraq is in breach of several resolutions of the Security Council on her disarmament obligations - these obligations must be complied with immediately. The EU is determined to support the efforts of the UN to that end. We agree with the US that this matter should urgently be dealt with by the Security Council. We agree with the Secretary General that if Iraq's defiance continues, the Council must face its responsibilities.
- Repeat that we are committed to proceeding prudently and in consultation with allies and partners.

## *Double standards & hypocrisy*

### **Double standards on Israel/Palestine, other proliferators**

- We press for the implementation of UNSCRs everywhere. In the case of Israel and the Palestinians, priority is implementation of UNSCR 1402, which imposes obligations on both sides, including Israeli withdrawal from Palestinian cities and a meaningful ceasefire leading to the resumption of political negotiations. In Iraq, we need to see the early and unconditional return of weapons inspectors.
- What singles out Iraq as a proliferator is Saddams' demonstrated willingness to use WMD and wage war against his neighbours. Naive to suppose that we could persuade Saddam through dialogue to give up his weapons: he has been flouting the will of the international community for over ten years.
- In cases of other proliferators, we have tried to address our concerns through dialogue. This is what we have been doing with Iran, North Korea and Libya, even though some people have criticised us for this.
- Urge all countries, including Israel, to sign and fulfil commitments under the relevant international conventions on arms control (notably the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention)

**Fact that UK and US backed Saddam against Iran shows how hypocritical war would be.**

- Previous relationships irrelevant. Saddam has been an international outcast for over a decade.

## *Effects on Iraqi people/The region*

Wouldn't military action hurt the Iraqi people themselves?

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

- No decision has been taken to launch military action. Prime Minister has said repeatedly that military action should only ever be a last resort.
- Unlike Saddam Hussein, we have always tried to minimise the adverse effects of our actions on the Iraqi people, and we will continue to do so.

## **Wouldn't military action in Iraq destabilise the whole Middle East?**

- No decision has been taken to launch military action. Prime Minister has said repeatedly that military action should only ever be a last resort.
- There are many aspects we would need to take into account in taking a decision to launch military action. This is why we are considering all the options carefully, with our allies.
- But Saddam should be in no doubt about our determination to remove the threat of his WMD. Nowhere is this threat higher than in the region.
- President Bush's 12 September call in the UN General Assembly for the UN to deal with the Iraqi threat has been widely welcomed, including in the region.

## ***Regime change/"Day After" questions***

### **Regime change policy**

- We have always said we believed Iraq, the region, the world would be a better place without Saddam Hussein.
- As the Prime Minister said on 3 September:

*"the key objective is to deal with the threat [that Iraq] carries on building up chemical, biological, nuclear weapons capability. Either the regime starts to function in an entirely different way, and there hasn't been much sign of that, or the regime has to change."*

- [UK/US splits, if required:] We and the US are united in our determination to deal with the threat. As the PM has said, we have to deal with the issue of weapons of mass destruction and Iraq - it will not go away. There are many different ways of dealing with it, but we have to deal with it.

## **What about government in Iraq after any possible military action?**

- We repeat - no decision has been taken to launch military action.

DECLASSIFIED

## DECLASSIFIED

- The government of Iraq is a matter for the Iraqi people. But we believe that the Iraqi people deserve a better Government: one based on the rule of law and respect for human rights, economic freedom and prosperity.
- We welcome the external opposition's role in discussing the future of Iraq and debating issues like democracy which cannot be discussed within Iraq itself. Government officials meet regularly with the external Iraqi opposition to remain informed of their thinking on such issues.
- We look forward to a future Iraqi regime which co-operates with the UN and which represents the interests of all its people, and we would support political and humanitarian efforts to reintegrate such a regime into the international community.
- As since the end of the Gulf War, Britain would remain at the forefront of efforts to help the Iraqi people.

### **Would a new regime be any better?**

- Difficult to see how it could be worse. Saddam's regime has used chemical weapons against its own people and caused regional instability by invading two of its neighbours and threatening others. These actions have cost the people of Iraq dearly - in addition to the losses and damage of war and the compensation that Iraq has been obliged to pay for its wanton aggression against Kuwait, the regime has sacrificed tens of billions of dollars of potential income in order to maintain a WMD threat.
- And Ba'athist rule has brought with it the brutal suppression of political, religious and community rights. The Iraqi regime's human rights record is one of the worst in the world.

### **Isn't the opposition divided, quarrelsome and lacking credibility?**

- The external opposition has an important role in debating the future shape of an Iraqi state, something which cannot at present be done within Iraq itself. In different ways they reflect the social tensions that any future regime in Baghdad will have to contend with. In many areas they have come a long way in formulating ways to overcome these obstacles. We welcome efforts by the opposition to co-ordinate together and present a joint platform.

### **Don't the Kurds just want independence and won't the end of a strong leadership lead to civil war and chaos?**

- Both the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan (PUK) and the Kurdistan Democratic Party (KDP), as well as all the other major political groupings within Iraq, support the territorial integrity of Iraq and want the chance to agree on a more representative system, with a government in Baghdad committed to the rights and interests of all its citizens. More representative government is the best guarantee of long-term stability.

DECLASSIFIED

## DECLASSIFIED

It is not the case that the only way to rule an ethnically and religiously diverse is by dictatorship. There are plenty of examples to the contrary.

- We have always supported territorial integrity of Iraq. We wish to see autonomy (not independence) for the Iraqi-Kurds.

**Wouldn't a democracy, which will probably lead to a Shi'a-led government, push Iraq closer towards Iran?**

- There are strong cultural links between the Iraqi Shi'a and those in Iran. However, there are also major differences between the Arab Shi'a of Iraq and the Persian Shi'a of Iran. We should recall that during the Iran-Iraq war (1980-88) the Shi'a of Iraq fought alongside their Sunni counterparts.
- After eight years of destructive war with Iran and the unresolved issues arising from it (Prisoners of War and exchange of bodies) substantive dialogue between the two regimes is to be encouraged. We hope that any future Iraqi regime would negotiate better relations with all its neighbours.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## II. UN ROUTE

### UN responsibility

- Best way to eliminate WMD is to get the inspectors back into Iraq, immediately and unconditionally. Top priority to do this soon.
- This is why Prime Minister has warmly welcomed President Bush's call in the UN General Assembly for a new UN Security Council resolution on Iraq.
- As Prime Minister has made clear, UN is right place to deal with issue of Iraq and its WMD, because it is the UN's authority that has been consistently flouted. But this must be on the basis that the issue is dealt with, not avoided.

### Iraqi "offer" on inspections

- We are naturally sceptical about Iraq's latest move. Iraq has a long history of playing games. This apparent offer to allow weapons inspectors to return 'without conditions' comes only four days after Iraq's Deputy Prime Minister said precisely the opposite.
- Nevertheless, whatever it means, this offer has only come through the determination of the international community to stand firm against Saddam Hussein's threat.

### New UN resolution

- [Because of Iraqi regime's long history of playing games] we have no intention of abandoning plans for a new UN Security Council resolution on Iraq. We are looking for actions not words. No chance of this happening if we take the pressure off now.
- New resolution or resolutions will make unmistakably clear to Iraq what its obligations are to the UN. It must establish a tough and intrusive inspections regime; and allow for an early test of whether the Iraqi offer is genuine.
- [If required] As we have made clear, UK will be at the heart of discussions in New York. Too early to say how drafting will proceed.

DECLASSIFIED



111

## **Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)**

### **1. Does Iraq possess WMD?**

Yes. Iraq is still hiding weapons of mass destruction in a range of locations. The regime has admitted hiding chemical, biological weapons and missile parts in the desert (buried in the sand), caves and railway tunnels. We also believe that it has the capability to deliver these weapons to a range of locations.

The Iraqi regime has admitted producing large quantities of chemical warfare agents including Sarin, Tabun, Mustard and VX gases. It has also admitted to producing biological warfare agents such as anthrax, botulinum toxin, gas gangrene and aflatoxin.

In the course of their work between 1991 and 1998, UN weapons inspectors were unable to account for thousands of tonnes of so-called precursor chemicals used in the production of weapons; hundreds of tonnes of precursor chemicals used in the production of VX nerve agent; and tens of thousands of special munitions which can be used in chemical and biological weapons.

### **2. Developments in Iraq's WMD Programmes Since the Last Inspections?**

Despite tight controls on imports of military and weapons-related technology, the Baghdad regime continues to pursue ballistic missile, nuclear, chemical and biological programmes in breach of its UN obligations.

We believe that Iraq has recently accelerated its weapons programmes. For example:

Saddams's ballistic missile programme has made continued progress and facilities damaged by Operation Desert Fox in 1998 have been repaired. In the absence of inspections, we believe that he is planning to extend the range of his current missiles beyond the 150km limit imposed by the UN.

# DECLASSIFIED

We are concerned by reports of increased nuclear procurement. We think that R&D on a nuclear weapons programme has restarted. If sanctions are lifted, we believe that Saddam could develop a nuclear weapons programme within 5 years. If he were able to procure fissile material from outside Iraq, then he might possess a nuclear weapons capability in a much shorter timeframe.

We believe that the Iraqi regime continues its biological and chemical weapons programmes.

In these circumstances, it is more important than ever that the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors are given unconditional and unrestricted access to all relevant sites in Iraq. This means completely unfettered access to any site, any where, any time.

### **3. What are we doing to stop Iraq developing acquiring WMD?**

UN measures have played a vital role in frustrating Saddam's ambitions to develop WMD. UNSCOM and IAEA inspectors in the 1990s were able to account for significant aspects of his chemical, biological, missile and nuclear programmes. And UN controls on Iraqi imports have made it more difficult for Iraq to acquire easily the WMD technology it is seeking.

We continue to press for the earliest possible resumption of UN weapons inspections to ensure Iraq's full compliance with its disarmament obligations.

We continue to prohibit the export to Iraq of any goods which could be used in a WMD programme.

A new regime to control the export of such goods, The Goods Review List (GRL), was adopted by the UN Security Council on 14 May 2002. This changes the controls on Iraq from the previous situation where all exports to Iraq were prohibited unless approved by the UN to one where all goods are automatically

DECLASSIFIED

## DECLASSIFIED

allowed except for the more focused list of items on the GRL. GRL is not a denial list. It is focused exclusively on military and WMD-related goods, the import of which into Iraq will require full consideration (e.g. who will be using the goods, where and for what purpose) before making a decision. Its adoption by the Security Council demonstrates that the international community remains united in its determination to control the export of military-related items to Iraq.

#### **4. Surely sanctions have stopped Saddam getting WMD?**

Sanctions have helped make Iraqi acquisition of WMD and the means to deliver them more difficult and have undoubtedly slowed the pace of their reconstitution, but there are always those who are willing to breach sanctions. Some equipment has reached Iraq's WMD programmes. Particularly in the case of biological and chemical weapons, the equipment required to produce biological or chemical agents is the same as that required to produce legitimate chemical or biological products. The only way to ensure that such equipment is not going to WMD programmes is to have inspectors on the ground and an effective Ongoing Monitoring and Verification (OMV) system in place.

#### **5. If sanctions are effective, why do you need to take action?**

As the PM said on 3 September -

"The policy of containment isn't any longer working, certainly without a massive change in the way the regime is inspected and monitored".

If Saddam has nothing to hide, he has nothing to fear from letting in inspectors, but they must be let in.

#### **6. Won't Saddam use his WMD if cornered?**

No decision has been taken to launch military action. The PM has said repeatedly that military action should only ever be a last resort.

We are giving Iraq every chance to comply with UN resolutions. But Saddam should be in no doubt about our determination to remove the threat of his WMD.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## **7. Aren't the Weapons Inspection Bodies Merely Tools of Western Intelligence Services?**

Absolutely not. UNMOVIC, like UNSCOM, is entitled to seek information and advice from all possible sources in pursuit of its mandate to destroy Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction capability.

UNSCOM Executive Chairman Richard Butler made clear that he always insisted on all UNSCOM activity being carried out strictly in pursuit of its disarmament mandate, not to benefit any individual member state. The Chairman of UNMOVIC, Dr Hans Blix, has emphasised that his organisation will act in the same way.

UNSCOM's successor, UNMOVIC, has also made clear that it will need to draw on open source material and information from governments in making its own, independent assessment of Iraqi programmes.

We have stated publicly that all activities by UK nationals assigned to UNSCOM, and all information exchanges between the UK and UNSCOM, were strictly in pursuit of UNSCOM's mandate to dismantle Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction capability. The US Government has made similar statements.

## **8. Don't Scott Ritter's Allegations Undermine Your Case?**

In assessing Iraq's record of compliance with UN weapons inspectors, we should all refer to the report produced by the then UNSCOM Chairman, Richard Butler, in 1999.

This report represents an account of Iraqi deceit. There are many damning extracts. For example:

- In 1991 Iraq "decided to limit its disclosures for the purpose of retaining substantial prohibited weapons and capabilities"
- Butler declared that Iraqi activity had had "a significant impact upon the Commission's disarmament work."

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

- Contrary to the requirement that destruction be conducted under international supervision, "Iraq undertook extensive, unilateral and secret destruction of large quantities of proscribed weapons and items";
- And Iraq "also pursued a practice of concealment of proscribed items, including weapons, and a cover up of its activities in contravention of Council resolutions."

Against this background, I am sure you will agree that we have very good reason to question the assertions of Iraq and independent experts such as Mr Ritter that Iraq is no longer pursuing WMD programmes.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## Supps on UK nuclear weapons policy for Iraq debate

### Would you use/rule out use of nuclear weapons against Iraq?

We have no plans to use our nuclear weapons against Iraq.

The threshold for any potential use of the UK's nuclear weapons remains as high as ever. We have made it clear that the circumstances in which any use of nuclear weapons might have to be contemplated are extremely remote. The fundamental role of the UK's nuclear weapons is political, not military and we have repeatedly stated that we would only consider their use in extreme circumstances of self-defence and in accordance with our obligations under international law.

Nonetheless, the Government continues to believe that there is no benefit to be gained from speculation about hypothetical scenarios when the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons might be considered. To do so would remove the key element of ambiguity from our deterrent posture.

### Didn't the Defence Secretary threaten the use of nuclear weapons against Iraq (in the HCDC)?

The Defence Secretary did not threaten the use of nuclear weapons against Iraq. Commenting on general UK nuclear deterrence policy.

### What about CBW threat?

The UK seeks to deter use of these weapons by making clear that use will not secure political or military advantage for an aggressor. On the contrary, it will invite a proportionately serious response, and we will hold personally accountable those at every level responsible for any breach of international law relating to the use of such weapons. Any state that chose to use them should therefore expect us to exercise our right of self-defence and to respond accordingly.

### UK policy on first use of nuclear weapons?

The Government has made clear on many occasions that it would only consider using nuclear weapons in self-defence and in extreme circumstances. But it does not determine in advance exactly how it will react to aggression, and therefore has neither a first use nor a no first use policy.

The UK and NATO therefore leave this question open, to be decided in the context of all circumstance prevailing at the time. In so doing, we seek to ensure uncertainty in the mind of any aggressor about the nature of our response to aggression against the UK or our Allies.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

*(If pressed)*

The Government does not believe that a policy of no first use of nuclear weapons would in practice add to international confidence, or to the prospects for nuclear disarmament.

*(If raised) The UK's Negative Security Assurance (NSA):*

- The UK remains committed to the NSA we made at the NPT RevCon in 1995. This was confirmed in a statement by the UK's head of delegation to the NPT Prepcom in April this year, who said: *"There has been speculation in the press about whether the UK is still committed to the negative security assurances we gave in 1995 ... I can assure those who have concerns that these fears are groundless. I would like to take this opportunity to remind delegations that we remain fully committed to our declaration on Negative Security Assurances in April 1995, as noted in UN Security Council Resolution 984. Our policy has not changed."*

*(For information: the full text of the UK's NSA is as follows:*

*"The United Kingdom will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT except in the case of an invasion or any other attack on the United Kingdom, its dependent territories, its Armed Forces, its Allies or on a State towards which it has a security commitment, carried out or sustained by such a non-nuclear-weapon State in association or alliance with a nuclear-weapon State.*

*"In giving this assurance the United Kingdom emphasises the need not only for universal adherence to, but also for compliance with, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In this context I wish to make clear that Her Majesty's Government do not regard their assurance as applicable if any beneficiary is in material breach of its own non-proliferation obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons."*)

# DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## WHY PICK ON IRAQ AND NOT OTHERS?

- We do not let other proliferators off the hook. On the contrary, our approach to Iraq is fundamentally identical to the way we approach other states believed to be pursuing WMD programmes.
- We engage the governments concerned, politically and diplomatically and through the UN to bring pressure for compliance with their international non-proliferation obligations. We also exert pressure through our efforts to block proliferators' access to sensitive materials and technology relevant to WMD and missiles.
- That is precisely what we have also tried to do with Iraq for almost 12 years. The difference is that in the case of Iraq the diplomatic route has constantly been obstructed by Saddam's intransigence and duplicity. This route has been blocked completely since UNSCOM and IAEA inspectors left Iraq in December 1998 - leaving no alternative but to consider other options.
- Whatever we may believe or suspect of others, we know of Saddam Hussein. UNSCOM and the IAEA uncovered his WMD programmes leaving no shadow of doubt. His use of chemical weapons against Iran and against his own people at Halabja puts him in a league apart.
- Iraq has been proved to have broken every commitment it has ever made under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. No other state has such an extensive proven record of duplicity.
- Iraq, uniquely, is subject to 14 Security Council obligations (in 5 separate Resolutions) relating to its WMD and missile programmes. It is in flagrant violation of all of them.

DECLASSIFIED



# DECLASSIFIED

## Supplementaries: LATW Dossier

### Iraqi intention to use WMD

- Iraq is a proven threat to its own people and to the region. We cannot look only at threats to the UK and US. If UK and US demonstrate any lack of resolve over dealing with Iraqi WMD, Iraq will interpret this to mean no threat of reprisals in the event of their continued use.
- Iraq is under obligation to the UN to have its WMD programmes destroyed under international supervision. If the UN does not enforce compliance with this obligation, its credibility will be seriously undermined. We cannot hide behind a parochial approach and watch the UN lose its credibility.

The best way to avoid prompting Iraqi leaders to use any non-conventional capacity would be to refrain from invading Iraq or attempting to assassinate or depose its rulers

- The best way to avoid Iraq using its WMD is to ensure the destruction of existing WMD stocks and the means for its delivery, and to have in place credible mechanisms to ensure Iraq does not simply restock once inspectors have left the country: in other words, the readmittance of inspectors with unfettered access, any time, any place, anywhere.
- Iraq has only made its latest offer as a result of the threat of military action. We must maintain this pressure if we are to avoid a repeat of the vents of 1998, when Iraq said it would readmit inspectors unconditionally and then embarked on a continued campaign of obstruction and obfuscation.

### Halabja - MENARG looking at this

Iraq has never used chemical weapons against an external enemy without the acquiescence of the most powerful states

### Arming terrorists

- The UK does not base its argument on this: we are concerned about the threat to the region and the wider world by Iraq's continued possession of and willingness to use WMD.
- Iraq has since the Gulf War attempted to assassinate the President of the US. This clearly shows their continued willingness to use such means against the outside world.

### Internal Repression

The most effective way of preventing any future use [of WMD] against Iraqi civilians is to put this at the top of the human rights agenda between Iraq and the UN

DECLASSIFIED

## DECLASSIFIED

- The best way to avoid Iraq using its WMD is to ensure the destruction of existing WMD stocks and the means for its delivery, and to have in place credible mechanisms to ensure Iraq does not simply restock once inspectors have left the country: in other words, the readmittance of inspectors with unfettered access, any time, any place, anywhere.

- Iraq has refused to admit the UN Special Rapporteur on Human Rights since ???

In 1998, when the US ordered UN weapons inspectors to leave Iraq, it was widely accepted that Iraq's nuclear capability had been wholly dismantled

- The Director General of the IAEA reported to the Board of Governors in September 2002 that

In recent months the UK Government has put primary emphasis on Iraq's alleged nuclear programme

- Read the dossier. The UK Government does no such thing. We are equally concerned about Iraq's proven possession of biological and chemical agents and the means to deliver them.

IAEA experts maintain that Iraq has never had the capacity to enrich uranium sufficiently for a bomb and was extremely dependent on imports to create centrifuge facilities

- LATW contradict themselves here. Iraq was developing an indigenous centrifuge facility to enrich uranium. The dossier makes clear that in 1991, Iraq was enriching uranium for use in nuclear device, and the IAEA gives details in its 1997 consolidated report that Iraq had instituted a "crash programme" to divert fissile material from its civil reactors to shorten this timeline by "up to two years". The reason the "crash programme" failed was damage caused to Iraq's nuclear infrastructure by coalition forces during the Gulf war.

Journalists have visited al-Qaim and have found it in a state of disrepair

- The journalists, many of whom admitted in their articles that they were not disarmament experts and could make no objective judgement, were taken on a carefully stage-managed tour, taken on a planned route that did not cover the whole facility. This visit, and other similar media stunts arranged by the Iraqi authorities, cannot be taken as any substitute for qualified inspectors with free and unfettered access.

Enriching uranium requires substantial infrastructure and a power supply that could be easily spotted by US satellites

- Iraq has become expert at concealing its facilities, as evidenced by the facilities that were uncovered by UNSCOM when it was able to carry out its UN mandate. Facilities can be concealed underground, in remote locations or within other facilities. Satellites cannot cover every inch of Iraqi territory, and without

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

intelligence to direct surveillance to a particular location, cannot be expected to detect concealed activity. Absence of evidence must not be taken as evidence of absence.

Iraq could have a nuclear bomb within months if fissile material is acquired from abroad

- We agree with LATW that this is not credible. Our dossier gives HMG's assessment of the timescale for this, based on technical assessment of Iraq's nuclear weapons programme. LATW will be pleased to hear that HMG, and the rest of the G8, is engaged with Russia to ensure the security of its fissile material and supports the negotiation of an FMCT.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## IV TERRORISM

### **Has our Iraq policy created a climate for terrorism?**

- Wrong to suggest there can be any such justification for terrorism. Our Iraq policy is and will remain based on the imperative of containing the very real threat posed by the Iraqi regime to Iraq's people and neighbours.
- We have never sought to punish the Iraqi people. On the contrary we have been at the forefront of efforts to maintain tight controls on Iraq's military capabilities while minimising the effects on Iraqi civilians.
- By contrast Saddam Hussein has clearly shown that he would rather spend Iraqi oil money on weapons and luxuries for his cronies, not the welfare of his people.

### **What evidence is there of Iraqi support for terrorism?**

- Iraq has a long record of support for terrorism; this includes support for Palestinian terrorist groups (e.g. Abu Nidal) and the activities of the MeK against Iran, as well as the assassination of political opponents.

### **Was Iraq behind the 11 September attacks/Are there links with Al Qaeda?**

- We are keeping an open mind about Iraqi links with Al Qaeda. Nothing we have seen so far suggests Iraq was involved in the 11 September attacks. But we are investigating all reports of links.
- We must guard against the terrifying prospect of Saddam Hussein passing weapons of mass destruction to terrorists such as Al Qaida. Al Qaida has said that it is seeking and would use weapons of mass destruction.

### **By going after another "Islamic" country you are playing into UBL's hands.**

- We are determined to ensure the widest international support for the firm line we are taking against Saddam – that is why we want to address this issue through the UN.
- Impatience with Saddam's game-playing growing in the region and the Islamic world.
- Nothing "Islamic" about Saddam – a brutal, secular tyrant, with no respect for human life, or Islam. Our quarrel is with him, not the Iraqi people.

### **Manipulation of Palestinian crisis**

- Saddam Hussein has consistently sought to exploit the plight of the Palestinians to further his own ends – most recently his sickening encouragement of suicide bombing, his payment to bomber's families and his grandstanding by cutting off oil

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

exports (which can only hurt ordinary Iraqis). But in reality he is only interested in his own survival and his own military ambitions. He certainly was not thinking of the Palestinians when he invaded Kuwait.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## V SANCTIONS

### **UN sanctions have caused death of 1.5 million Iraqis since 1990?**

- Pure Iraqi propaganda. No evidence for these figures which are published by Iraqi regime and which no independent observer has been able to verify. These figures climb steeply when Iraqi regime feels under most international pressure – have climbed by a million in last year alone.

### **Haven't sanctions actually strengthened Saddam Hussein's regime?**

- Aim of sanctions is not to depose or weaken the regime, but to force Iraq to comply with the UN's obligations and prevent the regime from obtaining weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMD).
- No doubt that Saddam would much prefer to have sanctions lifted. He has invested a great deal of effort to that end.

### **But they have no effect on Saddam?**

- Sanctions deprive him of control of the vast majority of his oil revenue – over \$11 billion last year. Reject the argument that this is a satisfactory situation for him.
- Sanctions have also helped to contain Saddam who remains an international pariah.

### **Aren't sanctions widely disregarded?**

- No. They are, for the most part, effectively implemented. There will be leakages in any sanctions regime. But illegal trade is small as a proportion of Iraq's pre-Gulf War trade or trade within "oil for food".
- For individual countries to ensure that sanctions are not violated in or via their territory. We raise violations with the countries concerned.
- The UK also participates in the multinational Maritime Interdiction Force which patrols the Gulf in order to crack down on sanctions busting.

### **Sanctions prevent export to Iraq of harmless goods such as pencils and children's toys?**

- Stories of bans on pencils to prevent Iraq importing 'graphite' are just that – ridiculous stories. These items are regularly exported to Iraq. No sense whatsoever in banning such harmless items.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## **But UN sanctions on Iraq should be targeted?**

- They are. Full implementation of revised sanctions in July 2002 - under UN resolution 1409 - changes controls on Iraq from the original situation, where all exports to Iraq were prohibited unless approved by the UN, to one where all goods are automatically allowed except for those on a more focused list of military-related goods - the Goods Review List (GRL).
- GRL - a public document - is not a denial list but a review list. UN considers full circumstances of the export of GRL listed goods (such as who will be using the goods, where and for what) before making any decision about their export to Iraq.
- The changes have expedited humanitarian exports to Iraq, and made clear the culpability of the Iraqi regime for the people's continued suffering. The United Kingdom is proud we initiated and fought for these changes.

## **Lifting of sanctions?**

- UN resolutions consistently make clear that Iraq holds the key to its reintegration into international community by complying with UN resolutions, particularly on disarmament. Iraqi rejection of UN requirements an obstacle to progress.

## **Why does UK hold up Oil for Food contracts?**

- With introduction of revised sanctions in July 2002, no longer any holds put on Oil for Food contracts. Only items of military concern are passed to Sanctions Committee for a decision - accept or reject.
- UN currently reviewing all holds which existed on introduction of revised sanctions in July.

## **Humanitarian flights to Iraq in breach of sanctions?**

- UK interpretation, consistent with EC regulation 2469/96 and UN SCRs, is that all proposed flights to Baghdad need prior approval of Sanctions Committee, providing Committee with full details, including proposed cargo and passengers. All but a handful of flights to Baghdad have received Sanctions Committee approval.
- The UK has consistently approved humanitarian flights to Iraq. We encourage organisations to provide additional humanitarian assistance to the Iraqi people - and called on them to do so in SCR 1284.
- Resumption of scheduled commercial flights involving financial transactions with Iraq would be a clear contravention of Security Council Resolutions.

DECLASSIFIED

## DECLASSIFIED

**Why are the former UN humanitarian co-ordinators (Hans von Sponeck & Denis Halliday) critical about "oil for food" programme?**

- UN programme is a unique and complex programme worth billions of dollars each year. Administering it is a huge job, particularly when the Iraqi regime does so little to help and so much to obstruct the UN's efforts. It is a job for an experienced and dedicated administrator who is committed to making the most of the humanitarian programme in the interest of the Iraqi people.
- Unfortunately, Hans von Sponeck (and before him Denis Halliday) chose to focus on the political debate rather than the job in hand. It became clear early on that while trying to maintain a difficult and tense relationship with the regime in Baghdad, they disagreed with the decisions of the Security Council and the purpose of the UN resolutions. They were therefore not inclined to make "oil for food" work.
- In contrast Mr Lopes da Silva, the current incumbent, and his predecessor, Tun Myat, have worked hard to implement programme as effectively as possible during last two years to benefit the Iraqi people. UN officials describe the programme as having made an 'ocean of difference' to the lives of the Iraqi people.
- Disappointing that von Sponeck and Halliday, who failed to make any impact with "oil for food" a couple of years ago, continue to judge current progress by their own standards. Disappointing too that in between their discussions with the Iraqi regime they devote more effort to rubbishing the programme than ever they did to making it work.

DECLASSIFIED



# DECLASSIFIED

## **VI HUMANITARIAN SITUATION (including DEPLETED URANIUM)**

### **What is UK doing to ease humanitarian situation?**

- UK has been at the forefront of the efforts of the international community to improve the humanitarian situation in Iraq.
- Aside from our role in the UN, UK aid to Iraq continues both bilaterally and through the EU. Since 1991 the UK has donated over £100 million worth of aid, making us one of the largest donors.
- DFID has allocated £6 million this financial year for humanitarian assistance to Iraqi people, focusing on de-mining, vulnerable groups funding and infrastructure rehabilitation projects for hospitals and water and sanitation facilities.
- EU recently agreed €13m of humanitarian aid for the most vulnerable, for clean drinking water and health facilities.

### **Shouldn't sanctions be lifted now to reduce suffering?**

- Sanctions are not responsible for the suffering in Iraq. The Iraqi regime is.
- To lift sanctions before the Iraqi regime relinquished its weapons of mass destruction, would allow the regime to threaten, once again, the Iraqi people and Iraq's neighbours.
- We are dealing with one of history's most brutal regimes.
- Suffering of the Iraqi people is needless. Billions of dollars available for the purchase of civilian goods. No reason for the Iraqi people to want except for the Iraqi regime's callous decision to deny them relief for propaganda purposes.
- There is a clear and fair route out of sanctions via implementation of SCR 1284. It is up to Iraq to take it.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## **Is Iraq short of funds for the purchase of humanitarian goods?**

- No. But the Iraqi regime pursues its own priorities not those of the Iraqi people.
- While Baghdad claims that "oil for food" cannot meet the health needs of the Iraqi people, it has submitted contracts to the UN for approval in recent weeks for:
  - over 2 billion cigarettes
  - about 70,000 tons of cosmetics
  - 1.5 million tons of perfume
  - 750,000 television sets
  - 31,000 dishwashers
- Instead of buying additional humanitarian goods for the Iraqi people, the regime spends its own illicitly-obtained revenue constructing:
  - a 40-hectare film production complex in Baghdad;
  - The "Mother of Mosques" outside Baghdad. It is said that it will be the largest mosque in the world when completed. It will contain a 605 page Qur'an allegedly written in Saddam's blood.

## **Evidence of Iraqi regime's disregard for people?**

- The Iraqi regime is cheating the Iraqi people out of "oil for food" money: proceeds from illegal Iraqi oil exports and Iraqi abuse of "oil for food" programme go into Saddam's pocket and do not benefit the Iraqi people.
- Saddam Hussein has trucks for military troop movements but has not made one of these vehicles available to distribute food and medical supplies. Worse, the UN has seen evidence that Saddam has systematically diverted to his military effort vehicles ordered by Iraq to deliver food and medicines under 'Oil for food'.
- For December 2001- May 2002, Iraq planned to spend \$40 million of "oil for food" funds on medicines - a quarter of its allocation for medicines for the same period last year. At same time the Iraqi regime announced its intention to use \$25 million of "oil for food" funds to build an Olympic Stadium.
- Iraq regime has failed to respond to a UN proposal on "Improving child nutrition" put to it over a year ago. But it has found the resources to build a 40-hectare film production complex in Baghdad.
- Iraq has failed to spend over \$2.5 billion allocated by the UN for humanitarian purchases. The Iraqi Central Bank consistently holds up delivery of \$1 billion worth of goods already approved by the UN.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## **Has the standard of life in Iraq deteriorated over the past 10 years?**

- Claims that Iraq is being returned to a medieval state are false. Before the 1991 Gulf War, Iraq was already suffering the effects of 8 years of war with Iran. The regime was spending the majority of its revenue – billions of dollars – on arms. In 1989 the regime spent \$12 billion of its \$18 billion oil revenues on weapons. In 2000 the UN forced the regime to spend \$12.5 billion of its \$17 billion oil revenue on the Iraqi people.
- Areas over which the Iraqi regime has little control, such as northern Iraq, are better off now than when they were under Baghdad control. The difference is that in the north there is the political will to extract the maximum benefit from "oil for food".

## **And healthcare?**

- Briefing by WHO to the Sanctions Committee in March 2002 suggested an improvement in the quality of healthcare available to the Iraqi people. A wide range of basic medicines and medical supplies are available in Iraq, with increased efficiency in drug handling and distribution.
- Supported by recent UNICEF figures, which show that the incidence of measles, diphtheria and polio in Iraq has fallen below that recorded in late 1980s.

## **UK's use of Depleted Uranium-based ammunition has caused cancer in Iraq?**

- UK- forces only used DU-based ammunition operationally against Iraqi forces during Gulf conflict itself. MOD's assessment is that UK tanks used fewer than 100 DU-based rounds against Iraq's military forces during hostilities.
- Aware of claims of an increase in ill-health (including deformities, cancers and birth defects) in southern Iraq, based on anecdotal evidence and that some have attributed this to the use of depleted uranium-based ammunition used by UK and US forces in the Gulf in 1991.
- There is no evidence that the illnesses of the types suggested, including cancers, are uniquely associated with exposure to DU. Nor has Iraq produced credible research data to support these repeated claims.
- WHO have not yet published the findings of their limited studies last year. Only when they have worked with the Iraqis on a proper study of the health situation can any particular problems be addressed.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## VII HUMAN RIGHTS

### **What is the human rights situation in Iraq?**

- Iraq's human rights record is appalling. Human rights violations include harassment of women, persecution on account of religious affiliation, torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and punishment, extrajudicial killings and arbitrary executions, imposition of the death sentence for crimes not serious enough to justify it, persecution on account of political opinion and ethnicity, forced population transfers (Arabisation), arbitrary arrest and detention and lack of fair trial and due process.
- Amnesty International's report of 15 August 2001 highlighted systematic torture of political prisoners in Iraq. Methods include knife cuts, sexual attacks, electric shocks, eye gouging, cigarette burns, pulling out of fingernails and mutilation of hands with electric drills.
- Anyone found guilty of slandering the President is punished by having their tongue removed.

### **What is the UK doing to improve the human rights situation in Iraq?**

- Together with international partners, the UK takes every opportunity to raise this issue in international fora and has, for example, helped to draft and sponsor annual resolutions at the UN Commission on Human Rights and the UN General Assembly.
- We also take practical measures to protect those suffering repression by participating in patrols of the northern and southern No Fly Zones which were established in support of UN Security Council Resolution 688 to help prevent Saddam Hussein from once again repressing the Iraqi people in those regions.

### **What about the UNCHR Special Rapporteur's visit to Iraq earlier this year?**

- For the last 10 years the Iraqi Government had denied UN Special Rapporteurs on human rights access to Iraq. Welcome the fact that Andreas Mavrommatis was allowed to visit in February 2002. It remains to be seen whether, following this initial visit, he will be able to continue his mission and will be given unrestricted access to enable him to carry out a full, independent assessment of Iraq's human rights situation.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## VIII NO FLY ZONES

### **Why are UK and US planes bombing Iraq?**

- UK and US planes patrol the No Fly Zones, which were established in 1991 and 1992 to prevent Iraqi regime once again using its air power to repress and terrorise the Iraqi people.
- Since late 1998 Iraq has waged a systematic campaign to shoot our aircraft down. There have been over 2500 direct threats against our aircrew, including missile attacks and heavy anti-aircraft fire.
- We only take action to protect our aircrew. Our responses are justified in self-defence.
- Absolutely no wish to see this confrontation prolonged. Could end today if Iraq stopped trying to kill our aircrew.

### **What about civilian casualties?**

- All targets are military targets, very carefully selected to minimise the risk of civilian casualties.
- Precision guided weapons are used where there is any risk of civilian casualties or damage to civilian infrastructure.
- Learned long ago to distrust Iraqi claims about casualties. They have claimed civilian casualties on days when none of our aircraft have even been flying. They have claimed that buildings have been destroyed when photographs have later shown them to be entirely intact. Iraq claims that coalition aircraft were responsible for the deaths of some 23 people during a football match on 19 June last year. On that day, coalition aircraft were fired on by anti-aircraft artillery and surface to air missiles but did not respond. We are confident that the incident was a result of an Iraqi missile falling back to the ground.

### **Legal justification for the NFZs?**

- The No Fly Zones were established in 1991 (north) and 1992 (south) in support of SCR 688 which called on Iraq to end its brutal repression of the civilian population. They are justified under international law in response to a situation of overwhelming humanitarian necessity.

DECLASSIFIED

DECLASSIFIED

**What about Turkish incursions into northern Iraq?**

- Member states of the United Nations have an obligation under Article 51 of the UN Charter to report to the Security Council any military action taken in self-defence. Turkey is fully aware of its obligations in this regard. Turkish incursions into northern Iraq target PKK terrorist camps.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## IX NORTHERN IRAQ / KURDS

### **Kurdish reconciliation / current situation?**

- UK remains committed to building peace and stability in northern Iraq. Clear from our co-sponsorship of the Ankara Peace Process, our continuing participation in patrols of the northern No Fly Zone, and our bilateral aid programme for the Kurds in Northern Iraq.
- Welcome progress made by the PUK (Patriotic Union of Kurdistan) and the KDP (Kurdistan Democratic Party) on the Washington Agreement, in particular the recent announcement that the two parties have reached agreement on reconvening the joint Parliament.

### **Break up of Iraq?**

- Have always supported territorial integrity of Iraq. We wish to see autonomy (not independence) for the Iraqi-Kurds.
- Kurds have made this clear this is what they want.

### **Rapprochement between the Kurds and Baghdad?**

- A matter for the Kurds. We would not stop them, but understandable that they should not trust Baghdad.

DECLASSIFIED

# DECLASSIFIED

## **X IRAQI OPPOSITION/INDICT**

**What is the HMG's relationship with the Iraqi opposition?**

- UK maintains contacts with a wide range of Iraqi opposition groups and supports their role in mapping out the future of a post-Saddam Iraq.
- We give moral [though not financial] support to the Iraqi opposition.

**Does HMG support the work of INDICT (NGO trying to indict Saddam and other senior officials for war crimes)?**

- Support INDICT in its aim to bring Saddam Hussein and others senior officials to justice.

DECLASSIFIED



# DECLASSIFIED

## **XI KUWAITI MISSING/PROPERTY**

**Has Iraq accounted for all the Kuwaitis and other foreign nationals missing since the Gulf war?**

- Iraq has only provided information sufficient to close three Kuwaiti missing files so far. The UK continues to take an active role in the Tripartite Commission to establish the whereabouts of 605 Kuwaiti and other nationals still missing since the occupation of Kuwait. Despite efforts to urge Iraq to recognise the humanitarian nature of this issue, the government of Iraq still refuses to co-operate with the process.

**What about missing Kuwaiti property?**

- Iraq has refused to cooperate with the UN over the issue of returning property stolen during the Gulf War.
- Despite denying for several years that it had the Kuwaiti national archive, Iraq has now admitted that it does after all have them
- Hope that Iraq will now turn words into actions and return the archives to Kuwait as soon as possible

DECLASSIFIED

