
The lies of the war - the war of the lies

By Bo Elkjaer

Published in Denmark by Ekstra Bladet

5 October 2003

Second edition February 2004

Bo Elkjær's account of the lies behind Denmark's participation in the invasion of Iraq - English translation.

Bo Elkjær shared the Cavling Prize for 2003 with two other journalists for their exposure of the Danish government's collusion in the invasion of Iraq. The Danish original of this account, entitled "Løgner om krigen - krigen om løgner", was originally published as a supplement to the Danish daily newspaper, Ekstra Bladet, on 5 October 2003.

The Danish Peace Academy, November 2005

I. Declaration of war.....	3
II. The day terrorism rose to the top of the agenda.....	5
III. Axis of Evil.....	7
IV. Rumbling war drums.....	9
V. The elusive Iraqi bomb.....	12
VI. “What I didn't find in Africa”.....	20
VII. Exposed a CIA operative.....	22
VIII. The Minister for Foreign Affairs' memory lapse.....	24
IX. 111 times “disarmament” and a single “regime change”.....	26
X. Falsified evidence.....	27
XI. “You won't find any weapons”.....	28
XII. Blix and Ekeus agree: “There are no weapons”.....	29
XIII. Robin Cook: “It is an unjust war”.....	30
XIV. More lost evidence.....	34
XV. “I was appalled”.....	35
XVI. The evidence that decayed.....	36
XVII. Timeline - Iraq day by day.....	40
XVIII. The vanishing threat of the biological and chemical weapons.....	45
XIX. Losing track of the terrorists.....	51
XX. Per Stig's household terrorists.....	57
XXI. Fogh is a liar.....	59

XXII. Harmless old goop.....	61
XXIII. War without mandate: How the coalition abandoned the UN and international law.....	62
XXIV. Fogh should come clean.....	67
XXV. “Rasmussen’s war has been my greatest disappointment ever”	69
XXVI. The hunt for the weapons.....	71
XXVII. The government’s classified sources.....	73
XXVIII. The Iraqi deception.....	75
XXIX. Strategic oil.....	77
XXX. Bonus for Denmark.....	79
XXXI. Killing qualifiers: How the CIA cleaned doubts out of the Key Judgements.....	81

Declaration of war

IT WAS 4:15 AM when the phone rang at the home of Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen. The caller was head of department Nils Bernstein from the Prime Minister’s Office in Copenhagen. Nils Bernstein was calling to tell the Prime Minister that Baghdad was under attack from the first wave of American bombs and cruise missiles. Fifteen minutes later, US president George W. Bush went live on TV in the States, telling the American people that US was now at war with Iraq. Denmark was not yet officially part of the attack force.

It was not until the early evening the next day, on March 21 2003, that Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen could call for a press conference in the Prime Minister’s Office and announce that Denmark was at war with Iraq. Anders Fogh Rasmussen said that a majority in the Danish parliament had voted for proposal for a parliamentary resolution B118 concerning Danish participation in the attack to disarm Iraq.

“It is important to remember what this is all about,” said Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and summarised the charges against Iraq and its leader Saddam Hussein in bullet points:

- “That Saddam Hussein is a dictator, oppressing his own people and killing and torturing his opponents.”
- “That Saddam Hussein has started several aggressive wars against his closest neighbours.”
- “That Saddam Hussein has used poison gas against his own people.”

- "That Saddam Hussein has had obvious connections to terrorists, and possibly still does so."
- "That Saddam Hussein for 12 years has chosen to ignore the international community's demands to disarm."
- "That Saddam Hussein in 1998 threw out the UN weapons inspectors."
- "That Saddam Hussein has not declared thousands of litres of anthrax, approximately 6,500 chemical bombs, at least 80 tons of mustard gas and large quantities of biological toxins."
- "On top of that comes the dangerous threat from long-range missiles and the risk that he will soon possess nuclear weapons."

With these words Denmark was officially taking part in a war of aggression that was not sanctioned by the United Nations and, as time would tell, was based on evidence that was incorrect, purposefully distorted or forged.

The day terrorism rose to the top of the agenda

THE PLANE THAT LANDS IN Copenhagen Airport on 17 February 2001 is carrying some 50 delegates from the Confederation of Danish Industries (*Dansk Industri*). They have just completed a trip to Iraq. The delegation is part of the largest Danish export venture ever to the Middle East. To Iraq.

- There's nothing unusual in sending business delegates to Iraq. We're the 28th delegation this year, and practically all other European countries and the US have made similar arrangements, says the CEO of the Confederation of Danish Industries, Hans Skov Christensen, in an interview with the Danish daily newspaper, *Politiken*.

The same day that the delegation leaves Baghdad, American and British planes bomb the Iraqi airport's radar installations. The bombing raid is part of the control of the airspace over Iraq that the US and UK have been maintaining over Iraq since the Gulf War in 1991. The bombings do not worry Hans Skov Christensen:

- I don't think the bombings have altered the situation in Iraq or our relations with the country, he says.

35 Danish companies are negotiating trade deals with Saddam Hussein's Iraq. They are all in the food and health industries, and all trade will be managed through the UN Oil-for-Food Programme.

This programme gives the Iraqis the opportunity to alleviate the worst injuries from the post-war sanctions by trading oil for foodstuffs, medicines and the like.

The Confederation of Danish Industries is optimistic. It has placed an order for more than 7,000 square feet of exhibition space in the Baghdad congress centre in connection with the trade fair in November the same year. The organisers are expecting visitors from 50 countries. Over the summer, a visit by Iraqi officials to Denmark has been scheduled, and in the autumn a new Danish delegation is planned for Iraq.

IT IS NOT JUST THE Danish industries who have begun to gaze with interest at Iraq. At the same time, the Danish Immigration Service (*Udlændingestyrelsen*) is planning a fact-finding mission to Iraq. Preparations have been long under way. The immigration service has been in contact with Iraqi authorities and visas have been arranged for the officials who are travelling to Iraq. The mission takes place as planned in March 2001, and in June 2001 the immigration authority publishes its "Report from fact-finding mission to Iraq".

This report concludes that Iraqis who have legally left the country can safely return without risking persecution by the Iraqi authorities. Until the report was finished, Denmark had automatically granted asylum to Iraqis arriving from the part of the country controlled by Saddam Hussein's regime. This automaticity is now cancelled.

Iraq is a safe country, is the assessment, and the immigration service immediately starts to reject Iraqi asylum-seekers.

"On the basis of the report, we felt that the situation in Iraq had changed so that you could return safely if you had left the country legally. So we refused asylum in several cases - unless the persons could document that they had been

persecuted,” says deputy director Anni Fode of the Danish Immigration Service in an interview with the Danish daily newspaper, *Berlingske Tidende*, on 14 April 2002.

In 2001 and 2002, this means that by far the majority of Iraqi asylum-seekers are refused. In 2002, more than two-thirds of the pending cases end in refusal.

IN MARCH 2001, IRAQ is safe enough for the Danish industries. Three months later, in June 2001, Danish authorities assess that Iraq is safe enough for Iraqi refugees to be returned. Less than two years later, in March 2003, the Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen declares war on Iraq on the grounds that “Saddam Hussein is a dictator who suppresses his own people and kills and tortures his opponents.”

What happened?

11 September 2001 changes everything. Nobody is in serious doubt that the attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon is masterminded and performed by the terrorist group Al-Qa'eda, orchestrated by the Saudi terrorist ringleader, Osama bin Laden. The US intelligence services have long been following bin Laden and immediately knows who is behind the terrorist attack.

But the same morning, while the World Trade Center is still standing in flames, the White House is already implicating Iraq in the terrorist attack. NATO's former Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Wesley Clark, tells Meet the Press's Tim Russert on NBC on 15 June 2002 that he got a call and was asked to identify Iraq as being responsible for the attack.

Clark: - There was a concerted effort during the fall of 2001, starting immediately after 9/11, to pin 9/11 and the terrorism problem on Saddam Hussein.

Russert: - By who? Who did that?

Clark: - Well, it came from the White House, it came from people around the White House. It came from all over. I got a call on 9/11. I was on CNN, and I got a call at my home saying, “You got to say this is connected. This is state-sponsored terrorism. This has to be connected to Saddam Hussein.” I said, “But--I'm willing to say it, but what's your evidence?” And I never got any evidence.

When General Wesley Clark goes on CNN, he avoids mentioning Iraq.

GENERAL WESLEY CLARK'S remarks are substantiated by CBS Evening News almost a full year after the attack. Evening News says that less than five hours after Flight 77 struck Pentagon on 11 September 2001, the US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld asked his aides to get information that could implicate Saddam Hussein as the mastermind behind the attack.

This was based partly on notes written by a Pentagon aide the same day at 2.40 pm. The notes, quoted by journalist David Martin from CNS on 4 September, 2002, say that Donald Rumsfeld asked for the “best info fast” to “judge whether good enough to hit SH at the same time, not only UBL”.

The initials SH and UBL stand for Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden. The notes then quote Rumsfeld as demanding, ominously, that the administration's response “go massive ... Sweep it all up, things related and not.”

Axis of Evil

IN JANUARY 2002, four months after the devastating terrorist attack on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, President George W. Bush gives his long-awaited State of the Union speech. In the speech, Bush describes the results of the War on Terrorism and the attack on Afghanistan. After that, he poses a blistering charge against three countries that are claimed to be an "axis of evil": North Korea, Iran and Iraq.

- Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens, says President George W. Bush.

- Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens - leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections - then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

- States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic, says the President of the United States in his speech to the nation.

AT THIS TIME, The US is already way ahead in construing the burden of evidence against Iraq. A few days after the speech, the retired ambassador Joseph Wilson travels to Niger in Africa. It is the Central Intelligence Agency CIA that is sending Wilson to Africa, on orders from Vice President Dick Cheney.

Ambassador Wilson is supposed to investigate whether claims that Iraq has attempted to buy uranium in Niger are true. Joseph Wilson travels back from Africa with decisive information about the uranium deal. His report is analysed by the CIA and on 9 March 2002 his information is forwarded to the White House and the State Department.

Here it stops.

It is not until July 2003 that Joseph Wilson's conclusions concerning Niger are published. This happens when Joseph Wilson himself writes a column in The New York Times entitled: "What I didn't find in Africa".

THE DEFINING INFORMATION that Joseph Wilson brings back from Africa and that the public only gets to know about a year later, is that all claims that Iraq has attempted to buy uranium in Niger are false. They are simply not true.

Wilson is not the only American guest in Niger in February 2002. The country is also visited by General Carlton W. Fulton, Jr., who is in Niger to investigate the coun-

try's nuclear safety precautions.

The four-star general meets with the president of Niger, among other people, and reports back home to the American military leadership that Niger's safety precautions concerning uranium stocks are completely up to date.

Rumbling war drums

THE MONTH AFTER the American mission to Niger, Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen is visiting the White House and the Pentagon.

First Fogh meets President George W. Bush in the White House on 25 March 2002. During the subsequent press conference the same day, Prime Minister Anders Fogh is asked how Denmark will respond to an initiative against Iraq. Anders Fogh Rasmussen replies:

“In connection with terrorism, obviously we discussed Iraq. The President told me about his attitude to Iraq and Saddam Hussein. I emphasized that we should ensure first and foremost that international inspectors could gain free access to Iraq to investigate and ensure that Saddam Hussein is not developing weapons of mass destruction.”

Two days later, Anders Fogh Rasmussen is visiting the Pentagon. Here, the Danish Prime Minister is escorted up the steps by the American Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, one of the hawks in the Pentagon. The meeting between Wolfowitz and Anders Fogh Rasmussen deals with “defence topics of mutual interest”.

During the course of 2003, Ekstra Bladet sought access under the Danish freedom of information act to all documents in the Danish Prime Minister’s Office concerning the decision to participate in the war. This includes the documents from the visit to Washington.

The Prime Minister’s Office is still holding on to most of the key documents. Several of the requests for access to documents under the freedom of information act have ended as complaints to the ombudsman of the Danish parliament.

THE DANISH FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT is quite clear: All papers shall be released as quickly as possible. If it is not possible to close the case and deliver the papers within ten days from the time of application, the ministry in question must state why the case has been delayed and when the papers will be released. At the same time, the ministry is obliged to show the press “particular amenability”, as it is expressed in the guidelines of the Danish Ministry of Justice.

Ekstra Bladet sought access to the papers concerning the decision to go to war on 16 June 2003, and has subsequently continually complained about the handling of the case.

The latest response from the Prime Minister’s Office came on 10 December 2003, and the ministry has yet to release more than two-thirds of the documents in the

case. The day before, 9 December 2003, the Ombudsman of the Danish parliament criticised the Prime Minister's Office for not stating how long it would take to conclude the case and release the documents.

During the summer of 2002, intense work proceeds in the CIA, Pentagon and White House to build up a case against Iraq.

The intention is that the case will be presented to the world on 12 September 2002. On that day, American President George W. Bush will hold a speech about Iraq to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

WHILE EVERYBODY IS WAITING for Bush, the Danish debate about Iraq gradually picks up speed. On 6 September, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, says that "the evidence must be able to hold up in the city court." The same day, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says to the Danish news agency, Ritzau, that "I am not in the least in doubt that he has weapons of mass destruction and wishes to manufacture them."

On 9 September, 2002, President George W. Bush telephones the Prime Minister of Turkey, the United Nations' Secretary-General Kofi Annan and Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen - who at this point is also the president of the European Union. The press release from the American State Department reveals that President Bush in all three telephone calls made identical requests to listen very carefully to the speech Bush will make to the General Assembly three days later. The intention is that the speech will define the threat to world peace that Iraq constitutes.

Exactly a year and a day after the terror attack on the World Trade Center, on 12 September 2002, President George W. Bush presents his speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Bush sets the agenda for the speech from the start: the battle against terrorism. After this, he directs the spotlight towards what George Bush designates as the greatest current threat: Iraq.

"Our greatest fear is that terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill on a massive scale. In one place - in one regime - we find all these dangers, in their most lethal and aggressive forms, exactly the kind of aggressive threat the United Nations was born to confront," says President George W. Bush.

IN CONNECTION WITH the speech, George W. Bush presents the document "A Decade of Deception and Defiance". The speech and the document attack Iraq for having breached a long series of UN resolutions and for having continued to develop weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and for having associations with terrorists.

As evidence of the development of nuclear weapons, it is mentioned that Iraq has attempted to buy "thousands of specially designed aluminum tubes which officials

believe were intended as components of centrifuges to enrich uranium.”

As evidence for Iraq's associations with terrorists, the document mentions that Iraq is sheltering “the Mujahideen-e-Khalq Organization, which has used terrorist violence against Iran and in the 1970s was responsible for killing several U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilians.”

In addition, among other things, the document mentions that the Palestinian terrorist Abu Nidal is in Baghdad. In his speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations, President George W. Bush says that “al-Qaida terrorists escaped from Afghanistan and are known to be in Iraq.” This assertion is not followed up in the document, which does not specifically mention al-Qa'eda.

But now a name has been given to the Iraqi threat: weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and the fear that Iraq is using its associations with terrorists to disseminate these weapons.

The elusive Iraqi bomb

THERE IS A DEEP, serious resonance in president George W. Bush's voice as he presents his charges against Iraq for trying to develop nuclear weapons, in his high-profile and long-awaited speech for the UN General Assembly. The evidence is, according to Bush, most importantly that Iraq is trying to procure equipment needed for the development of an Iraqi nuclear device:

- Today, Iraq continues to withhold important information about its nuclear program - weapons design, procurement logs, experiment data, an accounting of nuclear materials and documentation of foreign assistance. Iraq employs capable nuclear scientists and technicians. It retains physical infrastructure needed to build a nuclear weapon. Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes used to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. Should Iraq acquire fissile material, it would be able to build a nuclear weapon within a year. And Iraq's state-controlled media have reported numerous meetings between Saddam Hussein and his nuclear scientists, leaving little doubt about his continued appetite for these weapons. The matter of the high-strength aluminium tubes is one of two concrete pieces of key evidence against Iraq for attempting to build nuclear weapons. The second defining item of evidence is that the country has tried to buy uranium in Africa. President George W. Bush presents the first piece of evidence in his speech to the UN General Assembly in New York on 12 September, 2002.

In contradiction, the Iraqis claim that the aluminium tubes are purchased for reverse engineering of artillery rockets that most probably will not be illegal according to the many UN resolutions.

In December 2002, three months after Bush has presented the evidence of the tubes, the US Department of Energy receives an analysis of the intercepted aluminium tubes. The CIA receives a copy of the report, which concludes that the intercepted tubes match down to fractions of a millimetre and type of aluminium the Italian-designed rockets, Medusa 81.

These rockets are produced by the Italian arms company, Simmel Difesa. So there is reasonable doubt concerning the function of the tubes.

This doubt is never put forward.

At the same time, several American nuclear experts express doubt as to whether the tubes can be used for gas centrifuges for enrichment of uranium at all. The founder of the US Department of Energy's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Houston G. Wood III, says that "it would have been extremely difficult to make these tubes into centrifuges. It stretches the imagination to come up with a way. I do not know any real centrifuge experts that feel differently."

Houston G. Wood III is probably the leading expert in gas centrifuge technology.

Apart from founding Oak Ridge, Houston G. Wood III has had a highly scientific career specialising in gas centrifuge technology for more than thirty years.

He has written several reports, books and articles on the subject.

SO NOW, IN DECEMBER 2002, the situation is this:

- Iraq says the tubes are for rockets.

- The CIA and the State Department know that an Italian rocket matches the spe-

cifications and aluminium type of the tubes.

- And American experts in gas centrifuges have reasonable doubts as to whether the tubes can be used in centrifuges at all.

These doubts concerning the US claims are withheld. The US maintains the charge that the intercepted tubes were meant for uranium enrichment. Two months later, on 5 February, 2003, this is one of the key charges in Secretary of State Colin Powell's speech in the UN Security Council.

A week before Powell's speech, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mohammad ElBaradei, presents an interim report in the UN Security Council. Mohammad ElBaradei tells the council that the IAEA has given particular consideration to answering the question of the tubes and whether they can be used for the construction of uranium enrichment centrifuges.

ElBaradei also reports that the Iraqi authorities claim that the tubes were meant for reverse engineering of conventional artillery rockets.

- The IAEA has conducted a series of inspections at sites involved in the production and storage of reverse engineered rockets, held discussions with and interviewed Iraqi personnel, taken samples of aluminium tubes, and begun a review of the documentation provided by Iraq relating to contracts with the traders. While the matter is still under investigation, and further verification is foreseen, the IAEA's analysis to date indicates that the specifications of the aluminium tubes sought by Iraq in 2001 and 2002 appear to be consistent with reverse engineering of rockets. While it would be possible to modify such tubes for the manufacture of centrifuges, they are not directly suitable for it.

THE SECOND PIECE OF EVIDENCE on which claims that Iraq has revived or maintained its nuclear arms programme are based is even more problematic. It is the question of whether Iraq has attempted to purchase uranium in Africa. In September 2002, now seven months have passed since the CIA investigated the Niger uranium claims. Six months have passed since the report concluding that the claims are false was delivered to the White House. Now, British Prime Minister Tony Blair enters the stage. On 24 September 2002, Blair publishes a dossier on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. It is in this dossier that the British government claims that "there is intelligence that Iraq has sought the supply of significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Iraq has no active civil nuclear power programme or nuclear power plants, and therefore has no legitimate reason to acquire uranium."

In the White House, President George W. Bush's press secretary, Ari Fleischer, supports the British claim in a press conference later the same day.

Later, it will be revealed that the only documentation that can substantiate the claim is a series of documents from Niger procured by a European intelligence agency - probably the Italian - and passed on to the CIA, among others. The documents are crude forgeries.

In the beginning of October 2002, the US intelligence community delivers a 90-page classified National Intelligence Estimate of Iraq and its weapons of mass destruction to the White House.

In this estimate, doubts concerning the alleged uranium deal are upheld. At about the same time, CIA director George Tenet personally warns the White House against using the allegations against Iraq.

ON 10 OCTOBER 2002, the American House of Representatives passes a resolution authorising the use of force against Iraq, followed by the Senate the next day.

In the weeks before and after the vote, numerous members of Congress specifically cite the nuclear threat as their main reason to support the resolution giving the President the authority to declare war. Several senators specifically mention the alleged uranium deal:

- As reported in the U.S. intelligence community document made public on October 4, 2002, he has been seeking to revamp and accelerate his nuclear weapons program, says senator Olympia Snowe (R. Maine) on 9 October 2002.

This information is echoed in the September 24, 2002, intelligence dossier released by British Prime Minister Tony Blair - a critical voice and ally in our war on terrorism. ... Tellingly, the report also documents Iraq's attempts to buy large quantities of uranium from Africa, even though Iraq has no civil nuclear power program. The Republican Chair of the House Rules Committee, David Dreier, also promotes the alleged uranium deal as decisive:

- Perhaps more frightening, we know that Iraq is actively seeking to reestablish its nuclear weapons program and has reportedly been seeking uranium to achieve that goal.

NINETEEN DAYS AFTER the US vote to hand over the authority to declare war to the President, and seven months and twenty days after the White House and the State Department received CIA reports that the Niger uranium allegation was false, the allegations surface in the Danish foreign ministry. On 29 October 2002, the ministry's Security Policy Office writes and delivers the confidential memorandum, "Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)", addressed personally to the Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller.

In this memorandum, the office writes that "even though the country has no civilian use of uranium (nuclear power), Iraq has attempted to buy uranium from Africa." Two weeks later, on 14 November 2002, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller refers to the memorandum during a debate in the Danish parliament concerning resolution 1441 on Iraq.

During the debate, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller says that Iraq is less than a decade from having nuclear weapons and that "if Iraq gets its hands on enriched uranium or plutonium, the country could possibly possess a nuclear device within a year."

The fact is that there is no evidence to substantiate Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller's allegation.

A COUPLE OF WEEKS LATER, on 7 December 2002, Iraq delivers the 12,200-page "Currently Accurate, Full and Complete Declaration" of illegal arms programmes that the UN Security Council demanded in resolution 1441. On 19 December 2002, the United States is ready with a reply to the declaration. It is Secretary of State Colin Powell and the US ambassador to the UN, John D. Negroponte, who reply to the Iraqi declaration. Says Colin Powell:

- Our experts have also examined the Iraqi document. The declaration's title echoes the language of Resolution 1441. It is called, "Currently Accurate, Full and Complete Declaration." But our experts have found it to be anything but currently accurate, full or complete. The Iraqi declaration may use the language of Resolution 1441, but it totally fails to meet the resolution's requirements.

- Most brazenly of all, the Iraqi declaration denies the existence of any prohibited weapons programs at all. The United States, the United Nations and the world waited for this declaration from Iraq. But Iraq's response is a catalogue of recycled information and flagrant omissions. It should be obvious that the pattern of system-

atic holes and gaps in Iraq's declaration is not the result of accidents or editing oversights or technical mistakes. These are material omissions that, in our view, constitute another material breach, says Secretary of State Colin Powell.

In connection with the remarks, the State Department publishes a fact sheet with examples of Iraqi omissions. Concerning the allegations of Iraqi attempts to clandestinely develop nuclear weapons, the fact sheet says:

"The Declaration ignores efforts to procure uranium from Niger. Why is the Iraqi regime hiding their uranium procurement?"

In fact, this false allegation is the only example given by the State Department in the fact sheet that Iraq is trying to hide a project to build nuclear weapons.

IN DENMARK, THE AMERICAN views are discussed the next morning in a telephone conversation between Dan Lawton, who resides as the 'POL MIL Officer' at the US embassy in Copenhagen, and Jakob Brix Tange and Jens-Otto Horslund from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs Security Policy Office.

After the conversation, Dan Lawton faxes printouts of the US presentations to the two aides. In the UN on the same day, Mohammad ElBaradei, Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), asks the US to hand over the evidence of the alleged uranium deal so the UN weapons inspectors can investigate the matter. The evidence consists of the documents that the US has received from a European intelligence service, most probably the Italian. The documents are not delivered to the UN.

Meanwhile, the inspectors are striding towards the first deadline on 27 January 2003. On this day, the UN inspectors, led by Hans Blix and Mohammad ElBaradei, are supposed to present their report to the UN Security Council, declaring their findings in the Iraq.

In his report, Mohammad ElBaradei is unable to substantiate the allegations that Iraq has attempted to buy uranium abroad. The IAEA has still not received any evidence from the US. In the end, Mohammad ElBaradei falls back to declaring that he needs the evidence to be handed over to further investigate the matter: "A fourth focal point has been the investigation of reports of Iraqi efforts to import uranium after 1991. The Iraqi authorities have denied any such attempts. The IAEA will continue to pursue this issue. At this stage, however, we do not have enough information, and we would appreciate receiving more."

BUT THE US STILL withholds the evidence. The next day, US President George W. Bush gives his TV-transmitted State of the Union speech.

It is now a year since the US directed the world's attention towards Iraq with Bush's speech on "the axis of evil". At the same time, eleven months have now passed since the White House received the CIA report denying any Iraqi attempts to buy uranium in Niger.

In his speech, President George W. Bush says that "the British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa."

It is later revealed that no documentation exists to substantiate this allegation, other than the falsified Niger documents. And these still have not been presented to the UN.

On 5 February 2003, US Secretary of State Colin Powell gives the speech in the UN Security Council that is meant to constitute decisive evidence against Iraq. Powell never mentions the alleged uranium deal. At about this time, the US finally sends the documents to the IAEA.

Iraq is immediately asked to provide further information concerning the country's contacts with Niger. But Iraq maintains that no attempts to procure uranium as described in the documents have taken place. After ten days of investigation in Iraq and Niger, the IAEA reaches the conclusion that Iraq can in no possible way have attempted to purchase uranium as described in the documents and as stated in the UK by Prime Minister Tony Blair, in Denmark by the Danish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and in the US by President George W. Bush.

Now the IAEA officials turn to investigate the documents themselves. On the basis of publicly available information, it is quickly and easily ascertained that the documents are mere forgeries.

AND WITH THIS, THE SECOND major piece of US evidence against Iraq in the area of nuclear developments has collapsed.

On 7 March 2003, the UN inspectors are again supposed to report to the UN Security Council. This time, IAEA Director General Mohammad ElBaradei says that the information that Iraq has attempted to procure uranium in Niger is based on falsified documents.

"Based on thorough analysis, the IAEA has concluded with the concurrence of outside experts that these documents which formed the basis for the report of recent uranium transaction between Iraq and Niger are in fact not authentic. We have therefore concluded that these specific allegations are unfounded."

Mohammad ElBaradei concludes that "After three months of intrusive inspections, we have to date found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapon program in Iraq."

This complete and utter rebuttal of the American evidence is sent back in emails directed personally to Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller on 8 March 2003.

A year has passed since the White House was informed that the uranium deal was false. This knowledge has finally been presented to the UN Security Council, and the Danish Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, and his Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, have personally been informed of this development.

THEY NEVER INFORM the Danish parliament about this. Eleven days later, on 19 March 2003, the Danish parliament has its first sitting on the decision to take part in the coalition to disarm Iraq. The day before, 18 March 2003, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Security Policy Office has written a memorandum, a so-called question/answer-sheet for Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller to use during the debate in parliament.

The memorandum contains a short description of the present conclusions concerning the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction: "After three months of inspections, the inspectors have to date found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons programme in Iraq. On the contrary, the assessment is that the Iraqi industrial capability to start up such a programme is now substantially less than in the late 1980s. The weapons inspectors have rejected the allegations of the illegal use of aluminium tubes and magnets for centrifuges for enrichment of uranium that Powell presented in his briefing to the UN Security Council on 5 February 2003. Furthermore, Powell's allegations that Iraq has tried to illegally import enriched uranium since 1991 has been rejected."

Per Stig Møller never reads this part in parliament. Neither during the first sitting, on 19 March 2003, nor the second, on 21 March 2003, does Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller or Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen tell the Danish

parliament that one of the most important accusations against Iraq has crumbled. The debate on 19 March 2003 lasts for eleven hours. The second sitting, on 21 March 2003, lasts almost ten hours. Towards the end of the second debate, at approximately 6.30 pm, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller reads from the memorandum that shows that the nuclear evidence against Iraq has been proven wrong and false.

Per Stig Møller delivers the two parts of the memorandum concerning the biological and chemical weapons to the parliament. The succeeding part, which reveals that the Danish government has knowledge that Iraq can in no way possible be said to constitute a nuclear threat of any kind, is withheld. 15 minutes later, the parliament votes on the proposal. With 61 votes out of the 111 parliamentarians present, Denmark decides to join the war against Iraq. The same night, a press conference is held in the Prime Minister's Office. It is now 13 days since Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen was informed that Iraq does not have an active nuclear programme, and less than an hour since this evidence has been withheld from parliament. In his speech during the press conference, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen specifically mentions the "risk that he (Saddam Hussein) will soon have nuclear weapons" as an important argument for taking part in the war. Everything points to the fact that Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen personally stretches the information that the Prime Minister's Office possesses on the subject. The speech notes written by the Prime Minister's aides for Anders Fogh Rasmussen state only that "there are uncertainties concerning his nuclear programme".

BUT THAT IS NOT what Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says. On the contrary, he declares that there's a risk that Iraq "will soon possess nuclear weapons". There are no facts to substantiate this claim, and the Prime Minister is obliged to admit this in parliament five months later - after the war.

On 9 April 2003, Baghdad falls. At this time, the US has long had intelligence officials inside Iraq, covertly and openly hunting for evidence for Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. But no evidence at all is ever found to indicate that Iraq has resurrected its nuclear weapons programme - neither before nor after the fall of Baghdad.

On 18 June 2003, a meeting is held in the Foreign Affairs Committee in the Danish parliament. During an interview after the meeting, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen maintains that Iraq was a growing nuclear threat:

- A third element is the risk of nuclear weapons. It has been proven that Saddam Hussein was very far in developing nuclear weapons.

- *Yes. Until 1991, when it was stopped?*

Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen makes no comment to this question at first. However, a little later in the interview, he returns to the nuclear problem:

- I want to point out that the basis in international law for the military action was that in 1991 it was unanimously agreed upon in the UN Security Council that a ceasefire with Iraq could be upheld on certain conditions. Including the condition that he should stop his nuclear program. Including the condition that he should cease his cooperation with terrorists. None of these conditions were fulfilled by the man over these many years.

- *Well, actually, the nuclear weapons program was stopped, you know?*

- But ... who says that he didn't continue?

- *The Americans say that...*

The Prime Minister interrupts the question:

- Yes, well, I can't remember exactly, but I believe it was in 1995 that it was revealed that he was very, very close to having it, but this only shows that he didn't fulfil the conditions from 1991, says Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen on 18 June 2003 - exactly 103 days after he personally was informed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' aides in the UN headquarters in New York that no evidence or credible indications at all had been found that Iraq's nuclear programme had been revived in any form at all since 1991.

A FEW WEEKS AFTER the interview, on 8 July 2003, the White House is forced to acknowledge that the information concerning the Niger uranium deals was based on the forged African documents. On 17 July 2003, the Danish embassy in Rome sends an e-mail message back to the Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs describing the affair of the forged documents. This information goes no further than the ministries.

On the same day, 17 July 2003, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller answers a series of questions concerning the government's claims on Iraq in a letter to the Danish newspaper Information.

One of the questions concerns the alleged Iraqi nuclear programme.

"Does the government have any information that substantiates the claim that Saddam worked towards nuclear weapons up to the war?" the newspaper asks.

Per Stig Møller replies:

"During the debate in parliament on 14 November 2002, I quoted American and British reports that had been published prior to the debate. It is correct that the IAEA has found no evidence that Iraq has revived its nuclear weapons programme. This does not change the substantial concerns that Secretary of State Colin Powell presented in his speech in the UN Security Council on 5 February 2003: That Iraq possessed two of the important three components in the construction of a nuclear device - nuclear physicists and a bomb design. The only thing lacking was enriched uranium. IAEA Director General ElBaradei pointed out in his report in the Security Council on 27 January 2003 that they had found no evidence of an active nuclear programme, but that there was nevertheless a series of uncertainties concerning illegal aluminium tubes, sophisticated explosives and reports on uranium imports."

NOTE HOW Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller refers to Mohammad El-Baradei's report of 27 January 2003, where ElBaradei is unable to comment on the question of the uranium imports, since the US is still withholding the definitive evidence.

Per Stig Møller writes, that there is a "series of uncertainties" concerning "reports of uranium imports". Per Stig Møller never writes that the uncertainties only exist because the US is withholding evidence. Nor does the Minister for Foreign Affairs reveal that the IAEA and Mohammad ElBaradei are easily able to reject the evidence as mere forgeries when the US finally hands over the documents. There are no uncertainties concerning Iraqi imports of uranium in Mohammad ElBaradei's report to the UN Security Council on 7 March 2003. Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller knows this. He is informed of this in an e-mail message from the Danish delegation to the UN headquarters in New York on 8 March 2003.

The letter to the newspaper Information in July 2003 can only be seen as misinformation, where Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller knowingly distorts the facts concerning the forged evidence and the UN rejection of same.

On 11 July 2003 - six days before the letter to Information - Per Stig Møller is asked in the Danish parliament whether the forged information has been "used in the Min-

ister for Foreign Affairs assessment of Iraq's nuclear programme?"

Per Stig Møller replies in writing on 7 August 2003 - just two weeks after referring to the false information in his letter to Information - that "the mentioned information has not been used in the government's considerations over Iraq's weapons of mass destruction."

THIS IS NOT THE LAST TIME that Anders Fogh Rasmussen's government runs into serious problems with documentation concerning the vanishing Iraqi nuclear weapons. In parliament, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen is asked in a written question to present evidence for his allegation, made during the press conference on 21 March 2003, that Iraq soon could possess nuclear weapons. The Prime Minister's Office is unable to present this evidence. Instead, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen replies that "the mention of the risk that Iraq could possess nuclear weapons expresses the political view that it would be irresponsible to continue to show compliance with Iraq's failure to live up to disarmament obligations, since Iraq then would have opportunity to pursue its nuclear ambitions." The same day, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen confirms in another reply that the Danish government in March 2003 had been informed that the Iraqi nuclear programme was dismantled.

"IAEA Director General ElBaradei reported to the UN Security Council on 7 March 2003 that IAEA after three months of inspections had not found any evidence or credible indications that Iraq had revived its nuclear weapons programme. At the same time, it was reported that inspections should continue. It should be noted, though, that the US has questioned some of the premises on which the IAEA bases its conclusions," replies Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen.

With this, the Prime Minister makes practically the same verbal evasive manoeuvre that the Minister for Foreign Affairs performs in his letter to Information in July. The Prime Minister replies that the United States has questions concerning the IAEA's evidence. He does not say what the questions are.

The American questions are related back in an e-mail message from the Danish embassy in Washington to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs on 16 March 2003. The e-mail describes how Vice President Dick Cheney in a television interview has said that the IAEA's conclusions cannot be trusted because the Iraqi nuclear programme had earlier, in 1991, been radically underestimated.

It is clear from the message that it is the serious mis-assessments of Iraq's nuclear capacity by the US intelligence community in 1991 that Vice President Dick Cheney uses as an argument for the view that the IAEA's conclusions in 2003 must be wrong.

It is these American questions to which the Danish Prime Minister makes verbal reference, but never mentions in his written answer to the Danish parliament.

“What I didn't find in Africa”

IN FEBRUARY 2002, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) sends the retired ambassador Joseph Wilson to Niger. The ambassador is assigned on the orders of the US Vice President Dick Cheney.

“In February 2002 I was informed by officials at the Central Intelligence Agency that Vice President Dick Cheney's office had questions about a particular intelligence report. While I never saw the report, I was told that it referred to a memorandum of agreement that documented the sale of uranium yellowcake - a form of lightly processed ore - by Niger to Iraq in the late 1990s. The agency officials asked if I would travel to Niger to check out the story so they could provide a response to the vice president's office,” Joseph Wilson writes in an opinion piece published in New York Times on 6 July 2003.

The CIA chose Joseph Wilson because of his experience with both Africa and Iraq. For 23 years, he served as ambassador in several African countries. In 1990, he was chargé d'affaires at the American embassy in Baghdad. In February 2002, he was sent to Niger to investigate the claims that Iraq was trying to purchase uranium in the African country.

All information concerning Joseph Wilson's travel to Niger was withheld until July 2003, when Wilson himself stepped forward with his opinion piece in New York Times:

“In late February 2002, I arrived in Niger's capital, Niamey, where I had been a diplomat in the mid-70s and visited as a National Security Council official in the late 90s.”

“The next morning, I met with Ambassador Owens-Kirkpatrick at the embassy. For reasons that are understandable, the embassy staff has always kept a close eye on Niger's uranium business. I was not surprised, then, when the ambassador told me that she knew about the allegations of uranium sales to Iraq - and that she felt she had already debunked them in her reports to Washington. Nevertheless, she and I agreed that my time would be best spent interviewing people who had been in government when the deal supposedly took place, which was before her arrival.”

“I spent the next eight days drinking sweet mint tea and meeting with dozens of people: current government officials, former government officials, people associated with the country's uranium business. It did not take long to conclude that it was highly doubtful that any such transaction had ever taken place.”

“Given the structure of the consortiums that operated the mines, it would be exceedingly difficult for Niger to transfer uranium to Iraq. Niger's uranium business consists of two mines, Somair and Cominak, which are run by French, Spanish, Japanese, German and Nigerian interests. If the government wanted to remove uranium from a mine, it would have to notify the consortium, which in turn is strictly monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Moreover, because the two mines are closely regulated, quasi-governmental entities, selling uranium would require the approval of the minister of mines, the Prime Minister and probably the president. In short, there's simply too much oversight over too small an industry for a sale to have transpired.”

“(As for the actual memorandum, I never saw it. But news accounts have pointed

out that the documents had glaring errors - they were signed, for example, by officials who were no longer in government - and were probably forged. And then there's the fact that Niger formally denied the charges.)"

"Before I left Niger, I briefed the ambassador on my findings, which were consistent with her own. I also shared my conclusions with members of her staff. In early March, I arrived in Washington and promptly provided a detailed briefing to the C.I.A. I later shared my conclusions with the State Department African Affairs Bureau. There was nothing secret or earth-shattering in my report, just as there was nothing secret about my trip."

"Though I did not file a written report, there should be at least four documents in United States government archives confirming my mission. The documents should include the ambassador's report of my debriefing in Niamey, a separate report written by the embassy staff, a C.I.A. report summing up my trip, and a specific answer from the agency to the office of the vice president (this may have been delivered orally). While I have not seen any of these reports, I have spent enough time in government to know that this is standard operating procedure," writes ambassador Joseph Wilson.

"Those are the facts surrounding my efforts. The vice president's office asked a serious question. I was asked to help formulate the answer. I did so, and I have every confidence that the answer I provided was circulated to the appropriate officials within our government."

Exposed a CIA operative

The cost, both in dollars and possible loss of human lives, could turn out to be huge, when former ambassador Joseph Wilson stepped forward with his column in New York Times and exposed how the White House used forged evidence against Iraq. Shortly after the column was printed in July 2003, it was leaked to American media that Ambassador Wilson's wife, Valerie Plame, was working for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Valerie Plame was working under cover in the CIA's Directorate Of Operations as an expert in weapons of mass destruction. She was - up to the time of the leak - operating a worldwide network of agents. With the leak, Valerie Plame and her many contacts have been put in danger.

It was not only Valerie Plame who was exposed with the leak. Also the CIA front company, Brewster-Jennings & Associates, was dragged out into the light. This company has been used by several other CIA employees, and according to the former leader of the CIA counterterrorism department, Vince Cannistraro, both Valerie Plame, her network of agents in more or less US-hostile countries worldwide and the CIA operatives who can be related to the front company are in fact in life-threatening danger. Not to mention the fact that the CIA's work of tracking down weapons of mass destruction around the world has suffered a serious blow.

It is believed that the information on Wilson's wife was leaked from the White House, and the CIA has asked the US Justice Department to investigate the matter. The FBI has launched a formal investigation, and several politicians are demanding independent investigations.

In December 2003, US Attorney General John Ashcroft recused himself from the case. The investigation has been moved from the Justice Department to the specially appointed investigator, Patrick J. Fitzgerald from Chicago.

All employees of the White House have been ordered to keep all documents, phone lists, memos, notes and calendar information from 1 February 2002 and forward that can in any way be related to Joseph Wilson or to the journalists implicated in the leak. This order was given in writing by the White House legal advisor Alberto Gonzales:

"Pursuant to a request from the Department of Justice, I am instructing you to preserve and maintain the following:

For the time period February 1, 2002 to the present, all documents, including without limitation all electronic records, telephone records of any kind (including but not limited to any records that memorialize telephone calls having been made), correspondence, computer records, storage devices, notes, memoranda, and diary and calendar entries, that relate in any way to:

1. Former U.S. Ambassador Joseph C. Wilson, his trip to Niger in February 2002, and/or his wife's purported relationship with the Central Intelligence Agency;
2. Contacts with any member or representative of the news media about Joseph C. Wilson, his trip to Niger in February 2002, and/or his wife's purported relationship with the Central Intelligence Agency; and
3. Contacts with reporters Knut Royce, Timothy M. Phelps, or Robert D. Novak, or any individual(s) acting directly or indirectly, on behalf of these reporters.

You must preserve all documents relating, in any way, directly or indirectly, to these subjects, even if there would be a question whether the document would be a presidential or federal record or even if its destruction might otherwise be permitted.”

The Minister for Foreign Affairs' memory lapse

ON 15 MAY 2003, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller took to the lectern in the Danish parliament and said: "Concerning weapons of mass destruction I'd like to emphasise that I have said *alleged* weapons of mass destruction all along."

One month later, on 18 June 2003, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller repeated and elaborated on this claim during a press conference outside the Danish parliament's Foreign Policy Committee.

- I have always said "presumed weapons of mass destruction".

- *Are you saying that you never told the parliament that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?*

- I don't have my speeches present. The important thing is that I have at all times stood by the view that the argument concerning weapons of mass destruction was decisive for me. You can probably find a sentence where I have not used the word "presumed".

So the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller claims, both in parliament and to the press, that he as Minister for Foreign Affairs has consistently mentioned the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction with reservations.

But this assertion is not correct.

34 times in the space of six months, in ten different meetings in the Danish parliament, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller asserts without reservation that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. Not one single time in one of his speeches about Iraq's stocks of illegal weapons does Per Stig Møller say "presumed weapons of mass destruction". No other qualifiers, such as "theoretical", "possible" or "presumed", are used in his speeches.

On one single occasion, the Minister for Foreign Affairs says "alleged". This happens on 15 May 2003 - after the war - when Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller claims that he "said *alleged* weapons of mass destruction all along".

DIRECTLY QUESTIONED about why he now claims that he has qualified his allegations of weapons of mass destruction all along, in an interview with Ekstra Bladet on 24 June 2003, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller replies:

- That must be a lapse of memory.

- *Per Stig Møller, you said weapons of mass destruction without reservation 34 times in six months?*

- Well, how many times did I say it with reservations?

- *None!*

- Well, that's not correct. I have a speech here, from the parliament on 19 March at 10 o'clock: "Those weapons still exist - one must assume," I say. There's your reservation.

- *Come on! Honestly! 34 times you say weapons of mass destruction without reservation, Per Stig?*

- Yes, but that's not so strange. All along, the UN weapons inspectors have listed a lot of weapons of mass destruction that have not been accounted for. I constantly build on this knowledge, which anybody can check.

- *But why did you tell us last week that you said “presumed weapons of mass destruction” all along, when this obviously isn’t true?*
- Yes, I said that, but then that must be a lapse of memory.

111 times “disarmament” and a single “regime change”

ONE HUNDRED AND ELEVEN TIMES in the period from 1 November 2002 to 30 April 2003, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller and Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen say that it's disarmament of Iraq that the Danish government wants. "So we all want this disarmament," says Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller on 19 March 2003. Two days later, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says:

"The parliament has today voted for Danish participation in the international coalition to disarm Saddam Hussein and liberate the Iraqi people."

A total of four times in May, June, July, August and September 2003, the government says that the war was about disarming Iraq.

On one single occasion, the two ministers have used the expression "regime change". This occurred on 26 March 2003, when Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller says in parliament: "But it is not for a regime change we have gone in. We went in to disarm him of his weapons of mass destruction."

Falsified evidence

IT IS VERY EASY to expose the falsified documents that both US President George W. Bush, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and the Danish government have used several times as evidence that Iraq has resumed its nuclear programme.

The President refers to the evidence in his State of the Union speech in 2003, and most recently, Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller refers to the documents in a letter to the Danish newspaper Information on 17 July 2003 - six months after the documents have been debunked as forgeries in Mohammad ElBaradei's report to the UN Security Council.

One of the false documents is dated 10 October 2000 and allegedly signed by Niger's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ailele Elhadj Habibou. He served as Minister for Foreign Affairs in the period 1988 to 1989.

Another of the forged documents refers to Niger's constitution of 12 May 1965. This document is dated 27 July 2000 and should correctly refer to the constitution that was adopted the year before, on 9 August 1999.

”You won't find any weapons”

- Iraq's chemical and biological weapons and the country's entire nuclear programme were almost totally destroyed in 1991 during the Gulf War.

Dr. Imad Khadduri is probably among the best experts in the entire world on the Iraqi weapons programmes. He managed some of the central nuclear research projects under one of Saddam Hussein's most important weapons projects, the development of an Iraqi atomic bomb.

Today, Dr. Imad Khadduri strongly denies that Iraq has hidden stocks of weapons of mass destruction.

From 1968 to 1998, Khadduri worked for the Iraqi atomic energy commission. Up until the first Gulf War, he was in charge of several clandestine nuclear projects. In 1998, Imad Khadduri fled with his family from Iraq. Today, he lives in Toronto in Canada, where Ekstra Bladet has interviewed him several times during the spring of 2003.

- *What are the chances that the US and coalition forces will find any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?*

- Literally zero. There are no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. That was clear already a few months after the end of the war in 1991, when Hussein Kamel, who was in charge of the nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programmes, ordered the destruction of the chemical and biological substances and the warheads. The nuclear programme was destroyed already on the first night of the air raids in 1991.

At that time, Dr. Imad Khadduri worked at the nuclear plant in Akashat. The plant was bombed by the American forces and has never been rebuilt.

- *What is your assessment of the evidence that Secretary of State Colin Powell presented in the UN Security Council, the evidence that President George W. Bush has produced and the evidence that the Danish government has declared must exist?*

- It is as I have described in my articles: There is no evidence. Only bad intelligence. Time is running out. Hopes that American and British forces will find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq that have not been planted there by themselves are withering mirages. Bush, Blair and their officials have lied to their people and led a criminal war based on moronic intelligence. Is that a democratic role model for a “liberated” Iraq?

In 1991, Akashat, where Dr. Imad Khadduri worked as a leading nuclear physicist, was one of two plants where Iraq attempted to develop an atomic bomb, based on the constructions developed in the US World War II Manhattan Project leading to the Hiroshima bomb.

Khadduri worked on the calutron separators, which were intercepted after the Gulf War, in 1992, and destroyed under the supervision of the UN inspectors during the UNSCOM inspections.

Dr. Khadduri was never interrogated about his knowledge of the Iraqi nuclear programme by either the Canadian or US intelligence services before the invasion of 2003.

Blix and Ekeus agree: “There are no weapons”

“**THERE WERE NO REAL** weapons left at the end of '97-'98.”

In an interview with the Australian news –show, Dateline, on 1 October 2003, the former chief UN weapons inspector, Rolf Ekeus, categorically denies that his UNSCOM inspectors missed significant parts of the Iraqi weapons programmes.

“It was clear when UNSCOM was forced to close down, I finished myself '97 and Richard Butler at the end of '98, that there could be hardly any stockpiles. There could be old weapons here and there, but definitely no massive stockpiles.

However, the question was, what had happened while the weapons inspectors were out of the country between '98 and 2002?”

“We were clear that Iraq's weapons programme had been closed down by the inspectors. The question was, could they have been revitalised during the four years without international control, and that was maybe a guesswork if they could be.”

Rolf Ekeus says that doubts needed to be resolved, as to whether Iraq “would try to preserve its potential, its capability one day when they wanted to acquire weapons again and I guess that is maybe what the present problem is.”

But there were no weapons, he says:

“We made clear that the huge chemical weapons stocks existing after the Kuwait war in the early '90s were systematically destroyed by UNSCOM during the coming years, '93 through '94. I made very clear that there was a secret, massive biological weapons programme in Iraq, which was finally demolished with the systematic eradication of the big al-Hakim facility in the summer of '96.”

The Dateline interviewer Mark Davis then asks:

“But was that really the question that was being debated in the last 12 months? The issue of the stockpile was a critical one. George Bush terrified the world by asserting that Saddam Hussein had 30,000 litres of anthrax and Tony Blair added that it could be deployed in 45 minutes. Now, when you heard those claims, did you believe those claims, and if not, what was your response? Did you do anything about that?”

“No, on the second point, the matter of activation 45 minutes, I was highly sceptical. I think I was on record saying that it could be one odd bits and pieces, a couple of pieces of ammunition, but certainly not major, I would say, military quality warfare was possible within that short time frame.”

In mid-September 2003, Ekeus' successor, the leading weapons inspector Hans Blix, says in an interview that, in his view, Iraq destroyed the major part of its stockpiles of weapons of mass destructions after the Gulf war in 1991, but that the Iraqis kept pretending to have the weapons in order to prevent attacks from Iraq's enemies in the area and elsewhere.

Robin Cook: "It is an unjust war"

UNNECESSARY, UNJUST AND SHAMEFUL. Robin Cook's choice of words when he describes the decision to go to war with Iraq is neither polite nor accidental. Two days before the first bombs fell, on 17 March 2003, Robin Cook resigned from the British government. Until then, after a period serving as Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Robin Cook held the position as Leader of the House.

Robin Cook resigned solely because he could not support the decision to go to war.

Ekstra Bladet meets Robin Cook in the last days of September 2003, in Bournemouth in southern England, at the annual Labour conference.

The party has gathered to discuss all the issues of the year - including Iraq.

- *You resigned from the government in March because you couldn't support the war. You claimed that you couldn't support an unnecessary war. Is this reason still valid?*

- Yes, I still think this war is unnecessary, says Robin Cook.

- And I must say that this belief of mine has been strengthened by what we have heard come forward since the start of the war.

- Here I'm thinking of the results of the investigations in Iraq, where apparently nothing has been found. With the information that has surfaced since I resigned, it is now even clearer that this was an absolutely unnecessary war.

And thus an unjust war, says the former Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs.

In the United Kingdom, the march to war has been one of the hottest subjects for debate over the summer of 2003, not least because of the tragic events concerning the death of arms expert David Kelly, who was exposed as the prime source of highly critical information to the BBC, and who committed suicide in July 2003. A few days after his death, Lord Hutton was asked to preside over a hearing, taking evidence and testimony from all parties - including Prime Minister Tony Blair - to investigate the events leading to Kelly's suicide.

- I have been following Lord Hutton's hearings on the weapons of mass destruction and David Kelly's suicide all summer. They clearly show that our entire parliamentary system is extremely compromised by this case. It has been most shameful to see.

- *What's your view on Denmark deciding to join the war?*

- It should be obvious that I can't comment on the Danish government's decision to join the war against Iraq. I have had enough trouble as it is with the remarks that I have made up to now, so I can't comment on that.

When Robin Cook resigned from the British government, it was with a speech of historic dimensions in the House. On 17 March 2003, Robin Cook spoke for the first time in 20 years as a back-bencher. In his speech, he demonstrably shot down all arguments for going to war with Iraq.

It was not without personal cost that Robin Cook resigned. In financial terms alone, he lost the equivalent of more than USD 120,000 annually by stepping down as leader of the House and retiring to the back benches.

Robin Cook is Scottish. He served as Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs in Tony Blair's government from 1997 to 2001, where he was appointed Leader of the House. He has been elected to the parliament for Labour since 1974.

"This is the first time for 20 years that I have addressed the House from the back benches.

I must confess that I had forgotten how much better the view is from here.

None of those 20 years were more enjoyable or more rewarding than the past two, in which I have had the immense privilege of serving this House as Leader of the House, which were made all the more enjoyable, Mr. Speaker, by the opportunity of working closely with you.

It was frequently the necessity for me as Leader of the House to talk my way out of accusations that a statement had been preceded by a press interview.

On this occasion I can say with complete confidence that no press interview has been given before this statement.

I have chosen to address the House first on why I cannot support a war without international agreement or domestic support.

The present Prime Minister is the most successful leader of the Labour party in my lifetime.

I hope that he will continue to be the leader of our party, and I hope that he will continue to be successful. I have no sympathy with, and I will give no comfort to, those who want to use this crisis to displace him.

I applaud the heroic efforts that the Prime Minister has made in trying to secure a second resolution.

I do not think that anybody could have done better than the foreign secretary in working to get support for a second resolution within the Security Council.

But the very intensity of those attempts underlines how important it was to succeed.

Now that those attempts have failed, we cannot pretend that getting a second resolution was of no importance.

France has been at the receiving end of bucket loads of commentary in recent days.

It is not France alone that wants more time for inspections. Germany wants more time for inspections; Russia wants more time for inspections; indeed, at no time have we signed up even the minimum necessary to carry a second resolution.

We delude ourselves if we think that the degree of international hostility is all the result of President Chirac.

The reality is that Britain is being asked to embark on a war without agreement in any of the international bodies of which we are a leading partner - not NATO, not the European Union and, now, not the Security Council.

To end up in such diplomatic weakness is a serious reverse.

Only a year ago, we and the United States were part of a coalition against terrorism that was wider and more diverse than I would ever have imagined possible. History will be astonished at the diplomatic miscalculations that led so quickly to the disintegration of that powerful coalition.

The US can afford to go it alone, but Britain is not a superpower.

Our interests are best protected not by unilateral action but by multilateral agreement and a world order governed by rules.

Yet tonight the international partnerships most important to us are weakened: the European Union is divided; the Security Council is in stalemate.

Those are heavy casualties of a war in which a shot has yet to be fired.

I have heard some parallels between military action in these circumstances and the military action that we took in Kosovo. There was no doubt about the multilateral support that we had for the action that we took in Kosovo.

It was supported by NATO; it was supported by the European Union; it was supported by every single one of the seven neighbours in the region. France and Germany were our active allies.

It is precisely because we have none of that support in this case that it was all the more important to get agreement in the Security Council as the last hope of demonstrating international agreement.

The legal basis for our action in Kosovo was the need to respond to an urgent and compelling humanitarian crisis.

Our difficulty in getting support this time is that neither the international community nor the British public is persuaded that there is an urgent and compelling reason for this military action in Iraq.

The threshold for war should always be high.

None of us can predict the death toll of civilians from the forthcoming bombardment of Iraq, but the US warning of a bombing campaign that will "shock and awe" makes it likely that casualties will be numbered at least in the thousands.

I am confident that British servicemen and women will acquit themselves with professionalism and with courage. I hope that they all come back.

I hope that Saddam, even now, will quit Baghdad and avert war, but it is false to argue that only those who support war support our troops.

It is entirely legitimate to support our troops while seeking an alternative to the conflict that will put those troops at risk.

Nor is it fair to accuse those of us who want longer for inspections of not having an alternative strategy.

For four years as foreign secretary I was partly responsible for the western strategy of containment.

Over the past decade that strategy destroyed more weapons than in the Gulf war, dismantled Iraq's nuclear weapons programme and halted Saddam's medium and long-range missiles programmes.

Iraq's military strength is now less than half its size than at the time of the last Gulf war.

Ironically, it is only because Iraq's military forces are so weak that we can even contemplate its invasion. Some advocates of conflict claim that Saddam's forces are so weak, so demoralized and so badly equipped that the war will be over in a few days.

We cannot base our military strategy on the assumption that Saddam is weak and at the same time justify pre-emptive action on the claim that he is a threat.

Iraq probably has no weapons of mass destruction in the commonly understood sense of the term - namely a credible device capable of being delivered against a strategic city target.

It probably still has biological toxins and battlefield chemical munitions, but it has had them since the 1980s when US companies sold Saddam anthrax agents and the then British Government approved chemical and munitions factories.

Why is it now so urgent that we should take military action to disarm a military capacity that has been there for 20 years, and which we helped to create?

Why is it necessary to resort to war this week, while Saddam's ambition to complete his weapons program is blocked by the presence of UN inspectors?

Only a couple of weeks ago, Hans Blix told the Security Council that the key remaining disarmament tasks could be completed within months.

I have heard it said that Iraq has had not months but 12 years in which to complete disarmament, and that our patience is exhausted.

Yet it is more than 30 years since resolution 242 called on Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories.

We do not express the same impatience with the persistent refusal of Israel to comply.

I welcome the strong personal commitment that the Prime Minister has given to Middle East peace, but Britain's positive role in the Middle East does not redress the strong sense of injustice throughout the Muslim world at what it sees as one rule for the allies of the US and another rule for the rest.

Nor is our credibility helped by the appearance that our partners in Washington are less interested in disarmament than they are in regime change in Iraq.

That explains why any evidence that inspections may be showing progress is greeted in Washington not with satisfaction but with consternation: it reduces the case for war.

What has come to trouble me most over past weeks is the suspicion that if the hanging chads in Florida had gone the other way and Al Gore had been elected, we would not now be about to commit British troops.

The longer that I have served in this place, the greater the respect I have for the good sense and collective wisdom of the British people.

On Iraq, I believe that the prevailing mood of the British people is sound. They do not doubt that Saddam is a brutal dictator, but they are not persuaded that he is a clear and present danger to Britain.

They want inspections to be given a chance, and they suspect that they are being pushed too quickly into conflict by a US administration with an agenda of its own.

Above all, they are uneasy at Britain going out on a limb on a military adventure without a broader international coalition and against the hostility of many of our traditional allies.

From the start of the present crisis, I have insisted, as Leader of the House, on the right of this place to vote on whether Britain should go to war.

It has been a favourite theme of commentators that this House no longer occupies a central role in British politics.

Nothing could better demonstrate that they are wrong than for this House to stop the commitment of troops in a war that has neither international agreement nor domestic support.

I intend to join those tomorrow night who will vote against military action now. It is for that reason, and for that reason alone, and with a heavy heart, that I resign from the government."

More lost evidence

THE SECOND GULF WAR is moving into its second week on 26 March 2003 when the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, speaks in parliament to comment on the war:

“But it is not for a regime change that we're going in. We are going in to disarm him of his weapons of mass destruction. And if he had destroyed his weapons of mass destruction, he's had twelve years, four months and two weeks to demonstrate to the world that he has destroyed them. It would not have been difficult to produce the reports that show that now these nerve gases have been destroyed, now this mustard gas has been destroyed and all the sarin and ricin and whatever terrible toxic gases and poisons he possesses.”

The reports that Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller refers to here have been in the possession of his ministry for up to two weeks. Nineteen days before, on 7 March 2003, Hans Blix presented the report “UNRESOLVED DISARMAMENT ISSUES” in the UN Security Council. This report proves that Iraq does not possess the equipment to produce mustard gas. In the same report, Hans Blix documents that the sarin that Iraq produced, at the end of 1991 at the latest – i.e. twelve years ago - would now have been degraded and worthless.

Hans Blix also reports to the UN that the UN inspectors have to date found no evidence that Iraq has developed ricin to a military capability.

“I was appalled”

IT WAS A SURPRISE for the former director of the UN's Oil for Food Programme in Iraq, Count Hans-Christof von Sponeck, to hear that president George W. Bush pointed to the former vaccine factory at Al-Dawrah as evidence that Iraq had resurrected its biological weapons programme:

- I was appalled when I heard that, says Hans-Christof von Sponeck.
- I almost couldn't stop myself laughing.

According to President George W. Bush and the White House, in a report entitled “A Decade of Defiance and Deception”, “The al-Dawrah Foot and Mouth Disease Vaccine Facility is one of two known biocontainment level-three facilities in Iraq that have an extensive air handling and filtering system. Iraq has admitted that this was a biological weapons facility. In 2001, Iraq announced that it would begin renovating the plant without UN approval, ostensibly to produce vaccines that it could more easily and more quickly import through the UN.”

Hans-Christof von Sponeck describes how he visited the facility in July 2002, just weeks before President Bush identified the facility as a growing biological threat:

- We inspected it in 1999. At that time it was completely destroyed by UNSCOM, the UN weapons inspectors. When I visited the place in 2002, it was even worse. There was absolutely no sign of life or even any tracks from passing cars. All roads and access driveways were overgrown. Inside the buildings, everything was completely broken down. Only the walls were left standing.

The evidence that decayed

WHEN ADNAN IHSAN SAEED al-Haideri escapes from Iraq to Bangkok, Thailand, in August 2001, he's carrying one of the gravest accusations against Iraq in his luggage. It is Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri who reveals that Iraq has secretly resumed the development of biological and chemical weapons. This is a turning point in the charges in President George W. Bush's speech to the UN General Assembly on 12 September 2002.

In connection with the speech, President George W. Bush publishes the report, "A Decade of Deception and Defiance". In this document, one of the first charges against Iraq is that "In 2001, an Iraqi defector, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri, said he had visited twenty secret facilities for chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Mr. Saeed, a civil engineer, supported his claims with stacks of Iraqi government contracts, complete with technical specifications. Mr. Saeed said Iraq used companies to purchase equipment with the blessing of the United Nations - and then secretly used the equipment for their weapons programmes."

The footnotes show that President George W. Bush is referring to an interview that Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri gave the New York Times ten months earlier. The interview was published in December 2001.

In this interview, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri explains that he personally took part in building secret laboratories intended for illegal weapons programmes. These laboratories were hidden in the basements under hospitals in Baghdad and beneath several of Saddam Hussein's palaces.

When President George W. Bush refers to the "stacks of Iraqi government contracts", this remark also refers to the article in New York Times the year before.

IT IS REMARKABLE that president George W. Bush in September 2002 chooses not to refer to US intelligence reports and interrogations of Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri. At the time, the US intelligence community has direct access to Mr. al-Haideri and his information. Shortly after the interview with The New York Times, on 17 December 2001, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri is first interviewed by agents from the Central Intelligence Agency and subsequently taken into custody and put in a witness protection programme. The Iraqi defector is today allegedly living in Virginia, USA.

So Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri has been under US intelligence control and full access for ten months when president George W. Bush and the White House in connection with the speech in the UN General Assembly on 12 September 2002 chooses to use information from the interview in New York Times the year before.

No explanation has been given why President George W. Bush elects to use ten-month-old, second-hand information in his defining speech to the nations of the world in September 2002.

In July 2003, it is revealed that Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri's escape from Iraq is arranged by the Iraqi National Congress (INC), directed by Ahmed Chalabi.

The INC spokesman, Zaab Sethna, says in an interview with the Australian SBS Dateline 3 in July 2003: "We got him out and it turned out that he was probably the

single most significant defector who came out of Iraq in terms of his knowledge of the Iraqi weapons programme.”

THE ESCAPE WAS SET UP in August 2001, after Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri came under suspicion for fraud in January the same year. At first, he escaped to Bangkok and applied for asylum in Australia. This was turned down. In the beginning of December 2001, Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri gave two interviews in Bangkok. One of the interviews was with The New York Times. It is this interview that President George W. Bush refers to in “A Decade of Deception and Defiance” in 2002.

The other interview was with the Australian TV-channel, ABC. In July 2003, Zaab Sethna discloses that it was the INC that set up the two interviews. None of Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri's information has subsequently been verified.

The alleged stacks of documents have never been published, either wholly or in part, either as part of the accusations against Iraq or in connection with the UN weapons inspections in Iraq.

Neither the UN nor the US weapons inspectors have found suspicious laboratories, weapons stockpiles or programmes at the sites that Adnan Ihsan Saeed al-Haideri pointed out in 2001, and which President George W. Bush repeated in September 2002.

IN HIS SPEECH TO THE UN General Assembly and the related document on 12 September 2002, George W. Bush puts forward another accusation that later, in Colin Powell's speech to the UN Security Council on 5 February 2003, is further elaborated and detailed. It says in the document that “Saddam Hussein continues its attempts to procure mobile biological weapons laboratories that could be used for further research and development.”

The information about the mobile laboratories comes from another Iraqi defector, Mohammed Harith, who has been interrogated by the Central Intelligence Agency in Amman, Jordan.

It seems that Mohammad Harith is the single source of the information concerning mobile laboratories. On 12 June 2003, the INC-leader Ahmed Chalabi says that it was the INC that fetched Mohammed Harith out of Iraq and set him up with the CIA.

Less than two weeks after president George W. Bush's speech to the UN General Assembly, the British Prime Minister Tony Blair on 23 September 2002 publishes a dossier containing the UK's assessments of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. In the foreword, Prime Minister Tony Blair writes:

“In recent months, I have been increasingly alarmed by the evidence from inside Iraq that despite sanctions, despite the damage done to his capacity in the past, despite the UN Security Council Resolutions expressly outlawing it, and despite his denials, Saddam Hussein is continuing to develop WMD, and with them the ability to inflict real damage upon the region, and the stability of the world.

“What I believe the assessed intelligence has established beyond doubt is that Saddam has continued to produce chemical and biological weapons [...]”

ALMOST A FULL YEAR LATER, on 15 September 2003, it is revealed during hearings in the UK that these allegations cannot be substantiated with evidence.

In connection with the write-up of the British dossier, the now retired head of section in the British intelligence service, Brian Jones, expresses his concerns over the very explicit statements that Iraq is still developing weapons of mass destruc-

tion.

"I acknowledge that in this statement the Prime Minister will be expressing his own 'belief' about what the assessed intelligence has established. What I wish to record is that based on the intelligence available to me it has NOT established beyond doubt that Saddam has continued to produce chemical [and biological] weapons," writes the head of section Brian Jones on 20 September 2002 - four days before Prime Minister Tony Blair's dossier is published.

This disparagement of one of the key points in Blair's dossier is first to be published the year after, in connection with the hearings over arms expert David Kelly's suicide.

IN DENMARK, THE WEAKLY founded information that Iraq has continued to develop and produce weapons of mass destruction, and that this production to some extent is performed in clandestine mobile laboratories, surfaces in a memorandum that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' international law office writes and sends to Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller on 29 October 2002:

"Since the end of weapons inspections in 1998, Iraq has revived a clandestine production of biological weapons, including small mobile facilities. One can only guess at the amounts and types of Iraq's present stockpiles of biological weapons, but they may include several thousand litres of botulinum toxin, anthrax and other types of bacteria and toxins, including ricin and plague bacteria."

Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller makes direct reference to this memorandum during a debate in the Danish parliament on 14 November 2002:

"I want to warn against underestimating the potential threat that the Iraqi regime actually constitutes. Both the American and the British governments recently published reports that document that Iraq has continued to develop weapons of mass destruction in spite of UN resolutions and restrictions. The country now possesses chemical and biological weapons, and missiles with a range that goes beyond the 150 kilometres allowed by the UN."

On the whole, the Danish government makes the argument of the illegal mobile biological weapons laboratories its own. In one case, the argument is repeated by Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller in parliament on 5 February 2003:

"These weapons can be hidden anywhere. Think about the anthrax or the chemical substances. They can be hidden in an apartment in some provincial city, they can be hidden in a truck that can drive around, there could be chemical laboratories driving around the countryside in trucks."

Per Stig Møller makes his statement at 1.25 pm in the Danish parliament, a little more than two hours before the United States' Secretary of State, Colin Powell, begins his speech in the UN Security Council, where he presents the same argument concerning the mobile laboratories as one of the primary pieces of evidence against Iraq. After the war on 28 May 2003, the Central Intelligence Agency publishes a report on two lorry trailers that have been found and that appear to contain mobile biological laboratories. One of the trailers has been found and secured by Kurdish troops in northern Iraq in the last days of the war. The other, which has been plundered, is found by American troops in the beginning of May. In the report, the Central Intelligence Agency describes the discovery of the two trailers as "the strongest evidence to date that Iraq was hiding a biological warfare program". The CIA report is faxed to the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs from the Danish embassy in Washington on 30 May 2003. The fax is marked as "urgent".

The CIA report never mentions that internal disputes have arisen in intelligence circles as to whether the two trailers are part of a biological weapons programme.

Several things contradict this hypothesis:

Investigations of the two trailers find neither traces of anthrax nor any other bacteria that Iraq has been suspected of developing.

None of the trailers is equipped with pressure tanks or other equipment for disinfection of laboratory equipment, as would be necessary to culture bacteria.

Finally, the trailers are not secured against leakages of bacteria. On the contrary, the trailers are constructed with tarpaulins that can be withdrawn to let out surplus heat and gases.

It is one thing that the tarpaulins would be unable to protect the surroundings from emissions of possibly toxic biological material from the trailers. But the tarpaulins are also unable to keep the environment inside the trailers clean enough that they can be used for the production of biological weapons.

On 22 June 2003, the Los Angeles Times quotes an anonymous American intelligence officer in Iraq as saying that the trailers were probably used for the production of hydrogen for weather balloons, routinely used by the Iraqi artillery.

In his speech in the UN Security Council on 5 February 2003, it is not only lorry trailers with biological laboratories that Colin Powell mentions.

According to Powell's evidence, Iraq is also using refurbished railway freight cars as biological arms factories.

"We have first-hand descriptions of biological weapons factories on wheels and on rails.

The trucks and train cars are easily moved and are designed to evade detection by inspectors. In a matter of months, they can produce a quantity of biological poison equal to the entire amount that Iraq claimed to have produced in the years prior to the Gulf War."

The entire Iraqi railway system is 1,462 miles long. To date, no rail cars with hidden laboratories have been found.

Timeline - Iraq day by day

11 September 2001: NATO's former Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Wesley Clark, is going to appear on CNN to comment on the terrorist attacks when he is contacted by people connected to the White House and asked to link the terror attacks to Iraq. Clark asks for proof, but is given none.

February 2002: The CIA sends former ambassador Joseph Wilson to Niger to investigate allegations of attempts by Iraq to purchase uranium. Wilson returns home with the conclusion that the information is incorrect. General W. Fulton Jr. is also in Niger to monitor the country's nuclear security. He concludes that everything is in order.

9 March 2002: The CIA sends a memo to the White House saying that the information about the uranium transaction is wrong. The same month, intelligence staff send a memo to Secretary of State Colin Powell with the same conclusion: that the information "is probably false."

25 March 2002: Bush and Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh meet in the White House, where they discuss topics including Iraq.

3 July 2002: Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller meets Colin Powell, who tells him that the United States intends to remove Saddam Hussein no matter what, and that both covert operations and overt confrontations with Iraq are being considered.

9 August 2002: Ekstra Bladet sends satellite photos to the Danish foreign ministry, which show that the United States is stockpiling large quantities of arms and equipment in the Gulf of Arabia. Per Stig Møller replies in a letter that he will not comment on an approaching Iraq war, which he describes as "speculations in the press".

6 September 2002: "The evidence must be able to stand up in the Municipal Court," says Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller. "I am not in the slightest doubt that he possesses weapons of mass destruction and wishes to manufacture them," says Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen to the Danish news agency, Ritzau Bureau, regarding the evidence against Saddam Hussein.

9 September 2002: President Bush telephones the Turkish Prime Minister, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan and the chairman of the European Union, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, and asks them to "listen very carefully" to his address to the UN General Assembly three days later, in which he will issue a warning against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq.

12 September 2002: Bush makes a speech and presents a document in the UN General Assembly, which is considered by many to be the actual declaration of

war.

20 September 2002: A leading British intelligence officer raises internal doubts about the validity of the evidence against Iraq.

24 September 2002: Prime Minister Tony Blair presents the first public document to assert that Iraq has attempted to purchase uranium in Africa. The same day, the White House endorses the claim.

27 September 2002: US Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld describes the hunt for hard evidence of a connection between Al-Qa'eda and Iraq: "We ended up with five or six sentences that were bullet-proof. We could say them, they are factual, they are exactly accurate. They demonstrate that there are in fact al Qaida in Iraq."

October 2002: United States intelligence agencies compile a 90-page National Intelligence Estimate, which is delivered to the White House. It casts doubt on the uranium claim and states that there "are no satisfactory sources" to confirm that Iraq supports Al-Qa'eda. In a speech, George W. Bush states: "We've learned that Iraq has trained Al-Qaida members in bomb-making and poisons and deadly gases."

Beginning of October 2002: George Tenet, Director of the CIA, personally warns the White House against using the claim about the uranium deal, as there is uncertainty as to whether it is correct.

7 October 2002: In a speech, President Bush says: "Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints."

10 October 2002: The US Congress authorizes President Bush to go to war with Iraq. Several members emphasize that the alleged uranium deal has played a part in determining their votes.

29 October 2002: In the Danish foreign ministry, the office of security policy writes a memo to the government that describes the uranium deal as a fact and as evidence against Iraq. The memo also deals with Iraq's chemical and biological weapons: "Since weapons inspections ceased in 1998, Iraq has resumed the covert production of biological weapons, partially in small, mobile facilities. The amounts and types of Iraq's current weapons reserves can only be guessed at, but the stock may very well include several thousand litres of botulinum toxin, anthrax, and other types of bacteria and toxins, including Ricin and plague bacteria."

14 November 2002: Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller reports on the memo to the Danish parliament. Among other things, he states that Iraq is less than a decade away from having nuclear weapons, and, "if Iraq gets its hands on enriched uranium or plutonium, the country could probably have an atomic bomb within a year." Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen states that "no connection has been established between the events of 11 September and the regime in Iraq, but there is no guarantee that Saddam Hussein could not be tempted to employ terror as an instrument to achieve his goals."

December 2002: Experts from US federal laboratories tell the Department of Energy and American intelligence services that the Italian-designed Medusa 81 missile possesses the same measurements and alloy as the confiscated aluminium tubing.

19 December 2002: The American State Department emphasizes the uranium deal as proof that Iraq is suppressing information about its weapons stocks. Same day: Secretary of State, Colin Powell, says: "The UN Special Commission concluded that Iraq did not verifiably account for, at a minimum, 2160kg of growth media. This is enough to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax - 3 times the amount Iraq declared; 1200 liters of botulinum toxin; and 5500 liters of Clostridium perfringens - 16 times the amount Iraq declared. Why does the Iraqi declaration ignore these dangerous agents in its tally?"

Same day: The IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) asks the US to release the documentation for Iraq's attempt to buy uranium in Niger.

27 January 2003: Mohamed ElBaradei, Director General of the IAEA, presents a report to the UN Security Council. He cannot comment on the allegation that Iraq has attempted to purchase uranium in Niger, as he has not yet received evidence for the matter from the United States.

28 January 2003: President George W. Bush mentions the uranium deal in his State of the Union address to Congress, which is broadcast on TV. In the same speech, Bush states: "Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaida."

5 February 2003: Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller tells the Danish parliament that Iraq can conceal its biological and chemical weapons on concealed trucks.

5 February 2003: In his address to the UN Security Council, Colin Powell states that the United States' evidence on the link between Iraq and al-Qa'eda consists of information about an al-Qa'eda training camp in the Kurdish-controlled part of Iraq, and information that a suspected al-Qa'eda member, Abu Mussab al Zarqawi, has received hospital treatment in Baghdad. In addition, Powell places emphasis on the confiscated aluminium tubes as decisive proof that Iraq is trying to develop atomic weapons.

Beginning of February 2003: The IAEA receives the Niger papers from the US. Initially, the IAEA attempts to obtain further information from Niger and Iraq. After ten days it becomes clear that there is no other information, and the IAEA therefore investigates the Niger papers, which quickly turn out to be forgeries.

19 February 2003: On the subject of anthrax and nerve gas, Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says in the Danish parliament that "we know that he has them."

6 March 2003: In a report, the United Nations' inspectors in UNMOVIC conclude

that large portions of Iraq's chemical and biological weapon stocks are decayed and worthless.

7 March 2003: IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei documents in the Security Council that the evidence for the uranium deal has been forged.

8 March 2003: The Danish foreign ministry's representative in New York e-mails Blix and ElBaradei's speech, together with an assessment, to the government in Denmark. The e-mail is sent personally to both Per Stig Møller and Anders Fogh Rasmussen.

14 March 2003: President George W. Bush telephones Fogh and then Blair to discuss disarming Saddam Hussein.

19 March 2003: First and second reading in the Danish Parliament of the parliamentary decision to participate in the war. Neither Fogh nor Møller mentions the fact that the important evidence concerning nuclear weapons has been rejected as mendacious. The Minister for Foreign Affairs says that "the situation has worsened" since 1998 due to Iraq's stocks of anthrax, botulinum and aflatoxin, but does not mention that the ministry has learned twelve days earlier that these materials are now harmless.

21 March 2003: During the press conference on Danish participation in the war, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says that "Saddam Hussein has had obvious connections with terrorists and possibly still has them." He also says that there is a risk that Iraq will soon have nuclear weapons.

18 June 2003: Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen maintains in an interview with Ekstra Bladet that Iraq has a nuclear weapons program. In the same interview, Anders Fogh Rasmussen maintains that "Saddam Hussein's collaboration with terrorists" is an important element in the government's basis for going to war.

July 2003: Former State Department intelligence official Greg Thielmann comes forward and states: "There was no significant pattern of cooperation between Iraq and the Al-Qaida terrorist operation."

8 July 2003: The White House acknowledges that the information about the uranium deal is based on forged documents.

11 July 2003: CIA Director George Tenet assumes responsibility for the fact that the White House has used the uranium allegation, despite the fact that the CIA knew that it was a lie.

17 July 2003: In a letter to the Danish daily newspaper, Information, Per Stig Møller refers to "uncertainty concerning ... reports about the import of uranium."

6 August 2003: Anders Fogh Rasmussen replies to parliamentary question S3898 (whether the Danish Defence Intelligence Service had doubts about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction): "In regard to the specific question, the Defence Intelligence Service has stated that, in the preparation of intelligence assessments, there often will be contradictory information."

7 August 2003: Per Stig Møller explains to the parliament that the government has not used the falsified information about the uranium deal in its assessments of Iraq's weapons.

7 August 2003: Fogh Rasmussen tells the parliament that the Danish Defence Intelligence Service's assessment of the connection between Iraq and al-Qa'eda is based on its own intelligence, open sources and information from NATO and foreign partners, and that the material cannot be published.

20 August 2003: The Prime Minister states that he did not have documentation on 21 March 2003 to assert that Iraq would soon have nuclear weapons, but that the assertion was only "a political view".

Same day: Fogh Rasmussen confirms in another reply in the parliament that he had been informed on 7 March that Iraq's nuclear weapons programme had been abolished.

The vanishing threat of the biological and chemical weapons

THE ENTIRE WORLD IS LISTENING when US Secretary of State Colin Powell gives his speech in the UN Security Council on 5 February 2003. The speech is transmitted live on TV and radio in numerous countries worldwide. During the speech, Colin Powell holds up a small vial as a gimmick to dramatically document the seriousness of the situation. The little vial contains a few grams of powder.

"Less than a teaspoon of dry anthrax, a little bit -- about this amount. This is just about the amount of a teaspoon. Less than a teaspoonful of dry anthrax in an envelope shut down the United States Senate in the fall of 2001.

"This forced several hundred people to undergo emergency medical treatment and killed two postal workers just from an amount, just about this quantity that was inside of an envelope," says Secretary of State Colin Powell and directs a blistering charge against Iraq:

"Iraq declared 8500 liters of anthrax. But UNSCOM estimates that Saddam Hussein could have produced 25,000 liters."

UNSCOM is the inspection team that UN had operating in Iraq in the period from 1991 to 1998.

"If concentrated into this dry form, this amount would be enough to fill tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of teaspoons. And Saddam Hussein has not verifiably accounted for even one teaspoonful of this deadly material. And that is my third point. And it is key. The Iraqis have never accounted for all of the biological weapons they admitted they had and we know they had," says Colin Powell.

WITH HIS EXAMPLE, Secretary of State Colin Powell draws a direct line between Iraq's production of anthrax and the terrorist attacks that took place in 2001, when a series of envelopes containing anthrax were sent to media and politicians in the US.

But his example is problematic.

Firstly, the anthrax that is used in the attacks in 2001 comes not from Iraq, but from the US itself. FBI investigations show that the anthrax that was mailed to the US Congress comes from the Ames strain of anthrax, which can be tracked back to US Defence laboratories in Fort Detrick, Maryland.

Secondly, Colin Powell holds up a vial of powder and talks about anthrax in dry form. Iraq only produced anthrax in liquid form. This was confirmed by the UN weapons inspectors already prior to 1996.

Dried anthrax has an almost unlimited shelf life.

Liquid anthrax degrades over a short period of years.

THE ANTHRAX IS ONE OF the central charges against Iraq. The United States accuses Iraq of having built up stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, including anthrax, since before the first Gulf War. On 19 December 2002, Secretary of State Colin Powell declared that "The UN Special Commission concluded that Iraq did not verifiably account for, at a minimum, 2160kg of growth media. This is

enough to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax - 3 times the amount Iraq declared; 1200 liters of botulinum toxin; and, 5500 liters of clostridium perfringens - 16 times the amount Iraq declared.”

So Colin Powell's - and with him the United States' - charge against Iraq is not that the country has produced 25,000-26,000 litres of anthrax. The charge is that Iraq at a time possessed growth media - and possibly still have them - enabling the country's scientists to produce large amounts of anthrax.

Growth medium in itself is harmless. It is also indispensable as foundation for the production of biological weapons. It is the nutritional material that the lethal bacteria feed upon to grow.

The growth media that Iraq is suspected of possessing were purchased in 1989 at the latest. According to the former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter, it has a shelf life of a maximum of five years. This would make it useless for the production of biological weapons any later than 1994.

ANOTHER ACCUSATION concerns the nerve gas VX. On 7 March 2003, chief weapons inspector Hans Blix reports to the UN Security Council. Here, he presents his report, “UNRESOLVED DISARMAMENT ISSUES”, which is dated 6 March. The report is copied by the Danish UN mission in New York and e-mailed to the Foreign Ministry in Denmark on 10 March. It is stamped as received on 11 March.

In the report, Hans Blix accounts for the banned biological and chemical weapons that UN inspectors have looked for in Iraq, including the nerve gas VX.

Iraq produced this nerve gas on two occasions. The first time was when it produced 2.4 tons of VX in the period from 1985 to the end of May 1988. Iraq has claimed that this VX was destroyed in 1988, because it was degraded and therefore useless. Via their inspections, the UN inspectors from UNSCOM have confirmed that Iraq has destroyed VX as claimed - but without being able to establish the amount that Iraq destroyed in 1988.

However, the fact that Iraq cannot account for how much VX was destroyed in 1988 does not matter, since it is clear that all the VX gas produced prior to 1988 has long since degraded and is therefore harmless. This is evident from the documents which Iraq presented to the UN, and which have been analysed by the weapons inspectors: “There is documentary evidence to support Iraq's accounts of all the events that occurred between 1985 and May 1988.”

In April 1990, Iraq produced a further 1.5 tons of VX. Iraq itself claimed that this batch of VX was highly unstable, and was therefore destroyed the same year. In February 2003, Iraq suggested that UN weapons inspectors take samples of earth from the site where the chemicals were allegedly destroyed. However, there was insufficient time to resolve the question of the 1.5 tons of VX before the war began on 19 March 2003.

There is concrete information, then, concerning the amount of VX produced and subsequently destroyed or degraded. Over half of the total of 3.9 tons was destroyed or had degraded by 1988 at the latest. The rest is claimed to have been destroyed in 1990, but without UN weapons inspectors being able to confirm this before they were withdrawn and the war began.

THIS WAS KNOWN to the Danish government by 11 March at the latest, when the Danish UN mission's copy of the weapons inspectors' report was logged in at the Foreign Ministry.

It is therefore demonstrable that Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller possesses knowledge to the contrary when, ten days later, on 21 March 2003, during the final debate about Danish participation in the war, he mounts the lectern in parliament and says:

"As regards the VX nerve gas ... Iraq has admitted producing four tons of VX nerve gas, of which two drops on your skin is lethal. Four tons of VX nerve gas and just two drops on your skin is lethal. We cannot account for what has happened to it," says Per Stig Møller.

In the first place, and at this point Per Stig Møller has known this for ten days, more than half the chemicals *have* been accounted for - they were destroyed 15 years previously. Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller conceals this fact.

In the second place, the reason that the rest cannot be accounted for is that the weapons inspectors have been pulled out and Iraq has been attacked, before the question of the remaining 1.5 tons VX nerve gas could finally be resolved.

In June 2003, Per Stig Møller is asked in the Danish parliament to account for his claims about Iraq's VX. Among other things, Per Stig Møller is asked to state whether he believes that the compound is still active.

PER STIG MØLLER'S ANSWER, which was delivered in parliament on 16 June 2003, can only be described as misleading:

"The 4 tons of nerve gas mentioned are identical with the 3.9 tons which Iraq itself admitted to producing. According to UNMOVIC'S documents, there is great uncertainty concerning both the amounts produced and destroyed, as well as the production methods and thereby the stability of the substance that Iraq produced. That this was still a source of concern for the UN weapons inspectors is evident from the fact that the VX question and the many loose ends connected with it was the first point that Hans Blix chose to address in his address to the Security Council on 27 January, in the chapter on chemical weapons."

In this answer, delivered in July 2003, Per Stig Møller refers to Blix's interim report from January 2003 and says that there is "great uncertainty" about the amounts and the stability of the Iraqi VX.

However, at the point in time at which Per Stig Møller sends his written answer to the parliament, the Danish foreign ministry has been in possession of Hans Blix's account, published on 7 March 2003, for five months. Here, the UN inspectors have accounted for the VX compounds as accurately as was possible before the war started, stating, among other things, that large portions of the VX gases have verifiably been destroyed.

ALSO ON 19 MARCH 2003, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller is at the lectern in the Danish parliament to talk about Iraq's chemical and biological weapons:

"The weapons inspectors have established that Iraq has produced 19,000 litres of botulinum, 8,400 litres of anthrax and 2,000 litres of aflatoxin, despite the fact that the Iraqi authorities claimed up until 1995 that no biological weapons programme existed or ever had existed. That is a quote by [then Minister for Foreign Affairs] Mr. Niels Helveg Petersen on 17 February 1998, and I do not think anyone believes that any of the things noted by Mr. Petersen as existing on 17 February 1998 have since been destroyed, as if this were so we would have been told. So the situation has got worse," says Per Stig Møller.

Here, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller is speaking despite knowledge to the contrary. Once again, his claims are contradicted by Hans Blix's last report from March 2003. The biological toxins that Per Stig Møller mentions have degraded.

Concerning the botulinum, Hans Blix's conclusion is that "any such stockpiles of botulinum toxin, whether in bulk storage or in weapons that remained in 1991, would not be active today."

Concerning the aflatoxin, Hans Blix concludes: "Such stocks would have degraded and would contain little if any viable agent in 2003."

Per Stig Møller knows this by 11 March 2003 at the latest. By this date at the latest, the Foreign Ministry has seen the evidence which documents that both the 19,000 litres of botulinum and the 2,000 litres of aflatoxin have now degraded, and are thus worthless and inactive.

Nevertheless, eight days later, Per Stig Møller mounts the lectern and says, firstly, that he does not think anyone believes that the materials have been destroyed since 1988, and furthermore, that "the situation has got worse."

IT IS NOT ONLY Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller who provides misleading information about Iraqi biological weapons. Denmark declares war on Iraq on 21 March 2003, and during the subsequent press conference, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen states that "*We should not forget what it is all about,*" namely "that Saddam Hussein has not accounted for thousands of litres of anthrax ... and large quantities of biological toxins."

But the Prime Minister's statement is in contradiction to the facts. As Hans Blix has made clear, the large amounts of biological toxins the Prime Minister mentions have long since degraded.

These examples of the government presenting the question of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction as a persistently growing problem, in spite of specific knowledge to the contrary, are not isolated.

In connection with the debate about resolution B118 concerning Danish participation in the war, numerous questions are put to the government. One of the questions put to Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller is: "Will the minister give an account of the evidence that exists that Iraq possesses weapons of mass destruction?" Per Stig Møller's answer begins with this explanation: "During the first weapons inspection in Iraq, undertaken by UNSCOM from 1991 to 1998, large quantities of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction were found and destroyed, particularly after 1995. This process was never completed, as a consequence of the fact that the weapons inspectors had to leave the country in 1998 due to Iraq's obstruction of their work."

This answer is incorrect. Scott Ritter, former leading weapons inspector for the UN, told Ekstra Bladet: "We found no weapons of mass destruction after 1993."

AFTER THE WAR, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller is forced to account for the incorrect answer in parliament. Per Stig Møller says that it was a matter of a typographical error, made by a civil servant in the ministry, and that the word "before" ("før") should have appeared instead of "after" ("fra") in the sentence: "During the first weapons inspection in Iraq, undertaken by UNSCOM from 1991 to 1998, large quantities of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction were found and destroyed, particularly after 1995."

But changing "after" to "before" makes nonsense of Per Stig Møller's answer to the Danish parliament. The original question was, as noted, what evidence there *is* that Iraq *possesses* weapons of mass destruction. With the correction of the alleged typo from "after" to "before", Per Stig Møller's answer to parliament is that the evidence that weapons exist today is that the Iraqis destroyed them eight years ago.

In connection with the question of the destruction of the Iraqi weapons after 1995, Per Stig Møller writes:

"In 1995, General Hussein Kamel, Saddam Hussein's son-in-law and the head of Iraq's secret weapons programmes, defected to Jordan. He presented a wealth of information about Iraq's weapons programmes, including both the biological weapons programme and the nuclear weapons programme, about which Iraq, contrary to its obligations, had not previously provided any information to UNSCOM."

Specific knowledge is withheld here, so that while the two sentences are superficially correct, their content is distorted. By referring to the defection of Hussein Kamel in 1995 and his subsequent debriefing by UNSCOM, it appears as though the UN has received concrete information about existing Iraqi weapons programmes which Iraq has successfully concealed in the period from 1991 until Kamel's defection in 1995.

This is not the case. Hussein Kamel told UNSCOM that all Iraqi weapons programmes, biological, chemical and nuclear, had ceased in 1991, and all illegal materials had been destroyed the same year.

"All chemical weapons were destroyed. I ordered the destruction of all chemical

weapons. All weapons - biological, chemical, missile, nuclear - were destroyed," Hussein Kamel explained at the debriefing conducted by UNSCOM to which Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller refers.

Losing track of the terrorists

THE TERRORIST THREAT and the fear that Iraq will supply its weapons of mass destruction to terrorists is one of the most important arguments - both in the United States and in Denmark - for going to war against Iraq.

President George W. Bush stated this in his speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations on 12 September 2002, where he referred to the collaboration between terrorists and Iraq regarding weapons of mass destruction as "our greatest fear".

The Danish Prime Minister, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, repeated this in his opening speech to the Danish parliament three weeks later, on 1 October 2002, where he said, referring to NATO: "we must adapt the alliance to a new time, to the threats from international terrorism and the risk of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction." And then, about Iraq: "The United Nations should, after more than ten years' attempts through the Security Council, get Iraq to live up to its responsibility to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is too late when the poison gas has spread over one of our large cities."

Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen elaborated on the threat in the Danish parliament on 14 November 2002:

"No connection has been established between the events of 11 September 2001 and the regime in Iraq, but there is no guarantee that Saddam Hussein could not be tempted to use terrorism as an instrument to achieve his goals. We cannot ignore such a possible threat."

...

It is only the "possible threat" of collaboration between Iraq and terrorists that worries the Danish government.

...

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S ARGUMENTATION about the connections between terrorists and Iraq reappear in Denmark in several contexts.

Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen repeatedly emphasizes Iraq's connections with terrorists as being decisive in relation to going to war.

This occurs, for example, in the Danish parliament during the debate of 14 November 2002, and it occurs in the Prime Minister's Office during the press conference of 21 March, where Anders Fogh Rasmussen announces that Denmark has decided to participate in the war against Iraq.

Here, Anders Fogh Rasmussen says that one important reason for Denmark's par-

ticipation is “that Saddam Hussein has had overt connections with terrorists and possibly still has them.”

The answer to question S4230 in the Danish parliament of 21 August 2003 shows that the Danish Defence Intelligence Service has prepared analyses of Iraq’s terrorist connections. According to the answer, these analyses were included “in the overall basis for the statements about Saddam Hussein’s connection to terrorists”. However, neither the wording, content nor conclusions of the estimates is presented.

In question S3963 in the parliament, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen is asked whether he “will state whether it was possible, on the basis of any analyses prepared by the Danish Defence Intelligence Service before the war in Iraq, to draw the conclusion that there was an association between Saddam Hussein and the al-Qa’eda network?”

Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen fails to answer the question, but refers in his written reply of 8 August 2003 to the fact that the intelligence service’s analyses “are not based exclusively on open sources, but also on information from NATO and foreign partners, as well as our own intelligence gathering, and therefore naturally cannot be passed on to the public.”

IT IS APPARENT FROM DOCUMENTS to which Ekstra Bladet has gained access under the Danish freedom of information act that the Prime Minister’s Office received the Danish Defence Intelligence Service’s estimate of the connections between terrorists, including between al-Qa’eda and Iraq, no later than the start of January 2003. The estimate has probably been delivered in the form of what is known as a “theme signal” (“temasignal”), i.e. a concise report from the intelligence service to the Prime Minister’s Office.

The contents of this estimate are unknown. But documents from the Prime Minister’s Office and the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs accessed under the Danish freedom of information act suggest that the established connections between Iraq and al-Qa’eda and the consequent terrorist threat are assessed as very weak or non-existent.

On 21 February 2003, the Danish Emergency Management Agency commences work on a website that is to inform the population when the war against Iraq takes place. In the first draft, there is a section containing examples of questions that one may expect the population to pose.

“Will al-Qa’eda strike in Denmark?” is one of the questions.

“No, but we cannot guarantee against the ‘mad sympathiser’,” is the Danish Emergency Management Agency’s answer.

Six days later, the question and answer in the draft have been changed to read as follows: “Is there danger in Denmark?”

“There is no reason to take special precautions because of the situation in Iraq.

There is no danger here in Denmark.”

On 13 March - a few days before the war - the text has again been changed: “There is at present no reason to expect actions in Denmark. However, after the attack on Iraq, the participating countries’ risk of terrorist actions is increased.”

The last version of the answer remains on the website until after Denmark enters the war.

The Danish Emergency Management Agency is continuously briefed by both the Danish Security Intelligence Service (police intelligence) and the Danish Defence Intelligence Service (military intelligence). The Danish Emergency Management Agency also participates in the meetings of the crisis management group in the Prime Minister’s Office.

On 21 March 2003, that is the same day that Denmark declares war against Iraq; the Danish Emergency Management Agency issues a situation report about the level of alert in Denmark. This says, among other things: “According to the information available, there is at the present moment no knowledge of terrorist attacks or violent actions against targets in Denmark occasioned by the military action against Iraq. Overall, on the existing basis, the threat must still be considered to be relatively low.”

The low state of alert continues. Papers released from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs show that the defence forces in the period from 24 March to 27 March - that is, in the period from three days after Denmark entered the war - proceed with an only moderately raised level of alertness.

THE HIGHEST state of anti-terrorist alert during the war is reached by the Danish defence forces in connection with the sailing of a Standard Flex SF-300 patrol vessel on 28 March 2003. Here, the defence forces are in “close contact with the police about possible unrest”.

Thus, according to the army and police estimates, anti-war demonstrators constitute a greater threat on Danish soil than al-Qa’eda.

Thus, everything suggests that the terrorist threat from Iraq and al-Qa’eda is actually not assessed as particularly high, despite the fact that Denmark from 21 March 2003 is a nation among only seven that have battle forces in Iraq or in the coastal waters off Iraq.

IN JUNE 2003, THE UNITED NATIONS’ terrorism committee states that there is no evidence of a connection between Iraq and al-Qa’eda. During a press briefing in the United Nations’ headquarters, the committee’s chief investigator, Michael Chandler, states: “Nothing has come to our notice that would indicate links between Iraq and Al-Qaida.”

The committee has been set up to monitor al-Qa’eda and this organisation’s financial support base. On 26 June 2003, the American news agency, Knight Ridder, quotes unnamed members of the committee as saying that “the U.S. government

had given them no information to support its claims of collaboration between Al-Qaida leader Osama bin Laden and the former Saddam Hussein regime.”

In an interview with Ekstra Bladet on 18 June 2003, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen repeats and emphasises that the terrorist connections were decisive for the government:

“Weapons of mass destruction were definitely an important argument. Saddam Hussein’s collaboration with terrorists another element,” said Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen after a meeting in the Foreign Policy Committee of the Danish parliament.

However, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen does not elaborate on which terrorists the government was thinking of, and asked directly, he does not comment on a question about the lack of evidence for a connection between Iraq and al-Qa’eda.

IN A LETTER TO THE NEWSPAPER Information on 17 July 2003, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, names which terrorist organizations the government is thinking of:

“It is publicly known that two terrorist organizations, MKO and Ansar al-Islam (with connections to al-Qa’eda), have operated on Iraqi territory, and that the Palestinian terrorist Abu Nidal was found shot in his apartment in Baghdad in August last year. It is also known that Saddam gave incentives to acts of terrorism by paying out large cash rewards to the families of Palestinian suicide bombers.”

It is worth noting that Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller in his letter to Information fails to mention that there is no proven connection between Saddam Hussein’s government and Ansar al-Islam.

The only connection that can be established between Ansar al-Islam and Iraq - but actually not the Iraqi government - is that the organisation is located within Iraq’s borders in the northern part of Iraq, which since the start of the 1990s has been under Kurdish control and thus outside the range of the Iraqi regime.

NEITHER IS THE OTHER terrorist organisation the government has now indicated, MKO, engaged in global terrorism. The organisation is directed solely against the Iranian theocracy.

Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller himself has explained this in the Danish parliament in November last year:

“In May 2002, the organization Mujahedin-e Khalq, MKO, was placed on the European Union’s terrorism list. MKO presents itself as a democratic party, but it is the only organisation that has conducted actual terrorist attacks in Iran, and this has had its main impact on Iranian political personalities and institutions with associations with the government.”

Until MKO was designated as a terrorist organisation in May 2002, the Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs had a close collaboration with the organisation, which at that point appeared as one of only two exile Iranian organisations. Per Stig Møller himself has previously described the organisation as “a democratic resist-

ance movement”.

“The terrorist argument is the thinnest argument for going to war,” says Lars Erslev Andersen in an interview with Ekstra Bladet. Lars Erslev Andersen is a specialist in global terrorism and lecturer in Middle East studies.

“What is known is that Saddam’s government has sent money to some of the families whose fathers or sons were suicide bombers. And that Iraq has supported the Iranian resistance group, MKO, which is fighting the fundamentalist theocracy in Iran.”

“What should be emphasised is that there is no evidence that Saddam has collaborated with global terrorist groups. Including al-Qa’eda,” says Lars Erslev Andersen.

AFTER THE WAR, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen is asked several direct questions in parliament about allegations about Iraq’s connections to terrorists. Papers from the Prime Minister’s Office and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs show that the answers to the questions were written in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and approved by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, before they were delivered by e-mail to the Prime Minister’s Office and from here forwarded to the parliament for publication.

Thus, it is Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller who in August, a few weeks after the letter to Information, takes up the pen when Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen is asked to elaborate on his allegations about the Iraqi terrorist connections.

The information about MKO and Ansar al-Islam has now fallen away.

To the question: “Will the Prime Minister state which terrorists Saddam Hussein supported and/or sheltered?” Per Stig Møller (and with him Fogh Rasmussen) replies in August 2003: “Open sources show that there was a connection between the former Baghdad regime and terrorist organisations. For example, the Palestinian terrorist Abu Nidal was found shot in his apartment in Baghdad in August last year.”

Abu Nidal was killed in August 2002 - that is, one month before President George W. Bush in September the same year outlined the Iraqi terrorist threat in his speech to the United Nations’ General Assembly, and several months before Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen in October and November designated it a possible threat that Saddam Hussein would supply weapons of mass destruction to terrorists.

IT CAN ONLY BE CHARACTERISED as misleading to use the deceased Abu Nidal as evidence for Iraq’s connections to terrorists. The man is not a terrorist, but dead, when the Iraqi terrorist connection is emphasised as a possible imminent threat in September, October and November 2002, and in January, February and March 2003.

In addition, justified doubt has been raised as to whether Abu Nidal had connections with the Iraqi government at all, when he was alive.

According to all accessible news sources, including CNN and Al-Jazeera, Abu Nidal was under house arrest in Baghdad when he died. Here, Abu Nidal was subject to investigation by the Iraqi security services, which accused him of conspiring with Iraqi opposition circles against Saddam Hussein's government. Abu Nidal had travelled illegally into Iraq on false papers a few months before his death.

The official Iraqi explanation, according to the then Iraqi Prime Minister Tariq Aziz, quoted by Arab News on 21 August 2002, is that Abu Nidal committed suicide while he was under house arrest.

CNN quotes Palestinian sources for an allegation that Abu Nidal was executed by the Iraqi security forces.

Per Stig's household terrorists

SEVENTEEN DAYS AFTER 9/11, the Danish Conservative Party presented a list of 49 organizations that the party regarded as terrorists, and which they proposed should be outlawed. The list was presented as part of the party's campaign during the general election in Denmark in the autumn of 2001. On the list was the Iranian exile organization Mujahedin e-Khalq, also known as MKO.

Shortly after the publication of the list, Per Stig Møller, the former leader of the conservative party protested against including MKO on the list and the organization was subsequently removed and cleared of all charges.

Per Stig Møller wanted MKO removed from the list with the explanation that "this is not a terrorist organization, this is a democratic resistance movement."

Eight months later, in May 2002, Denmark has had a change in government. Per Stig Møller is now Minister for Foreign Affairs. He - and Denmark - utters no word of protest when the EU adds MKO to its list of terrorist organizations.

The Danish foreign ministry has held a close dialogue with exile Iranian organizations, including MKO. This dialogue is immediately halted as regards MKO. The case leads to a series of questions in the Danish parliament. In May 2002, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller maintains that "the government has no plans to suggest that MKO should be removed from EU's lists of terrorist organizations."

In the space of just eight months, the MKO has changed from being a "democratic resistance movement" to being an outlawed terrorist organization.

The MKO is by far the largest armed Iranian dissident group, with 6,000 armed members. Since the 1980s, MKO has operated several bases in Iraq. In July 1988, the MKO organized a large suicide attack on Iran from Iraq. At the time, 7,000 MKO soldiers crossed the border in an operation codenamed "Eternal Light". 2,000 soldiers were killed during the invasion, and an unknown number were taken prisoner and subsequently executed by the Iranian theocracy.

In 1991, MKO soldiers fought side by side with Iraqi soldiers against Kurdish rebels. In May 1993, MKO soldiers attacked Sulaymaniyah, the capitol of Iraqi Kurdistan, capturing 13 Kurds who were later surrendered to Iraqi security forces. In September 1996, MKO soldiers again fought along with Iraqi security forces against Kurds. In 2002 and 2003, the Iraqi cooperation with terrorist organizations - among these the MKO - is presented as "an important reason" to go to war with Iraq. The government is especially concerned that Iraq would consider giving weapons of mass destruction to terrorists.

However, using MKO as an example of a terrorist organization that is under suspicion of obtaining weapons of mass destruction is problematic for the Danish government. The very organization MKO has on numerous occasions over the years been investigated for - and cleared of - precisely these suspicions. The investigations are well documented at the time when the organization and its connections with the Iraqi regime are emphasised by the Danish government.

THERE HAVE LONG BEEN suspicions that the MKO is related to Iraq's programmes for the development of weapons of mass destruction. But these suspi-

cions have never been substantiated with evidence. In 1992, UN weapons inspectors conducted investigations of several MKO facilities, including MKO's administrative headquarters in Baghdad and the MKO base Ashraf, approximately 40 miles north of Baghdad.

The UN inspectors were reacting to reports that Iraq was attempting to hide weapons of mass destruction on MKO bases. But they never found any evidence to substantiate the reports.

The survey of the MKO areas went on from 1992 until at least September 1997, when the MKO camp Bagherzadeh west of Baghdad was investigated for illegal weapons programmes.

In the final UNSCOM report from December 1998, the MKO camps are mentioned. UNSCOM concludes that the MKO camps seem to be out of reach of Iraqi authority and control. In January 2003, Hans Blix's inspectors under UNMOVIC conducted an inspection of an MKO base in Abu Ghraib, 20 miles west of Baghdad. They did not find any evidence of MKO connections with any illegal Iraqi weapons programmes.

Fogh is a liar

The former UN weapons inspector Scott Ritter is razor-sharp in his comments on Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen's claim that "we know that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction."

"If that is what your Prime Minister says - that he knows there are weapons of mass destruction in Iraq - then he is a liar. He is a liar who should be thrown out of government. Then I will call him a liar. Right now. Right in his face," says Scott Ritter to Ekstra Bladet by phone from New York, where he lives.

From 1991 to 1998, Scott Ritter worked as a UN weapons inspector in Iraq. He served as leader of one of the inspection teams in Iraq. During the first Gulf War, Scott Ritter fought as a captain in the US Marines. He won great respect as a weapons inspector until 1998, and when he resigned from the inspections, this was deeply lamented by the then director of inspections, the Australian Richard Butler. In 1998, the State Department honoured Scott Ritter for having performed "an admirable job under harsh, even dangerous circumstances".

"I testified last year for the Danish parliament with the Swedish UN inspector Rolf Ekeus. I explained that Iraq was no threat. I testified that no evidence to date has been presented to substantiate the American government's claims that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction.

"If your Prime Minister says that he knows that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction then he should come forward with the information that substantiates this claim. What does he build this knowledge on?"

How detailed is your knowledge of the Iraqi nuclear weapons programme?

"Very detailed. I investigated it. I have to say, that out of the four categories of WMD, the nuclear was the one that most efficiently was investigated and destroyed.

"It isn't worth investigating it today. There is no nuclear program in Iraq. Not in the least. It was eliminated. Anyone who says the opposite is blind to the facts and ignorant of what it means to maintain a nuclear program."

Your government and mine have said that Iraq has chemical and biological weapons, a crash nuclear weapons programme and connections to terrorists. And this is all lies?

"Yup."

There is not a shred of evidence?

"Nope."

Not a single fig leaf to hide behind?

"Nope."

But what about the mobile laboratories?

"There are no mobile laboratories."

But Colin Powell said that in the UN Security Council?

"They don't exist. They never did. They were invented by a defector controlled by Ahmed Chalabi's Iraqi National Congress, INC. He never told the truth. He handed the Bush-administration with defectors and they used these guys' information as facts. But it is a known fact that they all lied. Everyone in intelligence knows this. None of Ahmed Chalabi's defectors could pass the lie detector. This is why they

weren't handed over to the CIA as they would usually have been. Every single time one of Ahmed Chalabi's defectors was interrogated by the CIA, they instantly fell apart.

"This is why they were interrogated by the Pentagon Office of Special Plans, where their information was regarded as pure Gospel and passed directly on to the President."

But what about Colin Powell's evidence in the UN Security Council?

"That presentation was more about domestic policy than it was about presenting the evidence. It was pure theater. Colin Powell said nothing. It was pure fiction. He's a liar."

You use that expression a lot?

"I have to. There's no other way to put it. Colin Powell didn't make a mistake. He didn't fully and honestly believe what he said. He went in and handpicked the intelligence to find the information that fitted his conclusions.

"There's nothing of what he said, that has been substantiated. Nothing! Take a look at the unmanned planes that were supposed to rain death and destruction over the world and all people. They can't do anything. I explained this already when Colin Powell held that speech, that these planes were useless. And this is the conclusion that everybody has reached now: These planes are a joke. We investigated the planes. I investigated the planes. We knew that they couldn't be used for anything. But nobody wanted to listen.

"Colin Powell knew that the truck he pointed out on his photograph was a fire engine, not a disinfection vehicle. But he said it anyway."

He knew it?

"Of course he knew it was a fire engine! So it is absurd to sit here and say that we talk nicely of Colin Powell. He doesn't deserve that. We're at war. Americans are dying. A Danish soldier has died. And tragically, we're risking even more sacrifices. He is guilty in the death of American and a Danish soldier's death and thousands and thousands of Iraqis deaths too," says Scott Ritter.

Harmless old goop

IRAQ'S PRODUCTION OF ANTHRAX appears in the American, British and Danish accusations against Iraq. Both Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller several times mention anthrax bacteria as a major part of the Iraqi threat against the world community.

During a press conference in Brussels on 19 March 2003, Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen says that Iraq maintains a stockpile of illegal weapons: "This is not something we believe. We know it," says Anders Fogh Rasmussen, mentioning anthrax as one of the illegal types of weapons.

Iraq's production of anthrax was halted in the beginning of 1991 at the latest. All production facilities were later destroyed by the UN. Scott Ritter served as weapons inspector in Iraq from 1991 to late 1998. He took part in the destruction of Iraq's facilities to produce anthrax in the 1990s.

"If they hid any of it, then it's completely useless today. Their anthrax was in liquid form. It has a shelf life of three years! It's useless. It's goop! It can't be used for anything at all. Three years! And the latest production was in the beginning of 1991," says Scott Ritter in an interview with Ekstra Bladet on 12 September 2003. "We blew up that factory in 1996! We monitored the factory from 1991 to 1996 so we know for a fact that they couldn't produce anything. I'd very much like to know where Colin Powell thinks that anthrax should come from. I told these things to the Danish parliament in the fall of 2002."

What did they say to that?

"They said 'thank you very much' and guided me to the door. But the Danish parliament can't use as an excuse that they didn't know. They can't say as an excuse, that they didn't know that the chemical weapons had degraded. That they didn't know that all that we believed that Iraq might hide would be useless today. They can't say that as an excuse. Because they had this presented as fact. By one of the world's leading experts in Iraq's weapons programs. Me. I gave them these facts. If you compare my testimony with the facts we now know, you'll see that there's a one hundred percent match."

War without mandate: How the coalition abandoned the UN and international law

MANY ARE SURPRISED when Syria votes in favour of Resolution 1441 on 8 November, 2002.

The surprise at the Syrian decision is understandable. Of all the member countries in the United Nations' Security Council at the time, Syria is probably the country that is most remote from the United States and closest to Iraq.

The resolution for which the country has just voted yes lays renewed pressure on Iraq and threatens "serious consequences" if Iraq does not fulfil the new demands. Until the vote, Syria has consistently rejected the need for a new resolution.

The answer to the question of why Syria agrees to lay pressure on Iraq can be found in a letter that the United States' Secretary of State, Colin Powell, personally sent to Syria's Minister for Foreign Affairs in the days before the vote.

Here, Colin Powell gives his and the United States' guarantee that Resolution 1441 cannot be used to attack Iraq:

"There is nothing in the resolution that allows it to be used as a mandate to start a war against Iraq. If the American government had the most remote intentions of falling back on military action, it would not have spent seven weeks negotiating this resolution," Colin Powell writes to the Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs, Farouk Shara'a.

[Translator's note: As this quote has been back-translated from Danish, it may not reflect Colin Powell's exact words.]

AT THE EMBASSY IN DAMASCUS, in the days after the vote, the Danish envoy, Danny Annan, writes a report home to the Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs about the Syrian participation in the vote.

Danny Annan writes that Syria "had received guarantees that the resolution did not contain a 'mandate to attack Iraq'" from all five permanent members of the Security Council - including the United States - and from the Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. "There was nothing that could be 'misunderstood or misinterpreted as a mandate to attack Iraq'." Danny Annan calls Secretary of State Colin Powell's letter "the strongest guarantee".

Lawyer and expert in international law, Jens Elo Rytter from the University of Copenhagen's Faculty of Law, has seen Danny Annan's report:

"This supports the general understanding and prevailing opinion in international law that 1441 in itself could not be used to go to war," he says.

The United States' strong guarantee to Syria lasts exactly four months and 11 days. The United States, United Kingdom and Denmark go to war with Iraq without passing the new resolution that is necessary if there is to be a UN mandate for the war.

THE GUARANTEE GIVES the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, a serious explanation problem. In October 2003, a written question about the guarantee was made to Per Stig Møller in the Defence Committee of the Danish parliament.

The question is number 18 and is worded as follows: "Does the minister agree with the United States' Secretary of State, Colin Powell, when the latter in a letter to the Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs wrote that 'there is nothing in the resolution that allows it to be used as a mandate to start a war against Iraq'?"

The concise reply from Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller comes on 9 October 2003. It reads as follows: "The government has not been able to verify the quote in question, which originates in Syrian media."

The same day, Per Stig Møller replies to another question about the guarantee: "Is the government aware of the guarantee from Powell to the Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs that Resolution 1441 cannot be used to go to war against Iraq?"

The Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs' reply is again concise: "See reply to question 18."

THE MANOEUVRE IS A NUISANCE to the government. Per Stig Møller does not reply to the question that has been asked, but instead repeats that it has not been possible to verify the Colin Powell quote.

The problem is that the Danish government is aware of the guarantee that the United States has given Syria and that is mentioned in the report from Danny Anan. Consequently, Per Stig Møller's reply in the Defence Committee must be seen as misleading.

Syria's UN representative, Fayssal Mekdad, mentions the guarantee in the United Nations' Security Council on 8 November 2002, in the course of the very same debate at which Resolution 1441 is passed:

"Syria's vote for the resolution, having received from the co-sponsors of the resolution, the United States of America and the United Kingdom, as well as France and Russia, through high-level contacts reassurances that this resolution would not be used as a pretext to strike Iraq and does not constitute a basis for any automatic strikes against Iraq."

The guarantee is also discussed during the debate in the Security Council on 5 February 2003 - the day Secretary of State Colin Powell presents the United States' evidence against Iraq. During the debate, Syria's representative, Mikhail Wehbe, reads out a declaration written by the Syrian Minister for Foreign Affairs,

Farouk Shara'a:

"It is no secret for us to say that Syria joined the consensus on the draft resolution after receiving guarantees and clarifications from permanent members in the council that voting in favour of the resolution will mean seriously proceeding towards a peaceful settlement of Iraq's disarmament of all weapons of mass destruction and not using this resolution as a pretext to wage war against Iraq."

On 14 February, 2003, it is Syria's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Farouk Shara'a, who personally states in the Security Council that Syria had received a guarantee that Resolution 1441 cannot be used to go to war.

THE ROYAL DANISH MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS and Per Stig Møller are, of course, familiar with the details of these three key debates about Iraq in the Security Council. Firstly, the debate at which Resolution 1441 was passed, secondly, the debate where Colin Powell presented the evidence against Iraq, and thirdly the debate in February 2003, at which the leader of the weapons inspectors, Hans Blix, reported to the Security Council.

The surprising Syrian yes to the resolution is also analysed by the Danish Defence Intelligence Service in the days after the adoption of Resolution 1441. The result of the analyses is sent to the government in the form of the classified report, "Theme signal 202/02 regarding Syrian reactions to the crisis concerning Iraq".

No fewer than eight times in October 2002, the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, is asked in writing about the guarantee to Syria. In not a single one of the answers does Per Stig Møller confirm that the government has a detailed knowledge of the guarantee that has been given by the United States and the other permanent members of the United Nations' Security Council, that Resolution 1441 cannot be used to attack Iraq.

DURING THE FIRST months of 2003, it is clear that the Security Council will not pass a new mandate that gives the go-ahead to attack Iraq.

Instead, attention is directed back to the earlier Iraq mandates. An "and" situated in a sentence in a 12-year old UN resolution suddenly assumes a central significance. The entire foundation in the United Nations for the war comes to depend on this little "and".

After Iraq's occupation of Kuwait in 1990, the United Nations passed Resolution 678, which gave the world community the authority to liberate Kuwait using "all necessary means ... and to restore international peace and security in the area".

Resolution 678 deals exclusively with liberating Kuwait. But in the United Kingdom in autumn 2002, professor in international law Christopher Greenwood writes a report for Tony Blair's government. Professor Greenwood writes that the little "and" in the 12-year old and long since fulfilled resolution constitutes a full mandate to declare war against Iraq in 2003. After all, the resolution states that the member countries are to liberate Kuwait "and to restore international peace and security in the area" (Ekstra Bladet's emphasis).

But Professor Greenwood's interpretation is not tenable:

"The use of the words 'peace and security' belong to the fixed expressions of the United Nations," says Tonny Brems Knudsen, who is lecturer in political science and researcher into the United Nations at Aarhus University, Denmark.

"This formulation refers exclusively to the fact that the member countries of the United Nations have the authority to restore peace and liberate Kuwait. The core of Resolution 678 is to re-establish Kuwait's independence."

"I do not think that there is any way to refer back to this resolution today."

Resolution 678 does not constitute a blank cheque to use force today?

"No, no. It cannot justify an attack that does not deal with liberating Kuwait. It is completely unthinkable that the United Nations' Security Council in 1990 should authorize a deployment of force that at that point lay 12-13 years in the future," says Tonny Brems Knudsen.

ON 5 MARCH, the Danish United Nations representation in New York receives a copy of Greenwood's paper from its British counterpart. The same day, a member of staff at the representation sends the British paper home to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs by e-mail.

12 days later, the international law office of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs writes the memorandum, "The legal basis for the initiation of military measures against Iraq".

The memorandum follows the tune of Professor Greenwood's paper. The international law office states that "Resolution 678 authorizes member countries of the United Nations to do what is necessary in order to restore international peace and security in the region," thus referring to the same sentence that Professor Greenwood describes.

The international law office goes on to state that "it is a condition of peace and a condition for the ceasefire that Iraq does not develop or maintain a capacity regarding weapons of mass destruction, including particularly with respect to chemical and biological weapons. Because of Iraq's material breach of its obligations, it is necessary to ensure - if necessary by the use of military force - that the country be disarmed and thus no longer constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region."

This, then, is the situation on 17 March, two days before the United States attacks Iraq and four days before Denmark joins in: the United Nations' Security Council has not given the go-ahead for the war.

The Danish government knows that the permanent members of the Security Council, including the United Nations, have guaranteed that Resolution 1441 cannot be used to start a war.

Instead of looking forward to a new resolution, it is decided to use a 12-year old

resolution that has nothing to do with the current situation.

This entire construction is dependent on the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Fogh should come clean

"The way I see it, the Danish government is in a serious dilemma. Everybody knows by now that the intelligence used by the United States and Great Britain was not true. It was lies. And well considered lies at that," says the retired CIA analyst, Ray McGovern.

For 27 years, Ray McGovern worked as an analyst in the Central Intelligence Agency. He is a personal friend of George H. W. Bush, the current president's father, with whom he served when Bush was vice-president in the 1980s.

Ekstra Bladet has interviewed him by telephone at his home in Arlington, Virginia. "Your government has one choice. That is to say: 'We were conned. The US and UK lied to us. We're sorry that we supported the war. It was fought under false pretences'. That's the single opportunity that your government has now," says Ray McGovern.

"At some time, your government will have to say it. I can't be the judge as to whether it's best to do it now or postpone it, but those are the facts. There's no use denying them.

"As the situation develops, and when it's finally reported from Iraq that there were no weapons of mass destruction, only documents - when all that comes out, it will be my expectation that Prime Minister Tony Blair's popularity will decline even further. At that time there will be a great pressure on your government to say that it was fooled."

The Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen has said that he knows that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction?

"Yes. That's pure parrot-speak after President George W. Bush, Vice President Dick Cheney, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Secretary of State Colin Powell. Donald Rumsfeld even went so far as to say that he knows where the weapons are located.

"They expected to get their war. They expected it to be quick and they expected that the Iraqis would make them welcome and that we could go home quickly. That just shows how naïvely they acted. It shows a total lack of *realpolitik* on their behalf. They have no experience of any substance in Middle East relations and Middle East history.

"I feel sad about this. I care a lot about Denmark and know of the traditionally close relations between Denmark and the US. To see this being destroyed by these deceptions gives me great pain.

"It also gives me great pain to say such bad things about my own government. But I'm deeply convinced that only the truth can turn the situation to the better. The truth will prevail. It says in the Bible that 'the truth shall set you free' and that, I believe, is absolutely true.

"This is a constitutional crisis in the US. Never before, in the 40 years that I followed things closely, has a branch of the US government apparatus deceived another branch with the purpose of conning them into handing over their constitutional rights. In this case the right to declare war, normally held by the congress. This is a constitutional abuse without precedent.

"It's an abuse of our constitutional system that can't possibly be any worse, since

it's about the decision whether we should declare war on another country or not. *But if it's a constitutional crisis in the USA, wouldn't you say the same thing about the situation in Denmark?*

"That's a question of intent. I seriously wouldn't hope that your leaders intentionally deceived the parliament to persuade them into letting Denmark take part in the war.

"If your Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs are used to taking everything from the US for granted and haven't got the tools to assess the information, then your leaders can just say that they were tricked. As long as they admit it, your parliament has the opportunity to accept that, and to declare that you would have to be more careful the next time.

"Was your government bribed by the US? Did you receive services from the US? In the form of trade negotiations? That would explain why your government blindly followed the US even though alternatives were clear," says the former CIA analyst.

"Your intelligence services are closely related to both the German and French services, both of which had the means to prepare and present their own assessments of the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.

"Your government can't claim total innocence in this, unless they are prepared to declare that 'we were totally naïve' and that they believed everything served up by the US, even when Hans Blix and ElBaradei presented the evidence to the contrary in the UN Security Council," says Ray McGovern.

Rasmussen's war has been my greatest disappointment ever

FOR 32 YEARS, HANS-CHRISTOF VON SPONECK worked in the UN. His last assignment as director was in Iraq, where he supervised the UN Oil-for-Food Programme. Today, he's vehemently critical of the decision to attack Iraq. Hans-Christof von Sponeck is especially critical of the Danish government's contribution to the war.

"Mr. Blair, Mr. Bush and likewise Mr. Rasmussen must be held responsible for the policy that they supported and executed.

"The conclusion that we all must reach is that the evidence concerning the weapons of mass destruction has collapsed as totally as a house of cards. This is so important to understand because we were all convinced to believe - by your government, by the British government and by the American government - that there was a threat that was so imminent that it justified a preemptive attack - a phenomenon not previously recognized in international law."

Ekstra Bladet has interviewed Hans-Christof von Sponeck by email and telephone at his home in Geneva in Switzerland.

"I have been in the UN for 32 years," von Sponeck says.

"Through all my time in the UN, I have always looked to Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland as the best possible examples of correct international behaviour. As the best examples of countries, governments and populations trying to live as UN countries. Who implemented the conventions. Who signed the treaties.

"This is why it is almost incomprehensible for me why a government like the Danish didn't try to achieve as objective an understanding of the situation as possible.

"It is one of the absolutely greatest disappointments ever in my career in the UN, to see how irresponsibly and deceptively the Danish government behaved, and to see how they went up against the population who, after all, didn't want or support this war.

"Now we know that they didn't have the evidence that was the basis for their policy, but on the contrary, that the policies formed the evidence. I believe that this is extremely important to keep in focus.

"And what is so deeply disappointing for someone who has followed this development is that Europe, including Denmark, including the European parliament, as a whole managed this situation extremely poorly. We blankly accepted intelligence material, government assessments relayed by media, and simply reiterated what they claimed.

"When Iraq delivered the 12,200-page declaration in December 2002, the papers were brutally hijacked by the US. They took the papers out of the hands of Mr. Blix and made not only the UN but also the participating governments look like fools when they accepted the American explanation, which I'm almost ashamed to bring forward today. The American explanation was that they had better photocopiers in Washington!

"This is so insane. I will never be Secretary-General of the UN. But if I had been, I would immediately have resigned with Mr. Hans Blix. This was a clear and present

abuse of an almost criminal character of the UN system.

"Your Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, said in parliament that Hans Blix had said that he believed Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction. Hans Blix has never said that. He has never said that he believed they were there."

Are you saying that the Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs is lying?

"Correct. All Blix said was that he didn't believe the weapons were there, but that the inspectors had to continue inspections before they could reach the final conclusions."

These are very serious accusations of the governments?

"I believe that if you want to look at this in a responsible way, then it is not enough to look at the single pieces in the puzzle. You have to put all the pieces together. Then you start to see the red line that goes through all this in the form of a systematic, organized dishonesty."

"All the time, facts have been turned, twisted and misrepresented. No matter what way you turn your eyes, it's the same story: Misrepresentation, dishonesty."

"The Danish government chose the easy way out. They didn't do their homework. I'd say that my demands would be that the Danish Foreign Affairs Committee perform a full investigation of the matter. It is my conviction that the Danish government owes this to the population, but also to the one Danish soldier that has been killed in Iraq. They should ask again: 'Were we properly informed?'"

"When it comes to such important decisions as to go to war - an illegal war no less - the Danish government owes to Europe, to its population - to reassess its policies and answer the question: 'Why did we act as we did? Did we have proper reasons to do this? Was it the right decision?'"

"The truth will come out. The tragedy is that it won't bring back the thousands of innocent people who have disappeared, died or been traumatised. That's the true tragedy."

The hunt for the weapons

IT IS DRAMATIC when Secretary of State Colin Powell in February 2003 holds up a small vial of powder in the UN Security Council. The powder in Powell's vial is harmless, but effective when he charges that Iraq possesses the material to produce thousands of litres of biological weapons.

It is equally dramatic when the United States' leading weapons inspector in Iraq exactly eight months later presents another vial. It is a vial of live botulinum Okra B from which a biological agent can be produced.

David Kay directs the 1,400-man search team known as the Iraq Survey Group, ISG.

THE LITTLE VIAL CONTAINS the only possible biological weapon found to date in Iraq.

"This discovery - hidden in the home of a BW scientist - illustrates the point I made earlier about the difficulty of locating small stocks of material that can be used to covertly surge production of deadly weapons," says David Kay in his presentation on 2 October 2003.

"The scientist who concealed the vials containing this agent has identified a large cache of agents that he was asked, but refused, to conceal. The ISG is actively searching for this second cache."

The find - and the rest of David Kay's interim report - surprises neither the UN weapons inspectors in UNMOVIC nor other biological experts.

Patrice Binder is presently deputy commander of the Institute of Aerospace Medicine of the French Military Medical Service (FMMS) and adviser to the Surgeon General of the FMMS for medical NBC defence. He served as a weapons inspector in Iraq in 1991 and in periods from 1992 until 1995, and was associated with UNSCOM until 1997. Patrice Binder writes in the journal "Biosecurity and Bioterrorism" about David Kay's report:

"Importance given to the 'discovery - hidden in the home of a BW scientist' of a collection of undeclared reference strains - 'a vial of live *Clostridium botulinum* Okra B from which a biological agent can be produced' - is questionable. A strain is not a weapon, a scientist is not an organization, and all of it together is not enough to make a weapons program."

The little vial with bacteria is not the Iraq Survey Group's only find, but just one of a series of indications that David Kay presents in October 2003. Not much is new, though:

"The huge ISG team hasn't really made more progress compared to the past UN inspections, whose results were achieved with smaller teams. The professional skill sets, the technical and human resources dedicated by the US and the UK to this process, are surely as high as possible. But independent inspections under the auspices of a reduced number of nations are questionable regarding the validity of the conclusions. Different points of view on a better way to constrain Saddam's regime have been expressed in the past. Again giving responsibility to the UN to achieve its past job should be the better way to find the truth and to make an uncontested picture of Iraq's WMD program," writes Patrice Binder.

On 26 November 2003, the UN weapons inspectors report to the UN Security Council. The UN never receives David Kay's preliminary report, so the weapons inspectors are left to comment on the public presentation of the report.

"The general impression from the statement released is that most of the findings outlined in the statement relate to complex subjects familiar to UNMOVIC, both from declarations and semi-annual reports provided by Iraq and from correspondence, meetings and the inspection reports of United Nations teams."

IN OTHER WORDS: The UN's weapons experts now say that the US has been unable to present more than what Iraq has already declared and the inspectors have found before the war.

In the same report to the Security Council, the UN inspectors say that they have been denied access into Iraq to reconstitute the inspections after the war. Instead, the inspectors are now based in Cyprus, where they have set up their headquarters. Here, they have compiled a 975-gigabyte database about the Iraqi weapons programmes. Data that they are prevented from investigating in the field. By the coalition.

On 9 May 2003, Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller writes in a reply to the Danish parliament that "it is this government's conviction that the weapons inspectors should finish their tasks whenever the situation allows it." He sets no date for when the government thinks the inspectors can resume their work in Iraq.

IN DENMARK, David Kay's interim report is assessed by the Danish Defence Intelligence Service.

"The ISG have hitherto found no stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction, but are at the present time unable to definitively say that such stockpiles do not exist, or that such stockpiles existed before the war, but have been moved."

The ISG's work in Iraq is hindered by a lack of experts. The survey group consists of 1,400 men, but according to the former weapons inspector Dr. Raymond A. Zilinskas, it is by far the fewest that have previous experience as weapons inspectors:

"I have learned from reliable persons who have firsthand knowledge of the ISG that there are other difficulties not mentioned by Kay, mainly having to do with the inefficient operation of the ISG," Dr. Zilinskas writes in "Biosecurity and Bioterrorism".

"Thus, out of the 1,400 persons reportedly constituting the ISG, most have no prior experience as inspectors (former UNSCOM and UNMOVIC inspectors have generally not been invited to join), with the result that fewer than 100 are actually involved in generating information from field investigations, and the number of Iraqi weapons scientists interviewed by ISG operatives is pitifully low. Given these conditions, it is unlikely that Kay's subsequent reports will add much to the meagre substantial information discovered so far about Iraq's WMD."

In October 2003, the ISG is further weakened when the group has several intelligence experts, military members and interpreters reassigned to other tasks. At the same time, the UK pulls out its SAS soldiers assigned to the group and the US reassigns the 400 men in the Joint Captured Material Exploitation Group.

In January 2004, David Kay resigns from the post as director of ISG and tells the news agency Reuters that he no longer believes the Iraqis had weapons of mass destruction.

"I don't think they existed," Kay said.

"What everyone was talking about is stockpiles produced after the end of the last (1991) Gulf War, and I don't think there was a large-scale production programme in the nineties."

The government's classified sources

Both Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen and Minister for Foreign Affairs Per Stig Møller have on several occasions explained that the government's decision to join the coalition was based on "open sources" - commonly accessible information. An example of this is on 20 November 2003, when Anders Fogh Rasmussen says in the Danish parliament:

"Let me make one thing very clear: The government builds its decision to join the military operations in Iraq on open sources - the same open sources that were available to the parliament."

However, the journals in the Danish Ministry of Defence, Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister's Office show that several essential documents in the basis for the decision can in no possible way be described as open.

The following list is a small compilation of the government's classified reports and reviews:

14 June 2001 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service writes and delivers the report, "Theme signal 028/01 - Succession in Iraq. Qusay Hussein, Crown Prince of Iraq".

17 May 2002 - The Danish Ministry of Defence prepares the classified memorandum, "Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction".

1 September 2002 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service or the Ministry of Defence prepares the classified report, "Iraq's capability in weapons of mass destruction and missile technology". The same day, the Danish Defence Intelligence Service sends the classified report, "Iraq's major opposition groups", to the government.

22 October 2002 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service sends the classified report, "Theme signal 174/02 - Iraq's weapons of mass destruction", to the government.

28 October 2002 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service or the Ministry of Defence prepares the classified report, "Iraq's weapons of mass destruction".

20 November 2002 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service sends the classified report, "Theme signal 202/02 concerning Syrian reactions to the Iraq crisis", to the Prime Minister's Office.

22 November 2002 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service delivers the classified report, "Concerning the Kurdish question in Iraq", to the Prime Minister's Office. It seems that this report is elaborated on in the report, "Theme signal 222/02 concerning the situation in Iraqi Kurdistan, the Kurds considerations re an American invasion", the following month.

17 February 2003 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service delivers the report, "Concerning the weapons inspectors prepared statement in the UN Security Council", to the Prime Minister's Office.

20 February 2003 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service delivers the classified report, "Theme signal 025/03 - economic consequences of an Iraq war - oil and insecurities direct the world economy", to the government.

11 March 2003 - The Danish Defence Intelligence Service sends the classified report, "Theme signal 040/03 concerning Iraq after Saddam - preliminary American

plans”, to the government.

The Iraqi deception

UNTIL 11 MARCH 2003, Andrew Wilkie served as a leading and well renowned military analyst in the Australian intelligence service, the Office of National Assessments.

He quit that day in protest against Australia's unswerving course towards war in Iraq - the war that started just one week later.

Since then, Andrew Wilkie has been at the centre of a violent debate and critique of Australian participation in the war. It is Wilkie's claim that the Australian government deceived the Australian people to persuade them to join the war.

Among other things, information from Andrew Wilkie played a significant role when the Australian parliament in October 2003 censured Australian Prime Minister John Howard.

The Prime Minister was punished for saying: "There is no doubt on the evidence, on the intelligence material available to us, that not only does Iraq possess chemical and biological weapons, but Iraq also has not abandoned her nuclear aspirations."

On 4 February 2003, John Howard said: "The Australian government knows that Iraq still has chemical and biological weapons and that Iraq wants to develop nuclear weapons."

On 7 October 2003, these statements were condemned by the Australian parliament, which censured Prime Minister John Howard for making statements that have now been proven false, for failing to inform the Australian public on intelligence warnings that a war with Iraq would increase the likelihood of terrorist activity, and for misleading the country in his determination to join the President of the United States of America, Mr. George W. Bush, in the war on Iraq.

The information that Australia had intelligence reports concluding that the terror threat would increase in the wake of an attack comes from intelligence analyst Andrew Wilkie. Ekstra Bladet has interviewed him by phone in his home in Sydney, Australia.

"A lot of the discussions in Australia have focused on details and missed the completely fundamental issue, that the government is trying to divert us from, which in Australia - and probably also in Denmark - was that we were persuaded to go to war based on reports on weapons of mass destruction and terrorists.

"There is no doubt that there is an enormous divide between what was stated before the war and what has been found afterwards. The most important issue is that the belligerent governments took intelligence assessments that always contain elements of doubts, and removed the doubts, so the reports seemed more certain than the present facts were able to support. This is what's now coming back to haunt them," says Andrew Wilkie.

The Danish Prime Minister has made statements that practically mirror what Prime Minister John Howard now has been censured for saying?

"That is very interesting. I don't believe that the two of them thought out a conspiracy, but I believe that Denmark may have had the same motives as Australia, which would be to follow the US as closely as possible."

The problem we face today is it that the decision to go to war was made first and

then the intelligence was adapted afterwards?

"I believe so, yes. The US decided long ago, I don't know when, that they wanted this war. Then they went to the intelligence community and demanded that they presented valid reasons to base a declaration of war on.

"It is my clear conviction that the US has wanted this war for a very long while.

"It has been revealed that there was no evidence whatsoever to support the claim that Iraq cooperated with al-Qa'eda. I presume that your intelligence services would have prepared similar reports to the Danish government.

"Denmark is part of NATO, so you would have seen part of the intelligence material passing through the NATO system and you would have received material coming directly from the US and UK. This would be the same material that we have seen. I phrased this a bit cautiously, but what I'm saying is that you guys would have seen some of the same material that we have seen - even though we would have had access to more of it."

How solid were the conclusions in the NATO intelligence?

"The evidence was never unambiguous," says Andrew Wilkie.

Strategic oil

IRAQ'S OIL RESERVES ARE indispensable to the United States. In 2002, according to official American statistics, Iraqi oil accounted for 8.5 percent of total US oil imports.

Over the next 20 years, US oil consumption will rise by six million barrels a day. If the United States' own production of oil continues to follow the pattern of the last ten years, it will drop by 1.5 million barrels a day by 2020.

To fulfill the expected American demands, imports have to increase by 7.5 million barrels a day. In 2020, US production will meet less than 30 percent of American requirements.

Today, only Saudi Arabia and Iraq possess oil reserves large enough to meet the requirements for American growth.

ACCORDING TO THE FORMER Australian intelligence analyst, Andrew Wilkie, access to Iraq's strategic oil reserves was one of several essential reasons for the American decision to declare war.

Did the Australian intelligence services assess the US plans?

"Yes. Even though friends shouldn't spy on each other, we study each other and write assessments. I'm completely confident that your own intelligence services perform in exactly the same way," says Andrew Wilkie to Ekstra Bladet.

"Our intelligence services deliver a constant stream of reports on the US to the government. A lot of what drove this war forward was made clear, for instance, that it had a lot less to do with weapons of mass destruction and more to do with the fact that Iraq's underground holds between 112 and 142 billion barrels of oil that have already been located and of which only a fraction has been used.

"On top of that come the as yet undiscovered reserves, which, according to the US Department of Energy could be between 45 and 220 billion barrels of oil. Iraq's oil reserves are only topped by Saudi Arabia."

TO THE US, there are two enormous benefits of getting one's hands on Iraqi oil: First, American companies can make fortunes in Iraq.

Second, with Iraq's enormous oil reserves, the US can break open the Saudi iron grip on the global oil market and the world economy.

In the summer of 2001, intense negotiations take place in the UN over the sanctions against Iraq. Loosening the sanctions would benefit international companies and give access to the enormous oil reserves. But loosening the sanctions would at the same time seriously hamper the US in getting influence over Iraqi oil.

In the preceding years, both Russian, Chinese and French companies have made successful contacts and negotiated lucrative deals and contracts with the now toppled regime in Baghdad. In 1997, the Russian company Lukoil signed a 23-year, USD 20 billion-dollar contract with the Iraqis to rebuild the Qurna drillings.

The French oil company, TotalFinaElf, had signed contracts to rebuild the gigantic Majnoon oilfield that had been lying disused since the Iran-Iraq war of 1980-1988. According to the German Deutsche Bank, the Iraqis gave the Russians and French contracts that would give them exceptionally large profits. But the companies never

got around to moving in and starting the projects before the American invasion. All negotiations over loosening the sanctions stopped when president George W. Bush in his State of the Union address in January 2002 pointed out Iraq as one of the three countries in the "Axis of Evil".

Bonus for Denmark

IN THE SECOND QUARTER OF 2003, the American economy sees a growth of 3.3 percent. 60 percent of this growth is due to military expenses. In December 2003, the US decided that only countries that supported the war could apply for American reconstruction contracts.

Overall, Danish companies enjoy this decision. The American contracts amount to USD 10 billion. In December 2003, chief consultant in the Confederation of Danish Industries, Marianne Castenskiold, tells the Danish newspaper Politiken that Danish companies are up front in the biddings:

“Denmark stands well. We're talking enormous sums, but it is still way too soon to say anything about how much will be landed by Danish companies in the end. We have good contacts with the American companies that have been appointed to stand for the reconstruction projects.”

ONE OF THESE COMPANIES is Halliburton, which previously had the present American Vice-president Dick Cheney on its board. In the beginning of 2003, the company received contracts with the American military to put out oil well fires after the war. These contracts were so lucrative that a billion-dollar deficit in 2002 was turned to a surplus of more than USD 20 million in the first half of 2003.

During the contract negotiations in August 2003, it is revealed that the contract offers have been written in a way that Halliburton is in practice the only company on the market that can fulfil the contracts and thereby earn on them. It is the US Army Corps of Engineers that receives bids for the oil contracts. It fervently denies that Halliburton has in any way received benefits in connection with the contracts.

ON 22 MAY 2003, President George W. Bush quietly signs Executive Order 13303. This order exempts Iraqi oil - and thereby the oil industry - from any legal responsibility:

“I hereby order:

Section 1. Unless licensed or otherwise authorized pursuant to this order, any attachment, judgment, decree, lien, execution, garnishment, or other judicial process is prohibited, and shall be deemed null and void, with respect to the following:

(a) the Development Fund for Iraq, and

(b) all Iraqi petroleum and petroleum products, and interests therein, and proceeds, obligations, or any financial instruments of any nature whatsoever arising from or related to the sale or marketing thereof, and interests therein, in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest, that are in the United States, that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons.”

Steve Kretzmann and Jim Vallette are analysts with the Sustainable Energy & Economy Network of the Institute for Policy Studies. In July 2003, the two analysts write:

“In other words, if ExxonMobil or ChevronTexaco touch Iraqi oil, it will be immune from legal proceedings in the United States. Anything that could go, and elsewhere has gone, awry with U.S. corporate oil operations will be immune to judgment: a

massive tanker accident; an explosion at an oil refinery; the employment of slave labor to build a pipeline; murder of locals by corporate security; the release of billions of tons of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. The president, with a stroke of the pen, signed away the rights of Saddam's victims, creditors and of the next true Iraqi government to be compensated through legal action. Bush's order unilaterally declares Iraqi oil to be the unassailable province of U.S. corporations."

"In the short term, through the Development Fund and the Export-Import Bank programs, the Iraqi people's oil will finance U.S. corporate entrees into Iraq. In the long term, Executive Order 13303 protects anything those corporations do to seize control of Iraq's oil, from the point of production to the gas pump -- and places oil companies above the rule of law."

Killing qualifiers: How the CIA cleaned doubts out of the Key Judgements

In October 2002, the CIA released a classified report, the National Intelligence Estimate, on the intelligence agencies' assessments of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and programmes. At approximately the same time, an unclassified version of the report was released to the public. The Danish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Per Stig Møller, has acknowledged in the Danish parliament that the unclassified version was instrumental in the Danish government's assessments of Iraq and thereby the decision to take part in the coalition that attacked Iraq in March 2003. The following is a comparison of the classified version as released in July 2003 and the unclassified version from October 2002. The crossed out words, phrases and sentences appeared originally in the classified report, but were redacted from the unclassified version.

Key Judgements

~~We judge that~~ Iraq has continued its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs in defiance of UN resolutions and restrictions. Baghdad has chemical and biological weapons as well as missiles with ranges in excess of UN restrictions; if left unchecked, it probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade. ~~(See INR alternative view at the end of these Key Judgments.)~~

We judge that we are seeing only a portion of Iraq's WMD efforts, owing to Baghdad's vigorous denial and deception efforts. Revelations after the Gulf war starkly demonstrate the extensive efforts undertaken by Iraq to deny information. ~~We lack specific information on many key aspects of Iraq's WMD programs.~~

Since inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has maintained its chemical weapons effort, energized its missile program, and invested more heavily in biological weapons; in the view of most agencies, Baghdad is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. - Iraq's growing ability to sell oil illicitly increases Baghdad's capabilities to finance WMD programs; annual earnings in cash and goods have more than quadrupled, ~~from \$580 million in 1998 to about \$3 billion this year.~~

- Iraq has largely rebuilt missile and biological weapons facilities damaged during Operation Desert Fox and has expanded its chemical and biological infrastructure under the cover of civilian production.

- Baghdad has exceeded UN range limits of 150 km with its ballistic missiles and is working with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), which allow for a more lethal means to deliver biological and, less likely, chemical warfare agents.

- Although we assess that Saddam does not yet have nuclear weapons or sufficient material to make any, he remains intent on acquiring them. ~~Most agencies assess that Baghdad started reconstituting its nuclear program about the time that UNSCOM inspectors departed December 1998.~~

How quickly Iraq will obtain its first nuclear weapon depends on when it acquires sufficient weapons-grade fissile material.

- If Baghdad acquires sufficient fissile material from abroad it could make a nuclear

weapon within several months to a year.

- Without such material from abroad, Iraq probably would not be able to make a weapon until 2007 to 2009, ~~owing to inexperience in building and operating centrifuge facilities to produce highly enriched uranium and challenges in procuring the necessary equipment and expertise.~~

- Most agencies believe that Saddam's personal interest in and Iraq's aggressive attempts to obtain high-strength aluminum tubes for centrifuge rotors-as well as Iraq's attempts to acquire magnets, high-speed balancing machines, and machine tools- provide compelling evidence that Saddam is reconstituting a uranium enrichment effort for Baghdad's nuclear weapons program. ~~(DOE [Department of Energy] agrees that reconstitution of the nuclear program is underway but assesses that the tubes probably are not part of the program.)~~

- Iraq's efforts to re-establish and enhance its cadre of weapons personnel as well as activities at several suspect nuclear sites further indicate that reconstitution is underway.

- All agencies agree that about 25,000 centrifuges based on tubes of the size Iraq is trying to acquire would be capable of producing approximately two weapons' worth of highly enriched uranium per year.

~~-In a much less likely scenario, Baghdad could make enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon by 2005 to 2007 if it obtains suitable centrifuge tubes this year and has all the other materials and technological expertise necessary to build production-scale uranium enrichment facilities.~~

We assess that Baghdad has begun renewed production of mustard, Sarin, GF (cycloSarin), and VX; its capability probably is more limited now than it was at the time of the Gulf war, although VX production and agent storage life probably have been improved.

~~-An array of clandestine reporting reveals that Baghdad has procured covertly the types and quantities of chemicals and equipment sufficient to allow limited CW agent production hidden within Iraq's legitimate chemical industry.~~

~~-Although we have little specific information on Iraq's CW stockpile, Saddam probably has stocked at least 100 metric tons (MT) and possibly as much as 500 MT of CW agents - much of it added in the last year.~~

- The Iraqis have experience in manufacturing CW bombs, artillery rockets, and projectiles. We assess that they possess CW bulk fills for SRBM warheads, including for a limited number of covertly stored Scuds, possibly a few with extended ranges.

We judge that all key aspects-R&D, production, and weaponization-of Iraq's offensive BW program are active and that most elements are larger and more advanced than they were before the Gulf war.

~~-We judge~~ Iraq has some lethal and incapacitating BW agents and is capable of quickly producing and weaponizing a variety of such agents, including anthrax, for delivery by bombs, missiles, aerial sprayers, and covert operatives.

~~-Chances are even that smallpox is part of Iraq's offensive BW program.~~

~~-Baghdad probably has developed genetically engineered BW agents.~~

~~-Baghdad has established a large-scale, redundant, and concealed BW agent production capability.~~

~~-Baghdad has mobile facilities for producing bacterial and toxin BW agents; these facilities can evade detection and are highly survivable. Within three to~~

~~six months these units probably could produce an amount of agent equal to the total that Iraq produced in the years prior to the Gulf war.~~

Iraq maintains a small missile force and several development programs, including for a UAV probably intended to deliver biological warfare agent.

- Gaps in Iraqi accounting to UNSCOM suggest that Saddam retains a covert force of up to a few dozen Scud-variant SRBMs with ranges of 650 to 900 km.

- Iraq is deploying its new al-Samoud and Ababil-100 SRBMs, which are capable of flying beyond the UN-authorized 150-km range limit; ~~Iraq has tested an al-Samoud variant beyond 150 km perhaps as far as 300 km.~~

- Baghdad's UAVs could threaten Iraq's neighbors, US forces in the Persian Gulf, and if brought close to, or into, the United States, the US Homeland.

~~-An Iraqi UAV procurement network attempted to procure commercially available route planning software and an associated topographic database that would be able to support targeting of the United States, according to analysis of special intelligence.~~

~~-The Director, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance, US Air Force, does not agree that Iraq is developing UAVs primarily intended to be delivery platforms for chemical and biological warfare (CBW) agents. The small size of Iraq's new UAV strongly suggests a primary role of reconnaissance, although CBW delivery is an inherent capability.~~

- Iraq is developing medium-range ballistic missile capabilities, largely through foreign assistance in building specialized facilities, including a test stand for engines more powerful than those in its current missile force.

~~We have low confidence in our ability to assess when Saddam would use WMD.~~

~~-Saddam could decide to use chemical and biological warfare (CBW) preemptively against US forces, friends, and allies in the region in an attempt to disrupt US war preparations and undermine the political will of the Coalition.~~

~~-Saddam might use CBW after an initial advance into Iraqi territory, but early use of WMD could foreclose diplomatic options for stalling the US advance.~~

~~-He probably would use CBW when he perceived he irretrievably had lost control of the military and security situation, but we are unlikely to know when Saddam reaches that point.~~

~~-We judge that Saddam would be more likely to use chemical weapons than biological weapons on the battlefield.~~

~~-Saddam historically has maintained tight control over the use of WMD; however, he probably has provided contingency instructions to his commanders to use CBW in specific circumstances.~~

~~Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or CBW against the United States, fearing that exposure of Iraqi involvement would provide Washington a stronger cause for making war.~~

~~Iraq probably would attempt clandestine attacks against the US Homeland if Baghdad feared an attack that threatened the survival of the regime were imminent or unavoidable, or possibly for revenge. Such attacks more likely with biological than chemical agents probably would be carried out by special forces or intelligence operatives.~~

~~-The Iraqi Intelligence Service (IIS) probably has been, directed to conduct clandestine attacks against US and Allied interests in the Middle East in the event the United States takes action against Iraq. The IIS probably would be the primary means by which Iraq would attempt to conduct any CBW attacks~~

on the US Homeland, although we have no specific intelligence information that Saddam's regime has directed attacks against US territory. Saddam, if sufficiently desperate, might decide that only an organization such as al-Qa'ida with worldwide reach and extensive terrorist infrastructure, and already engaged in a life-or-death struggle against the United States, could perpetrate the type of terrorist attack that he would hope to conduct. In such circumstances, he might decide that the extreme step of assisting the Islamist terrorists in conducting a CBW attack against the United States would be his last chance to exact vengeance by taking a large number of victims with him.

State/INR Alternative View of Iraq's Nuclear Program

The Assistant Secretary of State for Intelligence and Research (INR) believes that Saddam continues to want nuclear weapons and that available evidence indicates that Baghdad is pursuing at least a limited effort to maintain and acquire nuclear weapon-related capabilities. The activities we have detected do not, however, add up to a compelling case that Iraq is currently pursuing what INR would consider to be an integrated and comprehensive approach to acquire nuclear weapons. Iraq may be doing so, but INR considers the available evidence inadequate to support such a judgment. Lacking persuasive evidence that Baghdad has launched a coherent effort to reconstitute its nuclear weapons program, INR is unwilling to speculate that such an effort began soon after the departure of UN inspectors or to project a timeline for the completion of activities it does not now see happening. As a result, INR is unable to predict when Iraq could acquire a nuclear device or weapon.

In INR's view Iraq's efforts to acquire aluminum tubes is central to the argument that Baghdad is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program, but INR is not persuaded that the tubes in question are intended for use as centrifuge rotors. INR accepts the judgment of technical experts at the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) who have concluded that the tubes Iraq seeks to acquire are poorly suited for use in gas centrifuges to be used for uranium enrichment and finds unpersuasive the arguments advanced by others to make the case that they are intended for that purpose. INR considers it far more likely that the tubes are intended for another purpose, most likely the production of artillery rockets. The very large quantities being sought, the way the tubes were tested by the Iraqis, and the atypical lack of attention to operational security in the procurement efforts are among the factors, in addition to the DOE assessment, that lead INR to conclude that the tubes are not intended for use in Iraq's nuclear weapon program.

Confidence Levels for Selected Key Judgments in This Estimate

High Confidence:

- Iraq is continuing, and in some areas expanding its chemical, biological, nuclear and missile programs contrary to UN resolutions.
- We are not detecting portions of these weapons programs.
- Iraq possesses proscribed chemical and biological weapons and missiles.
- Iraq could make a nuclear weapon in months to a year once it acquires sufficient weapons-grade fissile material.

Moderate Confidence:

~~Iraq does not yet have a nuclear weapon or sufficient material to make one but is likely to have a weapon by 2007 to 2009. (See INR alternative view, page 84).~~

Low Confidence:

~~When Saddam would use weapons of mass destruction.
Whether Saddam would engage in clandestine attacks against the US Homeland.
Whether in desperation Saddam would share chemical or biological weapons with al-Qa'ida~~

~~*Uranium Acquisition.* Iraq retains approximately two-and-a-half tons of 2.5-percent enriched uranium oxide, which the IAEA permits. This low-enriched material could be used as feed material to produce enough HEU for about two nuclear weapons. The use of enriched feed material also would reduce the initial number of centrifuges that Baghdad would need by about half. Iraq could divert this material the IAEA inspects it only once a year and enrich it to weapons grade before a subsequent inspection discovered it was missing. The IAEA last inspected this material in late January 2002.~~

~~Iraq has about 550 metric tons of yellowcake¹ and low-enriched uranium at Tuwaitha, which is inspected annually by the IAEA. Iraq also began vigorously trying to procure uranium ore and yellowcake; acquiring either would shorten the time Baghdad needs to produce nuclear weapons.~~

~~A foreign government service reported that as of early 2001, Niger planned to send several tons of "pure uranium" (probably yellowcake) to Iraq. As of early 2001, Niger and Iraq reportedly were still working out arrangements for this deal, which could be for up to 500 tons of yellowcake. We do not know the status of this arrangement.~~

~~Reports indicate Iraq also has sought uranium ore from Somalia and possibly the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We cannot confirm whether Iraq succeeded in acquiring uranium ore and/or yellowcake from these sources. Reports suggest Iraq is shifting from domestic mining and milling of uranium to foreign acquisition. Iraq possesses significant phosphate deposits, from which uranium had been chemically extracted before Operation Desert Storm. Intelligence~~

~~information on whether nuclear-related phosphate mining and/or processing has been reestablished is inconclusive, however.~~

Annex A

Iraq's Attempts to Acquire Aluminum Tubes

(This excerpt from a longer view includes INR's position on the African uranium issue)

INR's Alternative View: Iraq's Attempts to Acquire Aluminum Tubes

~~Some of the specialized but dual-use items being sought are, by all indications, bound for Iraq's missile program. Other cases are ambiguous, such as that of a planned magnet-production line whose suitability for centrifuge operations remains unknown. Some efforts involve noncontrolled industrial ma-~~

~~terial and equipment including a variety of machine tools and are troubling because they would help establish the infrastructure for a renewed nuclear program. But such efforts (which began well before the inspectors departed) are not clearly linked to a nuclear end use. Finally, the claims of Iraqi pursuit of natural uranium in Africa are, in INR's assessment, highly dubious.~~

Key words

(Figures refer to page numbers in Danish original.)

- 45 minutes; 31
- Ababil-100;86
ABC;39
Abu Mussab al Zarqawi;45
Abu Nidal;12;56;57;58
Adnan Ihsan Saed al-Haideri;38
Afghanistan;8;12
aflatoxin;45;50
Ahmed Chalabi;39
Ailele Elhadj Habibou;29
Al Gore;35
Alberto Gonzales;24
al-Dawrah;37
Al-Jazeera;58
Al-Qaida;
6;12;43;45;46;54;55;56;57;79
al-Samoud;86
aluminium tubes;12;13;14;18;20;87
Ambassador Owens-Kirkpatrick;22
Ames strain;47
Anders Fogh Rasmussen;
4;6;10;11;18;19;21;28;42;44;45;46
;51;53;54;56;57;58;63;69;76
Andrew Wilkie;78;79;80
Anni Fode;6
Ansar al-Islam;56;57
anthrax;
4;8;31;34;40;41;44;45;47;48;50;51
;63;85
Axis of Evil;8;17
- Baghdad;
4;5;12;19;22;34;38;45;56;57;58;60
;80;84;85;86;87;88
Berlingske Tidende;6
Biosecurity and bioterrorism;73;74
botulinum;40;43;44;45;48;50;73
Brewster-Jennings & Associates;24
Brian Jones;40
- Calutron-separators;30
CBS;6
Central Intelligence Agency
CIA;8;22;24;25;38;39;41;69
ChevronTexaco;83
Christopher Greenwood;67
- Clostridium perfringens;44
CNN;6;42;58
CNS;6
Colin Powell;
14;16;17;20;30;41;42;44;45;47;48;
61;62;63;64;65;66;69;73
Cominak;22
Copenhagen;4;5;16;42;65
cyclosarin;85
- Dan Lawton;16
Danish Defence Intelligence Service;
46;54;55;66
Danny Annan;64;65
Dansk Industri;5
David Dreier;15
David Kay;73;75
David Kelly;32
David Martin;6
Decade of Deception and
Defiance;12;38;39
Department of Energy;
13;44;80;85;87
Department of Security Policy;16;18
Deutsche Bank;81
Dick Cheney;8;21;22;69;82
Donald Rumsfeld;6;43;69
Dr. Imad Khadduri;30
Dr. Raymond A. Zilinskas;74
- Ekstra Bladet;
1;10;26;30;32;42;46;51;54;56;57;6
1;63;67;69;71;78;80
European Union;11;33;34;42;57
Executive Order 13303;82;83
ExxonMobil;83
- Farouk Shara'a;64;66
Foreign Affairs Committee;19;72
Fort Detrick;47
- General Carlton W. Fulton Jr;9
General Wesley Clark;6;42
George H. W. Bush;69
George Tenet;15;43;46
George W. Bush;
4;8;10;11;12;13;14;17;29;30;37;38
;39;43;44;45;53;58;69;78;81;82

Greg Thielmann;46
 growth media;44;48

Halliburton;82
 Hans Blix;
 16;31;35;36;48;49;50;51;60;66;70;
 72
 Hans Skov Christensen;5
 Hans-Christof von Sponeck;37;71
 Houston G. Wood III;13;14
 Hussein Kamel;30;51;52

IAEA;14;16;17;20;21;44;45;88
 INC;39;62
 INR;84;87;88;89
 Iraq Survey Group;73
 ISG;73;74;75

Jakob Brix Tange;16
 Jens Elo Rytter;64
 Jens-Otto Horslund;16
 Jim Vallette;82
 John Ashcroft;24
 John Howard;78
 Joint Captured Material Exploitation
 Group;75
 Joseph Wilson;8;9;22;23;24;42
 Justice Department;24

Knight Ridder;56
 Knut Royce;25
 Kofi Annan;11;42;64

Lars Erslev Andersen;57
 Lord Hutton;32
 Los Angeles Times;41
 Lukoil;80

magnets;18;85
 Marianne Castenskiold;82
 Michael Chandler;56
 Mikhail Wehbe;66
 MKO;56;57;59;60
 mobile laboratories;39;40;41;61
 Mohammad
 ElBaradei;14;16;17;18;20
 Mohammed Harith;39
 Mr. Niels Helveg Petersen;50
 Mujahideen-e-Khalq Organization;12
 MKO;12

National Intelligence Estimate;
 15;43;84
 NATO;6;33;34;42;46;53;54;79
 NBC;6;73
 New York Times;8;22;24;38;39
 newspaper Information;20;29
 Niamey;22;23
 Niger;
 8;9;10;14;15;16;17;18;20;22;23;24
 ;25;29;42;44;45;88
 Nils Bernstein;4
 nuclear;
 4;8;9;12;13;14;15;16;17;18;19;20;
 21;29;30;34;38;42;44;45;46;52;61;
 78;84;85;87;88;89

Oak Ridge laboratory;13
 Office of National Assessment;78
 Office of Special Plans;62
 Oil-For-Food;5
 Olympia Snowe;15
 ombudsman;10;11
 Osama bin Laden;6;7;56

Patrice Binder;73;74
 Paul Wolfowitz;10
 Pentagon;6;8;10;11;62
 Per Stig Møller;
 11;15;16;18;20;21;26;28;29;36;40;
 41;42;44;45;46;49;50;51;52;56;57;
 59;63;65;66;72;74;76;84
 Politiken;5;82

Qusay Hussein;76

Ray McGovern;69;70
 Resolution 1441;16;64;65;66;68
Resolution 678;67
 Richard Butler;31;61
 Ricin;36;40;44
 Robert D. Novak;25
 Robin Cook;2;32;33
 Rolf Ekeus;31;61

Saddam Hussein;
 4;5;6;7;10;13;17;19;28;31;39;40;4
 2;43;44;45;46;47;51;53;54;56;57;5
 8
 Sarin;36;85
 SAS;74

SBS;39
 Scott Ritter;48;51;61;62;63
 Simmel Difesa;13
 Somair;22
 specially appointed investigator
 Patrick J. Fitzgerald;24
 State Department;
 8;11;14;15;16;23;44;46
 State of the Union;17;29;81
 Steve Kretzmann;82
 Sustainable Energy & Economy Net-
 work of the Institute for Policy
 Studies;82
 Syria;64;65;66

 Tim Russert;6
 Timothy M. Phelps;25
 Tony Brems Knudsen;67
 Tony Blair;
 14;15;17;29;31;32;39;43;67
 TotalFinaElf;80

 UAV;86
Udlændingestyrelsen;5;6

 UN Security Council;
 14;16;17;18;19;20;21;29;30;36;39;
 41;44;45;47;48;61;62;70;73;74;76
 UNMOVIC;45;49;60;73;74
 UNRESOLVED DISARMAMENT IS-
 SUES;36;48
 UNSCOM;30;31;37;47;48;51;52;60;7
 3;74;85;86
 uranium;
 8;9;12;13;14;15;16;17;18;20;22;42
 ;43;44;45;46;85;87;88;89
 US Army Corps of Engineers;82

 Valerie Plame;24
 VX;48;49;50;85

 White
 House;6;8;10;11;14;15;17;18;20;2
 4;37;38;42;43;46
 World Trade Center;6;8;11

 yellowcake;22;88

 Zaab Sethna;39