

Leaked Documents for the War in Iraq

One journalist, **Michael Smith** of the Times, did the major work. In an era where brave journalists are fired (or shot in Iraq), his efforts cannot be overestimated. Washington Post compared his deed to the American journalists who presented the Watergate affair, which forced President Nixon to retire to avoid impeachment [1]. Although Smith's efforts ought to cause impeachment of both Bush and Blair, and although both of these persons will probably successfully ignore the challenge, his deed can be considered even more important (what is worse: lying about a burglary or lying your country into war with many thousands dead, not counting the Iraqi victims?). But also those who gave these documents free need a laurel. What hardly has been noticed internationally, but also in his homeland remains widely ignored by the mainstream media, is the Danish whistleblower **Frank Grevil**, who leaked sensitive documents in February 2004 and therefore was sentenced to jail. Other than Mr. Smith, also the journalists uncovering this affair, **Michael Bjerre** and **Jesper Larsen** from the daily "Berlingske" were prosecuted. But first to the story itself – What is it all about?

Saddam Hussein – just before we start

This is not a sympathy-declaration to Saddam Hussein. His way has been covered with dead bodies, his brutal reign is certainly not what any civilized person would like to preserve. However, that alone does not suffice for making war – a war that has brought Iraq much farther away from civilization. George 2nd Bush has tried to claim Hussein responsible for 9/11 (now the Afghan link has turned uninteresting). There is no halt in these claims, as little as the attempt now to turn responsibility for 9/11 over to Iran! These are expressions of a dictator, hoping that repetition will replace the truth and being kept upright by an uncritical press.

Weapons of Mass Deception

The formal reason for citing a lot of countries to war (of which only a few remains on the front, first of all USA, UK, Italy and Denmark) was that Iraq should be in possession of weapons of mass destructions [**WMD**]. As we now know, there was not the shadow of such in Iraq then, quite in contrast to the present days, where large masses of so-called 'depleted' uranium causes excessive diseases and congenital deformation (also among the occupation forces), unexploded cluster bombs threatens first of all children and an unlimited amount of explosives terrorizes the daily life in the country – for totally obscure reasons, by the way. The former foreign minister (secretary of foreign affairs) Colin Powell recently regretted his presentation for the United Nations Security Council [2], for which he should be given no absolution, given the knowledge and consequences of this act. The Downing Street Memos (or Minutes), and also Mr. Grevil's deed, is a confirmation that the authorities clearly knew, that the 'WMD' theory was known by its authors not to be true and merely served for lying their countries into war. And the decision for going to war was made much earlier.

How the Downing Street Memo was Revealed

To the majority (including the author of these pages), the Downing Street Memos were disclosed a few days before the British election, which in spite of that were won by the still acting Prime Minister Tony Blair (or bLiar, as called by Michael Rivero from www.whatreallyhappened.com). But let Michael Smith himself tell about his scoop [3]:

"It began with a phone call from a friend nearly 10 months ago — somebody well-placed who had given me a few stories before ... He thrust two sheets of paper into my hand. It was a "Secret — Strictly Personal" letter from Jack Straw to the prime minister written in March 2002, a year before the invasion. ... In [it was] said there was no evidence that

1 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/06/14/AR2005061400494.html>

2 <http://tvnz.co.nz/view/page/411749/610251>

3 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1669292,00.html>

Saddam Hussein had any weapons of mass destruction worth talking about and that, in part as a result of a lack of US preparation, post-war Iraq was likely to become a very nasty place ... Well, I've got five others just like it from the same period, said my source. "Most say stuff just like that, or worse."

The documents covered the period running up to a summit between George W Bush and Tony Blair ... in *early April 2002* ... Most ... were designed to brief ministers or Blair on whether backing the US plans to get rid of Saddam would be sensible and legal. They set out the merits and dangers of taking part. Their gist was that there weren't many merits. *The documents made it pretty clear that it wasn't sensible, it wasn't legal and it was very risky.*

The document that seemed to encapsulate the problems was another "Secret - Strictly Personal" letter to Blair. His foreign policy adviser, Sir David Manning, wrote it. "I think there is a real risk that the (US) administration underestimates the difficulties," Manning wrote. "They may agree that failure isn't an option, but this does not mean that they will avoid it [4]."

Then eight months later, somebody ... gave me further, even more startling documents. They concerned *a meeting in Downing Street on July 23, 2002*, eight months before the invasion, when Blair was insisting to the public that all options on Iraq were still open. One leaked document was a Cabinet Office briefing paper for a crucial Downing Street meeting held on the day in question. It said *the prime minister had promised Bush at the Crawford summit that he would "back military action to bring about regime change"*. It added that ministers had no choice but to "create the conditions" that would make military action legal [5].

The other document was the minutes of the actual meeting, chaired by Blair and attended by Straw; Geoff Hoon, the defence secretary; Lord Goldsmith, the attorney-general; Sir Richard Dearlove, the head of MI6; John Scarlett, chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee; and Admiral Sir Michael Boyce, chief of defence staff. Dearlove, who had just returned from Washington, said, "military action was now seen as inevitable ... the intelligence and facts were being fixed around the policy." ... Straw agreed with Dearlove. He said *Bush had "made up his mind to take military action. But the case was thin"* [6]. "

The Covert Air War

While the WMD-story was known to be unreliable, the allied forces tried to provoke Saddam Hussein into war by means of self-defence to an unprecedented aggression. Smith continues:

"Ministry of Defence figures for the number of bombs dropped on southern Iraq in 2002 show that virtually none were used in March and April; but *between May and August an average of 10 tons were dropped each month*, with the RAF taking just as big a role in the "spikes of activity" as their US colleagues. Then *in September the figure shot up again, with allied aircraft dropping 54.6 tons*. If this was a covert air war, both Bush and Blair may face searching questions. *In America only Congress can declare War* and it did not give the US president permission to take military action against Iraq until October 11, 2002. Blair's legal justification is said to come from UN Resolution 1441, which was not passed until November 8, 2002."

In an interview, Lieutenant-General T Michael Moseley, the allied air commander in Iraq, had previously (proudly) admitted that the "spikes of activity" were part of a covert air war. "From June 2002 until March 20, when the ground war began, the allies flew 21,736 sorties over southern Iraq, attacking 349 carefully selected targets. The attacks, Moseley said, "laid the foundations" for the invasion, allowing allied commanders to begin the ground war." Again, Smith found the admittance "that Foreign Office advice shows military action to pressurise the regime was 'not consistent with' UN law, despite American claims that it was" [7].

4 <http://www.portal.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2004/09/18/nwar18.xml>

5 http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1593607_3,00.html

6 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1650822,00.html>

7 <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,2087-1660300,00.html>

The Danish Whistleblower

Bush and Blair were not the only ones who lied their countries into war. In Denmark, an academic engineer, Frank Grevil, got frustrated that repeated warnings of the absence of WMDs were totally ignored by the (in analogy to USA and UK still) ruling government. At least, the Danes did not contribute to the air strikes and their contribution of soldiers is low in international comparison, but so is the population of Denmark. There have not been many casualties for the Danish force, which enjoys a comparative peaceful presence in the South of Iraq, but that may change. Strangely enough, and quite contrary to the expectations, also the Danes have been involved in abuse of prisoners. That the Danish soldiers are exerted not only to the beams of the sun but also to depleted uranium, has not been given any attention in the Danish media.

After having stretched the possibilities for internal protest completely in vain, Grevil contacted the journalists of 'Berlingske Tidende.' February 21, 2004, the publication of Grevil's documents followed, at first anonymously [8], but already one month later, he admitted to being the source [9]. The politicians, who should have shown another attitude after being caught in the act, responded with demanding the punishment for revealing military secrets [10].

In December 2004, Grevil was sentenced to six months in prison and around 15,000 € in expenses for having revealed secret documents and thereby also damaged Forsvarets Efterretningstjeneste [FE], the Danish secret service. Denmark offers legal protection for whistleblowers [11], but this fact was totally ignored by the courts. The sentence was appealed but largely confirmed on Sept. 23, 2005 (four instead of six months in prison). Strangely enough, the court was satisfied only to be given permission to study 20 of the 120 documents relating to the matter in FE. In the second instance, one of the six judges voted for the verdict 'not guilty' [12]. A biography of Frank Grevil has appeared in Danish [13].

In May 2006, it was decided that also the journalists publishing the leaked information and Niels Lunde, the Editor-in-Chief, will be prosecuted. The Prime Minister, Anders Fogh-Rasmussen, who lied his country into war and thus is responsible for the Danish soldiers killed in Iraq, is still at large, in his previous position and not even indicted. A majority of the Danes are no longer supporting his warfare politics.

On November 10, the two journalists, Jesper Lassen and Michael Bjerre, were awarded a price of Dkr 150,000 (€ 20,000) for their courageous revelations [14], three days before the prosecution should start. The process is based on the claim that the publication of secret information damaged the Danish secret service's relation to its 'friendly partners' (probably Mossad, CIA & MI6) and therefore posed a security danger to the Danish occupation troops in Iraq. That also UK, USA and Australia witnessed revelation of their politicians lie without prosecution of the journalists (or resignation of the political leaders) shows how low the Danish justice has sunk in recent years. That gives reason for concern for the outcome of the court-process (*to be continued*).

The Murder of David Kelly

The murder of Dr. David Kelly, claimed to be a suicide, remains the symbol of a singular case of criminal behaviour of the British government towards one of its subjects [15]. Kelly's 'crime,' was similar to the above-described whistleblowers, leaking evidence to a news agency (BBC). Instead of admitting that the WMD-story was mildly spoken 'exaggerated,' Kelly was led to a process of public humiliation, culminating in a 45 min televised hearing. That was then later taken as motivation for the alleged suicide.

Without going into details in this story, I want to lead attention to a letter in

8 <http://www.berlingske.dk/indland/artikel:aid=410384>

9 <http://www.berlingske.dk/indland/artikel:aid=420450>

10 <http://www.berlingske.dk/indland/artikel:aid=413390>

11 <http://www.cfje.dk/cfje/Lovbasen.nsf/ID/LB04331246>

12 <http://www.berlingske.dk/grid/indland/artikel:aid=631604>

13 http://www.informationsforlag.dk/view_product.php?product=87-7514-117-5

14 <http://www.berlingske.dk/indland/artikel:aid=822058/>

15 <http://globalresearch.ca/articles/THU311A.html>

Guardian [¹⁶], where various physicians make aware of the impossible way of committing suicide according to Lord Hutton's report. If the vague intoxication and sparse bleeding does not suffice for a suicide, it was probably a murder by other means. Instead, Hutton fails to investigate in direction of the mysterious persons, also present at the finding site but not belonging to any of the official services [¹⁷]. Also this revelation went in the wrong direction for a free press, leading to restrictions in the BBC.

Mainstream Media's Modest Reaction

According to what we learn at school, criminals are punished and those who fight against them are rewarded. These cases do not confirm this logic. We have also been told that the free press watch over criminal abuse in official organs. Wrong again, unless we take the deep step and acknowledge that the press is not free. The actions taken by Smith, Bjerre and Larsen do show that at least some journalists challenge the restrictions. Unfortunately, they are not very successful in doing so.

After all, some prominent representatives of the mainstream media have indeed published reference to the Downing Street Memos, including the Washington Post [cited above] and Los Angeles Times [¹⁸]. They did so, however, only for very attentive readers, not at a prominent place and (as far I have been told) only once. This is depressing. Since political commissions have turned out to be whitewashing instruments for the ruling politicians, the suggestion by Michael Rivero that this matter should be treated with tar and feathers (to the cruel leaders and their straw men) *does* indeed make sense.

Exposing the Madman

In July 2006, David Keogh, a Cabinet Office communications officer, and Leo O'Connor, a political researcher who worked for an anti-war Labour MP, Anthony Clarke, were arrested for vain fully trying to expose another Downing street memo. This four-page document recorded discussions about Iraq between Blair and Bush, held in the Oval Office in April 2004; it showed how Blair in the White House had argued with Bush, thus prevented the American bombing of Aljazeera's central in Qatar [¹⁹]. Keogh copied the document to O'Connor who then gave it to Clarke. However, Clarke notified the Prime Minister and failed to expose the document. On May 9, 2007, the two heroes were found guilty at Old Bailey for breaking the 'Official Secret's Act' [²⁰]. The war-mongers have not been shaken.

May 10, 2007
John Schou

16 <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/kelly/story/0,13747,1146232,00.html>

17 [#">http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/article.asp?ID=1164 #](http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/article.asp?ID=1164)

18 <http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-britmemos15jun15,0,3650829.story>

19 http://blogs.abcnews.com/theblotter/2006/07/leakers_face_to.html

20 <http://news.independent.co.uk/uk/legal/article2527728.ece>