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SIR WILLIAM PATEY
THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning.
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Good morning.
THE CHAIRMAN: Happy new year and welcome back everyone, and to our first witness of the New Year, Sir William Patey. The purpose of this session is to examine developments in Iraq from summer 2005 to summer 2006 . In broad terms it is the period from the formation of the Iraqi transitional government to the formation and first months in office of the first fully sovereign Iraqi Government after the fall of Saddam Hussein. The session will cover the United Kingdom's role in the process leading to the formation of the new government, the security situation in Iraq in general, and in Basra in particular, and the start of the process of the United Kingdom handing over security control to Iraqis in a number of provinces.

Since we have had a break and are now resuming, but I won't go on repeating this formula, I do want to recall once only that the Inquiry has had access to thousands of government papers, some of which are still coming in, including the most highly classified for the period under consideration, and we are continuing this
week to finalise the picture of the policy debates and the operational events and the decision-making processes.

These evidence sessions are an important element in informing our thinking and in complementing the documentary evidence, and so it is important that witnesses are, and feel able to be, open and frank in their evidence while respecting national security.

We recognise that witnesses are giving evidence based on their recollection of events and we are, of course, checking what we hear against the papers to which we have access. Now, I remind all witnesses that they will later be asked to sign a transcript of their evidence to the effect that the evidence they have given is truthful, fair and accurate.

Sir William, before we begin questions, I wonder if you could describe your role at the time in question.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I was the British Ambassador to Iraq from June 2005 to July 2006.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I would like to start with a rather general question, but the situation that you found yourself in at the time was one where the

United Kingdom's ability -- I'm asking -- was quite constrained in terms of the ability to control events to determine what should happen. We wonder how far there
was a full and well judged recognition of that fact at different levels in London, in Baghdad and elsewhere. Would you like to comment on that?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, I think the level of ambition was probably higher than the ability to deliver. I do recall in Iraq at some stage a saying that what could be delivered on Powerpoint couldn't necessarily be delivered on earth. It was a difficult situation, but it didn't mean we were helpless or powerless. We would have liked more control over the events but the key player was obviously the United States. They were the biggest players in town. We had, obviously, responsibility in a military sense for MND South East, which was the four provinces of the south centred in Basra, but the main players were obviously the Americans, but we worked very closely with them.

A new American ambassador arrived shortly after me, Zal Khalilzad, and my task was to work closely with him and his team, and $I$ think -- you would have to ask him, but $I$ think we did achieve quite a close working relationship. So we were able to influence events but not control them.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is the proportionality between the scale of the US presence and our own, there is also the

```
    lateral shift, isn't there, to Iraqi (eventually full)
    sovereignty, which is taking place?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think that's the key development at
    the time I was there. We had had an election
    in January 2005 to form the Iraqi transitional
    government whose task was to run the country while the
    constitution was drawn up and a fully sovereign
    independent Iraqi Government was formed. So the whole
    period while I was there was one of almost introspection
    as the transitional government politicians got on with
    devising a constitution and then positioning themselves
    under the terms of that constitution to form
    a government.
    So it was quite a difficult time in terms of the
    Iraqi politicians who increasingly were being asked to
    do more and to take more responsibility for running
    their own country. Our objective was to transition out
    of Iraq to a fully sovereign Iraqi Government, handing
    over full security control and we had ambitions to do
    this earlier than has been achieved, I think.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Martin?
    SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Based on our own previous experience
    and our pre-posting briefings, was the situation you
    found in Iraq as you expected?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, I think it was. The security
```

    situation was difficult. It was a country in
    transition. It was -- I suppose what I didn't quite
    expect was the sort of the level of historical baggage
    I found when \(I\) got there. It was very difficult to
    engage politicians. I remember a meeting \(I\) had with
    prominent Shia politician. We only had half an hour and
        the first 20 minutes was spent and we hadn't reached
        beyond a thousand years ago. There was quite a strong
        sense of victimhood amongst the Shia politicians, so
        that sense of bitterness and sectarianism, the level of
        that, perhaps, took me a little bit by surprise.
    SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Who were the primary actors in Iraqi
        politics with whom you were able to engage?
    SIR WILLIAM PATEY: When I got there, they were just about
to begin the constitutional negotiations and because the
Sunnis had excluded themselves from the election, they
weren't -- they hadn't elected their own participants in
the constitutional commission, and so the constitution
was essentially being drawn up by the other two big
groups, the Kurds and the Shias, and I think at that
stage we were trying to certainly engage with the Sunnis
to bring them into the process.
THE CHAIRMAN: And to make sure that the Shia and the Kurds
didn't exclude altogether the Sunnis despite their
self-exclusion?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think there was a danger -- as the negotiations with the constitution got very difficult, there was a danger that the Kurds and Shias could reach a deal which, if it was to the exclusion of the Sunnis, would never have lasted, the constitution would have been stillborn.

So part of the process -- I remember part of the role the British played, a distinctive role we played at the time was to remind the players that a constitution that did not include the Sunnis would not be a viable one, and that advice was accepted and there were adjustments made to the membership of the constitutional commission. A great deal of effort was made to accommodate some of the Sunni requirements for a constitution.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Who were you able to argue the case, for example, against the intensification of de-Ba'athification which was taking place?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We spent a lot of time on that trying to convince the transitional government and the Shia politicians that de-Ba'athification had gone too far, that the de-Ba'athification commission was being abused. It was being used as a tool to further political ends rather than save Iraq from a return of the Ba'ath. Now, that is not an argument that was accepted very
readily by Shia, who had a visceral fear of the Ba'athists and saw Ba'athists in most places. So we had limited success.

We were arguing for the de-Ba'athification provisions to be excluded from the constitution. We managed to get them watered down, we managed to get them reviewed, but that was one of the main issues for the Sunni community, because at the time we were trying to reach out to those Sunnis who were involved in the insurgency but who really had political objectives and who didn't want to be excluded. Those who were prepared to give up arms and join the political process. So there was a strong move to bring them in.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Were you engaging with them?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, I spent a lot of time with Sunni political parties and Tariq Al Hashimi, who was the leader of the IIP, and Saleh Al-Mutlaq, and some of the more extremist fringes, Khalaf Ulayyan and others. At one stage, I was accused by some Shia politicians of being a Sunni-loving Shia hater because of this effort.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: The other area I believed you were very active in related to human rights and to the whole question of the detainees and the treatment of the detainees. Can you tell us something about what you were able to to do about that?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Obviously, the large number of detainees
being held was a contributing factor to some of the
alienation of the Sunni community. There were quite
a lot of Sunnis being held. There was the aspect of the
detainees held by the coalition, and we were engaged
with the Americans in trying to speed up the processes,
so that people who were picked up in large sweeps could
be processed quickly and moved out.
There was also the accusation that there were death
squads operating within the Ministry of Interior and
detention centres that were abusing human rights. Indeed
the Coalition -- it was mainly in Baghdad -- the
Coalition uncovered a horrific detention centre, Jadriya
I think it was called, and that led to a process of
inspections, unannounced inspections, but you had the
dilemma, you were trying to get the Iraqi Government to
take responsibility and to improve its record, while at
the same time under pressure to do something
immediately.
There was always a balance to be struck by something
that was sustainable and getting the Iraqi Government to
improve its processes and to put into place procedures
for -- that would respect human rights and in dealing
with the most egregious cases at the time.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Was this also a joint UK/US endeavour?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: In Baghdad it was mainly the US forces.
We had our own problems in Basra. We had -- mainly with
the police. We had a huge problem with the police in
Basra, with criminal elements infiltrating the police,
what $I$ would describe as a situation of Mafia gangs and
political infighting. So we had our own problem.
I don't think we ever got to the stage of uncovering
or coming across the sort of systematic abuse in detention
centres that were uncovered in Baghdad.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: In terms of engaging with the Iraqi
body politic, were you able to made any contact or pass
on any minutes to the sadrists and to engage them in the
process?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We had a policy of sadrist outreach, if
you like. I was encouraged by Number 10 in particular
to reach out to the Sadrists, to give them a message
that we felt they had a place in the political system,
we wanted them to give up their arms and to stop
attacking coalition forces and to join the political
process. They were very reluctant. Moqtadr Al-Sadr
refused to see me throughout my time there and every
Sadrist I did see seemed to lose their job soon
afterwards. So it almost became a policy to decimate
the Sadrists just for the British Ambassador to call on
them. The Minister of Transport lost his job soon after

I developed a contact with him, and a few others. They were very reluctant to engage with us, but we tried to engage with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just as a postscript on that, was Sistani's influence operating in a positive way at that time in respect of the Sadrists?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think he had less influence on the Sadrists because, of course, Sistani was not the source of emulation for the Sadrists, he wasn't their Marjaih, but he did have influence given his position as Grand Ayatollah. He was not somebody they could ignore. So he had an influence on them, but it was weaker than perhaps his influence on some of the other Shia groups.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: You say that Number 10 was keen on this engagement. How was that keenness expressed?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Phone calls to me saying, "Get on with it". Phone calls saying, "How are you getting on reaching out to the Sadrists?" It was expressed in, you know, telephone calls, messages. It was part of a daily engagement, I have to say. There was really rarely a day went by when $I$ did not have a phone call from Number 10 .

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: This was during the whole period of the formation really of the --

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: An intense period for us because, in a sense, the future of Iraq, our strategic success or failure hinged on this period. We either got a constitution that was acceptable to most Iraqis, that would provide the basis for the formation of a sovereign government, or we didn't, and it was a kind of intense period in which the price of failure seemed quite high.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: One of our original end-game concepts in 2002 was that a unified Iraq should emerge. Was there, during this period of the formation of the first government, ever, in your view, a danger that this might be unobtainable, might be endangered?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think I wrote when I left that the prospect of descent into civil war and the break-up of Iraq was possibly more likely than a transition to a stable democracy unless certain things happened, and I think there were forces pulling Iraq apart.

Obviously, one of the biggest Shia groups was angling for a constitution that would allow them to form a region, a Shia region, of three or nine provinces. Obviously Kurds already had a high degree of autonomy. So there was a debate within Iraq. One of the great debates over the constitution was the extent to which there would be a federal system. I think a bit like in Europe federal means different things to different people, to some people it meant a strong central
government, to others it meant a weak central government and strong regions. So there were different people arguing for different things, and that was one of the intense debates over the constitution. But the danger was the sectarian nature of the politics in Iraq was leading Shia to move to Shia areas, Sunnis to move to Sunni areas, and you could have had a de facto sectarian division which would have made it very difficult to hold the country together. So there was a constant danger.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Where did the Kurds fit into this and what was your own engagement with the Kurds during this period?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I had intense engagement with the Kurds. I had regular contact with, Barhem Saleh, the Deputy Prime Minister, Hoshyar Zebari, the Foreign Minister, and with President Talabani, obviously, and I was a regular visitor to Erbil to see President Massoud Barzani, the President of the Kurdish region, and Nechirvan Barzani, the Prime Minister.

So I spent a lot of time with the Kurds trying to persuade them that their best interests lay in a federal Iraq, but a united Iraq, because an independent Kurdistan was never viable for them in terms of its neighbours, in terms of the situation in Iraq, and at a leadership level they understood that. On the street,
in Kurdistan everybody was for independence, but at a -at the level of the body politic they understood the realpolitik of that. And getting them to play a constructive part in drafting a viable Iraqi constitution, I spent a lot of time with them.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Kurdish President was a very reluctant and occasional visitor to Baghdad, I believe.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, although he -- on one occasion, at the crucial time of the constitution, he spent about a month there hunkered down with everyone else.

THE CHAIRMAN: I was going to ask whether your Kurdish interlocutors were mainly to be found in Baghdad on pretty much a continuing basis, or did you have to travel north a lot?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I travelled north quite a bit, and when Massoud Barzani came down -- I mean, we had pretty regular contact with Massoud and obviously, you know, the two factions of Kurds, the KDP and the PUK, the KDP were represented by Hoshyar Zubari, the Foreign Minister, so you would talk to the Foreign Minister about foreign policy, but you would actually be talking to him about internal politics as well. Occasionally, he would say, "You had better go and see President Massoud", and Talabani and Barhem Saleh of the PUK were in Baghdad virtually all the time.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Do you feel that the UK's influence, your influence, was effective in ensuring the cohesion at this time?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think we were listened to. We used to have a joke with the Kurds -- I'm Scottish, as you have probably gathered -- that we were the troublesome hill people from Britain and they were the troublesome hill people of Iraq. So we used to have this joke, and a lot of the experience of having a Scottish assembly, separate currencies, or at least able to print your currency -- some that of experience we were able to talk frankly to the Kurds about, that it was possible to retain a separate identity within a united country, actually proved to be quite persuasive.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: With the creation of the sovereign government, did this affect our ability, the UK's ability to act in Iraq?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, we had to accept that increasingly, as the Iraqis took control, they took decisions, and some of them, you know, might not have been decisions that we would necessarily have wanted, but that was always going to be the case. I remember saying, "Our task is to transition to Iraqi control. It might not always be pretty, but ultimately it is the only way to go".

One of the problems we had in Basra, I would say, and others will talk to you about Basra, of course, who lived the experience more directly than $I$ did, but getting the politicians in Baghdad to take responsibility for some of the things that were going on in Basra was difficult. It was inter-Shia politics going on in Basra, and life was bad enough in Baghdad without getting -- part of our job was to say, "Look, if you can't run Basra, you know, where you do not have the complications of Sunni insurgency or Kurds, who is going to believe you can run the country?" So there was a constant dialogue to get them more engaged in taking responsibility for what was going on in Basra.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Thank you very much.
THE CHAIRMAN: I think we would like to turn to the security situation and, to start with, one of your original objectives, I think you said, was to enable or help to bring about the handover of the provinces to the Iraqis as progress towards sovereignty was taking place.

Were there formal conditions set for the draw-down of our forces and the handover the provinces to the Iraqi authorities?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We began to look at that, I think, in August/September of 2005, where we established a conditions-based transition team in which we began to
talk to the Iraqis about the conditions that would have to be met before provinces could be handed over. That dialogue started quite early, but the Americans were quite reluctant at the time because they didn't want to get involved in discussing timetables for withdrawals. That was one of the issues.

THE CHAIRMAN: There is a natural tension in any such situation, I imagine, between conditions on the ground, on the one hand, and a desire to drive through a policy with some degree of timetable, but from the UK standpoint in Baghdad it was a general objective policy to bring about handover?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: It was an objective of the Americans, too, actually. I think we just felt we were probably a bit closer to it than they were in Baghdad. I got my instructions. You ask -- I mean, the first time I have ever had instructions, as an ambassador, directly from the Prime Minister to go was to help get a constitution that the Iraqis would vote positively for, the formation of a new government and create the conditions for the withdrawal of British troops. I mean, it was quite simple.

THE CHAIRMAN: Quite simple. One of the -- well, indeed, the conditioning factor, in terms of conditions on the ground, is the violence from its different quarters and
sources and motivations. I wonder whether you could talk a little bit about that? In particular, the different sources the violence to begin with. You have got Sunni refuseniks, you've got Al-Qaeda, you've got nationalism and you have also got Shia complications between different factions. Can you just paint a picture of the $2005 / 2006$ situation?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: You have got a very complicated picture because you have a Sunni insurgency, mainly in Anbar Diyala and Mosul provinces, overlapping and tied up with an Al-Qaeda terrorist presence, which had indigenised itself, if you like, and become Al-Qaeda in Iraq led by Zarqawi. You had that level of violence. You had Shia militia operating in and around Baghdad and in the south. You had tensions overlaying that. You had criminal gangs operating, and sometimes it was difficult to differentiate a criminal gang from a militia, and you had particular tensions in places like Kirkuk, where the Kurds had particular aspirations, and there were tensions between the various minorities. So it was quite a complex picture, but with probably the highest level of violence in and around Baghdad.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is too simple a question to address such a complex picture, but is there any general judgment you can make about the relationship between the levels of
violence in Iraq as a whole, but in particular in the south perhaps, and our military presence, the UK's military presence? Leave aside the US.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think the level of violence in the south changed while we were there because it had been a relatively benign area. We didn't have a terrorist presence, certainly not Al-Qaeda, and there was very little in the way of an insurgency.

I think, as we got more and more involved in trying to establish the rule of law, trying to work a non-corrupt police force, trying to build up the capacity of the Iraqi security forces, we increasingly found ourselves at loggerheads with particular interest groups and that led to a higher level of violence in the south than when $I$ arrived. That was part of a painful process of us being responsible for security and trying to improve the situation, because we were coming up against the interests of people like the Jaysh Al Mahdi or criminal gangs.

THE CHAIRMAN: One way of expressing it at the time, I think, was that we might be part of the problem rather than part of the solution. On the other hand, from what you have been telling us, if we were to fulfil our objectives, there really was no choice but to address the militias in the south.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: In a sense, we became a target and people tried to portray us as the occupiers. When we were originally in Basra, that was not how we were seen, but we were on the horns of a dilemma. I think eventually we succeeded because we did establish -- we did establish a competent 10 th Division, 14 th Division of the Iraqi security forces. We did root out some of the worst elements of the -- of a corrupt police force and once the Charge of the Knights took place and the militias were taken on in the south and defeated, that did lead, $I$ think -- it was after my time, but it did lead to an improvement in the security situation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like, if you would, to analyse a little more in-depth the militias' problem in the south. Was this principally a struggle for power, both political power and, if you like, control over criminal activities and assets, or was it at least as much or more the build-up of resentment against the British presence, the Multi-National Division in the south and its attempts to bring about an incorrupt or at any rate a less corrupt system of government and policing? SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think it is quite complex motivation because you get people -- I think the Jaysh Al Mahdi had -- the Sadrists started off as an Iraqi nationalist organisation. They were the most Iraqi nationalists of
all. They transformed into the most influenced by the Iranians. They moved from being the most Iraqi nationalists of all, but they still traded on this Iraqi nationalism. So they set themselves up as, "The Brits are occupiers. We must drive them out", and they constantly required us to -- the propaganda was all about withdrawal of British troops and they wanted a timetable. That's partly rhetoric but it was also how they portrayed themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN: In competition with alternative Shia factions?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Exactly. That was part of their USP, if you like, but it was all part of a power struggle to gain control. of the port, for instance. I mean, the way it operated in Iraq at the time was that people would get control of ministries or get control of economic assets and those assets would then be exploited for the benefit of a particular political party or a militia or the supporters of that party. So it was quite complex.

THE CHAIRMAN: That, as it were, partly political power struggle game that was being played among the Shia militias, was this also true at the national level, that the coalition presence was, as it were, a convenient board against which to bounce competing interests for local politics?
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SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think at the national level it wasn't
    so evident. The political infighting didn't quite
    involve posturing vis a vis the Coalition. From time to
    time, there would be complaints from particular factions
    if the Coalition had come down particularly hard on
    a particular group and the Prime Minister would complain
    if we had gone in hard on some Shia militia. Rarely did
    I hear him complain if we went in hard on some Sunni
    militia.
```

    It wasn't so much -- it played at political level in
    Baghdad and I think most of the political factions in
    Baghdad realised that the withdrawal of -- a precipitate
    withdrawal of the Coalition would not be in anybody's
    interests, certainly not in Iraq's interests. So there
    was a consensus on that. I didn't recall getting into
    many arguments about our continued presence.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Right. You touched earlier on the problems,
again particularly in the south, perhaps nationally as
well, of forming, perhaps for the first time, an
incorrupt, effective law enforcement service, a police
service. There had been no tradition of such a thing.
It was starting from scratch.
Was it principally a matter that could be and could
successfully be addressed by training effort and input
of that kind, or is there some more fundamental question
about the nature of policing in a society in a Middle East country?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think we were learning on the job. I think we started off thinking we would plant Surrey constabulary in Basra and ended up with the RUC I think is where we ended up. I think there was a certain naivety involved in what we could do and what we could not - but we were learning constantly. I mean we had to but I think we sowed some real seeds but I think part of the problem was that the public demanded -- the politics here demanded instant results and I think sometimes we lost sight of the longer-term impact we were having in the absence of instant results.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. You foresaw just then exactly the question $I$ was going to come to which is: how far did the lessons which were having to be learned painfully and by experience on the ground -- was it possible to communicate those back to London in particular?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We were adjusting our profile all the time, even within one year we -- I remember we had Ronnie Flanagan out, who came out. When things weren't working, we didn't just keep ploughing on. We did look at things again, Ronnie Flanagan came out and looked at the police and made a lot of recommendations which were implemented, and $I$ think in the end we sometimes had
to decisively. In one case there was a criminal intelligence unit
which we had formed and had to completely disband because it had
been completely infiltrated, but we took those
decisions, and it was a slow process, but I do think we
laid some groundwork there. But I think it was never going
to succeed until the Iraqi politicians took
responsibility for it.
That was always my view: until the Iraqis themselves
took responsibility for it, it was always going to be
second best.
THE CHAIRMAN: The Iraqi politicians were having to learn
from scratch with no previous experience?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, and they were also playing politics
at the same time. The Governing Council in Basra was
made up of different factions. So the governor was from
one party called Fadhila and the other was from
SCIRI/Badr and they were at loggerheads. People would
align themselves in the police to a particular faction
and gain protection as a result.

THE CHAIRMAN: You mentioned a little earlier about the relative success that the coalition had in training up the Iraqi military security forces, and indeed the creation of the 14 th Division $I$ think.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: The 10th Division and then bolstered by the 14 th, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Looking at the end of your time, and it was only a short year, the progress on the military front had been much faster than on the policing front, and indeed that is an uncompleted task, as I understand it, even now.

Was that simply a result of the self-disbanding of the Iraqi army under the Saddam regime, that it was possible to start from scratch, as opposed to leaving the provincial governor and police forces in being with all their inheritance?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think it was the nature of the beast. I think the army was a national army. It was recruited nationally. People were deployed away from their own areas. By its nature the police were recruited locally. If you recruited the police in Anbar, you got a lot of Sunnis linked to the local tribal leaders; if you recruited them in Basra, you got a lot of local people. So I think they were different beasts.

THE CHAIRMAN: Clearly our Inquiry is about lessons learned, primarily. It is hard to judge what is the lesson to be learned in terms of reforming, organising effective policing to reasonably satisfactory standards under western eyes in a Middle East country, what those lessons are, how you go about it, how you conceive the concept of policing.

```
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think the lesson I would take from
    this is you have to stick to your principles. There is
    no point in compromising over a police force that is not
    going to uphold the rule of law. Therefore, you have to
    keep insisting on that. I think you have to be patient
    and you have to get local buy-in for it and local
    responsibility for it, because, ultimately, the local
    politicians are going to be answerable to their own
    people if you have got elections.
    So you know, it is not easy and I don't think there
    is any -- if it happens again, you know, God forbid, we
    hope it doesn't, but if it happens again, there is no
    quick fix.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: But in your discussion with the Iraqis
    and your stress on the rule of law, were you able to
    make progress in a way in influencing their mindset?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, others will judge and probably ask
    those who came afterwards whether we had any impact.
    I think it was a painful process, but I do think we had
    some influence in Baghdad to get the Ministry of
    Interior to take more responsibility for what was
    happening in local policing. We were able to persuade
    them to disband the truly corrupt units and to try and
    support policemen who were honest and not subject to
    political influence. But it was a daily -- it was
```

a daily struggle.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: It was a daily struggle which you undertook?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, we had no choice. If we were going to get out, we had to leave some semblance of a rule of law there.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think you have already begun to bring out the fact that, addressing the security complex of questions, the national perspective is a quite different one from the provincial one, certainly looking at the south-east, whether it is in terms of competitive rhetoric and attitudes among different factions or whether it is a matter of the consequences of taking action by coalition security forces.

How far in Baghdad was there an awareness among the nascent Iraqi Government, an awareness of the security situation in the south and their attitude to it, or was it simply seen as, "That's a Shia problem in Basra province or it is a coalition problem mainly for the Brits"?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Amongst the Iraqi Government it was difficult to interest Kurdish ministers or Sunni ministers on it. For the Americans, it was something that we were supposed to deal with; the Brits were in charge down there, "You should be dealing with it".

I think for the Prime Minister, for instance, Ibrahim Al-Jaafari, and then subsequently

Nouri Al-Maliki, and the Minister of the Interior, who was also a Shia, Jabr then Bulani, for them, they were torn. They would send -- we had a particular incident in which three British soldiers were picked up on the streets of Basra. They were in civilian clothes, it was understandable. They wanted to find out what they were doing. They were taken to a police station and then it was established that they were British soldiers on legitimate Coalition business. Yet, that police station was in the hands of the militia and those soldiers were handed over to a militia.

There is your breakdown of the rule of law, and in dealing with that situation, where we took direct military action to recover those soldiers, there was a disconnect between us and the Iraqi Government in the centre. The Iraqi Government, who thought we had been heavy handed, apportioned blame to us, and I had some very forthright discussions with the Prime Minister and his nominated representative on this.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that genuinely a difference of world view or was it a necessary political reaction from the standpoint of Iraqi politicians in Baghdad?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think there was a little bit of
a difference in world view, different standpoints, but there was also an element of them playing a bit of politics. They had political rivals in those areas, those political rivalries in Basra were transferred up into Baghdad. At this time, we were going -- against this security backdrop we were going through a period, after the elections, of -- a sustained period of political infighting on who would be Prime Minister and how the government ministries would be divided up.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a sense, in what you are saying, that certainly looking at the security situation in the south, the Baghdad politicians' reaction is defensive rather than aggressive.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Very much defensive, and our aim was to get them more engaged and to take responsibility for what the local factions of their political parties were doing, and explaining to them that, ultimately, this is -- our plan is to transition security to them, so it is in their interests to have a professional, non-corrupt police force and a professional army capable of outgunning any of the armed groups that might still be there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Right. You mentioned a little while back Sunni outreach. I would like to ask just one or two questions about our relationship with the US in the
coalition in the security context particularly.
Sunni outreach, you implied, I think, indeed you
said, that there might be a difference of emphasis or
timing between ourselves and the Americans in the year
you were there. Was that something that was shifting?
Was there a coming together of the UK and the US view?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, we were first movers on this.
I think very quickly the US agreed with the analysis.
It didn't take very long to get the $U S$ to see that,
unless we brought the Sunnis into the process, we were
not going to have -- (a) we were not going to deal with
the insurgency, and (b) we were not going to have
a political system in Iraq that had any chance of
success or of being sustainable. So I would put them
a few weeks at most behind us.
THE CHAIRMAN: Was that true more generally for the whole of
the military strategy between the US and the UK
partnership?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: During my time, I thought the
cooperation between the US and the UK was very good.
I didn't detect any great divergence of strategy over
military. I think the only area of slight concern the
Americans might have had was a concern that we might
transition more quickly in the south than they would be
comfortable with. I think that became a concern later
on and they clearly wanted success, success meant transitioning to Iraqi control, but they didn't want to get too out of kilter with their own plans.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was that simply, as it were, relative timing rather than a different assessment of conditions in Maysan or Muthanna province?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We had a debate about conditions in Maysan and we set out with the Americans and with the Iraqis what would constitute the conditions for transfer, and at various times there would be different assessments and things would -- I think the Americans at one stage got more concerned about Maysan because of the Iranian dimension and the prospect that, if the British were to transition to Iraqi control, that would somehow increase Iran's ability to infiltrate, and our view was we weren't actually controlling the border anyway. So that wasn't something we were giving up.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was more that kind of consideration in the US mind rather than their anxiety that they might come under more pressure, if we were handing over provinces in the south, for them to do the same in central Iraq or the north?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I don't think they felt that sort of pressure. They had concerns that their line of supply was all through the south and, if something went wrong,
they could be a bit vulnerable, but these were understandable concerns and they were dealt with in terms of having a strategic back-up and -- these were just normal -- I would regard as normal political/military discussions that we had.

THE CHAIRMAN: One last thing from me on this general thing. You mentioned detainees already, not a problem essentially in the south. There were not many detainees that we were holding.

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: The ones we had were troublesome.

THE CHAIRMAN: Indeed, but there weren't also anything like the same levels of scandal and worse. Did you have in your year particular concerns about the evolving US approach to detainees and attached scandals, whether they were being held by Iraqi groups themselves or indeed by coalition forces?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: The big dilemma, and the Americans shared this -- I remember having a discussion with General Casey -- they could see the political damage that having tens of thousands of detainees held without processing for long periods was not conducive to a policy of inclusion and reaching out to the sunnis. They knew that. It was one thing to take a decision to speed up the process, and they did speed up the process of dealing with detainees, but your American soldier on
the ground was picking them up as quick as they were being released. So there was a real issue there.

There was also an issue that the Iraqis, the ordinary Iraqis, preferred the detainees to be in American custody than Iraqi custody. So there was an issue of having to clean up the image of detention by the Iraqis, deal with the issue --

THE CHAIRMAN: As part of the transition?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: As part of the transition. In order to make it palatable for all the detainees eventually to be handed over to Iraqi control or Iraqi process, you had to create a situation where there was confidence in that Iraqi process that individuals wouldn't be subject to abuse.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, and presumably the image, in the Iraqi minds and eyes, would follow the reality of reform?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: The difference between -- you could usually find out where your brother or son was, or father, in the American system. In the Iraqi system they often didn't know where they were.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just going back for a moment to Basra detainees, you have mentioned that there were a few but they were troublesome. Was there a quite different process of assessment and picking up and holding and processing?

```
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, we had -- I mean from what -- we
    had a sort of rather forensic approach to this. The
    people we picked up tended to be the people we had
    evidenced were attacking us or blowing us up. So we had
    very few, but we were pretty confident that the ones we
    had were bad guys. The trouble was they were nearly
    always Shia and they were nearly always connected by
    some process to some politicians. So for every detainee
    that we picked up in Basra, I was always being summoned
    by the Prime Minister or the Minister of the Interior to
    explain myself, whereas the American Ambassador had tens
    of thousands of them and nobody cared.
THE CHAIRMAN: Last from me: Basra/Baghdad, several issues.
    One of them is resources, the resource flow, whether it
    is US money going into the south or, indeed, UK direct
    to the south. Your perspective from Baghdad was -- were
    the lines of communication and, indeed, the lines of
        resourcing and exchange of information reasonably open
        in your year?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: In terms of civilian resources?
THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, principally, I suppose.
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We didn't have a lot of money to spend
    in the south. We spent considerable sums, but we didn't
    have the resources that the US had, but during my
    period, it was about getting the Iraqis to spend their
```

own money. Oil production was up to 2.6 million barrels a day at the time, but the Iraqis had an unspent capital budget. There was -- I mean -- I remember complaining -- there was \$2 billion of capital sitting in the Ministry of Finance unspent, with demand for power stations and roads. So it was getting the Iraqis to spend their own money wisely that was the focus. I'm not sure it was a question of resources, it was a question of governance.

THE CHAIRMAN: How far does that lie back in the history of 2003, and even 2004, where certainly the American approach, was we have heard it, was to engage in quite long-term plans for large-scale projects, oilfield development, electricity and water infrastructure, as opposed to things with a quite short payback period?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: It is difficult to know. At the time, I used to have a weekly meeting and somebody would tell me the megawattage of electricity that was being produced. It was one of our indicators: was it going up or down? It was very difficult to deliver, given the security situation, you know, the transmission lines were being blown up. It was very difficult to get a power station project up and running. You had a very weak administration, and I think part of the problem was
that you had no means of delivery. One of the discussions I had with the Deputy Prime Minister a lot was, "Could you take this out of the bureaucracy?"

The Iraqi bureaucracy was in no fit state to deliver on a reconstruction programme. Could you somehow take that out, because -- so you had a weak system, which is a function of the collapse of the Iraqi bureaucracy in 2003/2004. So you had to rebuild that system at the same time as which you were trying to rebuild the infrastructure, at a time when the government was trying to establish the constitution, form a government --

THE CHAIRMAN: And much more interesting things like that.
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: -- against an appalling security
backdrop. So there were -- you know, there were
formidable obstacles in terms of getting the power grid up, power stations built, oil pipelines repaired and I can't say we had a huge amount of success.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were you, yourself, in the problem zone in terms of balancing electricity supply in the south, where much of it was being generated, and the centre of Baghdad?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I did intervene a couple of times to suggest that there was a National Grid and that Basra couldn't just isolate itself from events, but there were occasions when Basra was having twice as much power as

```
    Baghdad. So there was politics being played there and
    we did intervene with the government to try and improve
    the situation and to prevent a beggar thy neighbour
    policy.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Right. The last thing really is relations
        with the US through your period. You have told us that
        in many respects the kind of dialogue that went on was
    entirely natural and expected. If there were
    differences, these were resolved or capable of being
    resolved, there weren't huge splits or tensions, but did
    the standing of the UK, in terms of its influence within
    the coalition as a whole, change by reason of our
    getting closer to handover, getting closer to drawdown
    than the Americans were?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I don't think so. I think the Americans
    regarded us as their most important coalition partner.
    We were, by far, the largest contributor, both in terms
    of military resources and civil and political resources.
    The American Ambassador I were the only two coalition
    ambassadors who were on the Iraqi National Security
    Council, so we sat on the Iraqi National
    Security Council with the Prime Minister and the
    Minister of Defence in terms of trying to manage this
    transition. So we had a very close relationship.
        We operated closely over the discussions on the
```

constitution, over government formation, over supporting the electoral process. There were differences of view. We had opinions, they had opinions. We argued them out. But I didn't really detect any great division. Our aim was the same, and I thought -- personally, I thought the relationship was very good.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Martin?
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Continuing with relationships, may I ask, what was the UK relationship with the Maliki government --

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, we were sort of relieved at the end that a government had been formed. I mean, there was quite a period -- a long period, a drawn-out period -- we had hoped that there would be a Prime Minister appointed in the January and the government might be formed in February. That actually rolled on to April and May and was very painful. Nouri Al-Maliki came sort of from nowhere through this process. It was -- once the UIA, the Shia grouping, had won the majority of seats in Parliament, it was clear that the UIA was going to have to nominate the Prime Minister. A long period when it was between Ibrahim Al-Jaafari, the incumbent, and Adil Abdul-Mahdi of a rival function, and they kind of checkmated each other, but then it was quite clear that, still, the UIA
were going to have to nominate someone, and then there were various discussions and Nouri Al-Maliki sort of arrived as a rather surprise candidate, came to the fore, but our initial contact with him was good. He said all the right things. He was leading a government of national unity. They agreed a national programme in May. It was based on national reconciliation, national recovery, international engagement. He said all the right things about inclusion. So I think we were quite encouraged by his steps and initial statements.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Were you involved in encouraging him? SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I was in a rather difficult position in the sense that -- I think he had the impression that he wasn't Britain's favourite candidate, but our position was we wanted a credible leader who could lead a balanced government and national reconciliation. We didn't have a preferred person; we had a preferred model.

I think he certainly -- he certainly came forward with the right ideas at the time. So we were involved directly in trying to shape the national programme, the programme of national reconciliation and to help him develop something we called the international compact which was a better relationship with the international
community, because $I$ think institutions like the UN and the IMF and the EU had been a bit stand-offish on Iraq and we wanted to use the fact that a sovereign Iraqi Government had been formed after an election to have a new relationship with the international community. So we very much engaged with him. I mean, I only had an month or two -- six weeks of an overlap, two months at most, of him when he was forming the government.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Had his dependence on the Sadrists been an issue?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: He was less dependent on the Sadrists than Ibrahim Al-Jaafari would have been. So he was kind of free of that. He was neither dependent on the Sadrists nor on SCIRI, so he had an opportunity for independence. He was from Jaafari's own faction called the Daw'a. He had a reputation for being sectarian. Some people
thought him very pro-Iranian -- I never thought that; I thought it was a misreading of Maliki -- and, maybe conscious of his reputation for being sectarian, he did very clearly come out with this national reconciliation plan, which you would have to ask others about how well it has been implemented.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: But in terms of what we had hoped for?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: He was saying the right things. SIR MARTIN GILBERT: I would like to ask you about your contact with London. You mentioned your frequent telephone calls direct with Number 10. The instructions you got across the board, were they instructions that you felt were attainable?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: In the end, we did. I mean, my instructions were: get a constitution, get it agreed, have an election, get a government formed and get some troops out. So I suppose they were, because that's -by July, when I left, we had done all of those. Handover in Muthanna was just about to happen. Obviously, we would have liked to have got more troops out quicker, but it was always a conditions based approach, and when the conditions were right. We weren't just going to pull troops out for the sake of it.

So they were reasonable requests as long as you realised that they weren't in my gift or solely in the gift of the British Government. We were actors in a complex situation where there were other actors and the key for us was to work with the Americans, with the Iraqis, mainly, to try and see a path through. I was always struck by how open Iraqis were to discussions about how democracy worked, and what struck me about it
was how little experience they had of it. Most politicians
had been in exile a while -- how it was just your own
normal experience. I don't regard myself as
a constitutional expert, but my everyday understanding
of how government works was useful in talking to Iraqi
politicians who were genuinely interested. So there was
a process of constant dialogue with individuals, which
I think had an impact.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: When you passed back your concerns to
London, did you feel they were understood and met
speedily?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think so. There was a certain --
there were certain frustrations sometimes that London
would -- we would come up with a new plan for the police
and a week later somebody would be asking how we are
doing. I said, "Oh, it is fantastic. We have
completely transformed the police in the last week".
I would say there was a tension between desire for
instant results and the realities on the ground, it was
understandable. I didn't complain too much about that.
I understood what was going on. But what you could
achieve in the sort of timescales that London needed for
political reasons were - well there was a disconnect.
SIR MARTIN GILBERT: You have mentioned these political
reasons before at the beginning of your evidence today.

Do you feel the reporting culture was such that you were able to transmit your needs and your problems?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, I had no difficulty with that. If I needed something, there was no problem in asking for it. I didn't always got it because there weren't always the resources. The security situation in Basra was deteriorating. It would have been nice to have had more helicopters for the military, but, as we have seen elsewhere, you can't just conjure up helicopters very easily.

I think I was realistic about what resources could usefully be deployed. I was firmly of the view that UK resources applied in Iraq were less good than Iraqi resources applied in Iraq and our effort should be directed to encouraging the Iraqis to take their own decisions, build their own institutions, and, if that took longer, it was better.

There was a tension between military commanders who were under pressure to get quick fixes, and us under pressure to get quick fixes, and putting in place systems, procedures or a process that would be sustainable. But $I$ don't think those tensions ever reached breaking point.

SIR MARTIN GILBERT: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Roderic?

SIR RODERIC LYNE: I just wonder if I could follow up a bit on the London end. You have talked about getting almost daily phone calls from Number 10. Where were your instructions coming from? Did it seem to you at all odd that you were being managed from 10 Downing Street rather than another department? Did you sense that there was a joined-up policy in Whitehall?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: No, I didn't find it strange, given the sort of level of interest in the subject, the level of commitment, personal commitment, by the Prime Minister. I didn't get -- I had lots of visitors. Jack Straw was out three or four, maybe five times in the time I was there. The Prime Minister was out two or three times. The Defence Secretary was out, you know, at least as often as that. So $I$ had a lot of direct contact with the Ministers.

In a sense, we weren't getting daily instructions. You know, we had -- I had my marching orders, if you like, and a lot of it was left to us. It was one of those -- what they were interested in was updates: what's happening? What's happening on the constitution? Where are we? Where are we on the electoral processes? Where are we on the formation of the government? So a lot of it was an insatiable appetite for information on what was happening, and that was -- in a sense that
was the essence really of the Sheinwald call at nine o'clock in the morning. It was a kind of, "I'm going in to see the Prime Minister this morning. He is going to ask about Iraq. What's happening?"

SIR RODERIC LYNE: There was also an appetite you have talked of for instant results. You said --

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: There was.
SIR RODERIC LYNE: -- there was a level of ambition higher than the ability to deliver. Did you sense that people in London understood the constraints that were imposed by the transfer of sovereignty to an Iraqi Government?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think they did. You know, I don't want to overplay this kind of -- you know, this was a bit of -- I understood the frustration. I'm quite frank, so I would be quite frank back about the level of ambition and the level of achievement and I didn't encounter too many problems. Nobody withdrew me anyway. So -- I mean, there was what I would call a healthy exchange, them pushing us to achieve more, us explaining reality, but getting on with it and trying to do more and I don't think that relationship ever broke down. SIR RODERIC LYNE: What did you sense was the top priority in London? Was it to achieve the objectives that we had originally set ourselves, or was it -- you have talked several times about the desire to transition out of
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    Iraq. We had been in there over two years at the period
    you were there, and, indeed, three years by the time you
    left. Was the real push at this stage to get out of
    Iraq?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: There was a real push to leave Basra,
    leave the south, with a semblance of success, and
    I think there was some pressure --
SIR RODERIC LYNE: A "semblance"? That's a long way short
    of what we had originally intended to do.
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Nobody expected Nirvana. Nobody did.
    We were all realistic about what we could achieve.
    SIR RODERIC LYNE: We were realistic in 2005/2006. Had we
        been reasonable in 2003/2004 when we set our original
    objectives?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We knew a lot more in 2005/2006 than we
    knew in 2003/2004. We had learned a lot of lessons.
    I think what was clear to me in 2005/2006 was just how
    difficult this was.
SIR RODERIC LYNE: So the original objectives had been
    a long way from reality?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: The original objectives had been
    ambitious.
SIR RODERIC LYNE: That's a euphemism. Overambitious?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think the timescales were ambitious,
    I do actually think that the project is
```

```
    a five-to-ten-year project, and we are not yet ten years
    away from 2003. I have always -- what was clear to me
    when I was there, was that this would take longer to --
    if your ambition was to reconstruct a state that had not
    had democracy for the past 30 years, that had been led
    by a brutal dictator virtually from scratch, that was
    not going to happen in two years.
SIR RODERIC LYNE: Now, the period you were there, London
were beginning to plan, to increase our forces in
Afghanistan. That started before you arrived, the
planning process. The announcement was made halfway
through your tour. The increased deployment from 1,000
to about 5,400 happened just before you left. You have
mentioned helicopters as one example of where you would
have liked to have seen more resources.
    I know that is more in the area of the military, but
    to what extent did you sense that at least in the
    Ministry of Defence in London our objectives, our
    priorities, were shifting, in the time you were
    ambassador, from Iraq towards Afghanistan?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: They were beginning to shift and there
was a sense that obviously if we were able to reduce our
presence in Iraq, that would create the headroom to
reinforce our forces in Afghanistan. There was
a backdrop for that. I was aware of that. In the end,
```

we weren't able to reduce our forces to the extent. We still reinforced in Afghanistan. So you would have to ask the military how they managed to do that. There was certainly a sense that some drawdown in Iraq would help ease the pressure for Afghanistan, but, in fairness, there was never any question of withdrawing forces if the conditions weren't right, and it took longer than we originally thought.

SIR RODERIC LYNE: Did you think the MoD's priorities and Number 10's priorities were the same in this period?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think so. I think the MoD were obviously more anxious about some drawdown, but I never -- it never got to levels of screaming and shouting. I think they were also conscious that a precipitate withdrawal could be very damaging for what we called the UK's legacy in Iraq. There was talk of our legacy and leaving a stable system in place before we withdrew.

SIR RODERIC LYNE: Thank you.
THE CHAIRMAN: Lawrence?
SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: Following on from that, what was the impact of the February 2006 bombing of the mosque in Samarra?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, this was part of what we saw as an Al-Qaeda attempt to exacerbate sectarian divisions. So
there was the Samarra bombing, and I think the Al-Askari mosque in Samarra. That was a blatant attempt at
increasing the sectarian divide.
My impression at the time was that actually it brought people together and I think February 2006 was -I think the -- certainly, after that, we began to see some success in separating -- in getting the Sunnis to come more clearly into the security apparatus and things. So I think there was an initial, "My goodness! Is this going to be the point at which Iraq breaks up into sectarian civil war?" There was a shock element to that. But the response of the politicians was such that they managed that, and its impact was not what was intended, certainly by the perpetrators.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: But the initial impact on the ground was to vastly increase the levels of violence and sectarianism on the ground?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: There was initially -- but not particularly great. There was initially some increase in the levels of violence, but very quickly politicians saw where this could lead, and I'm just -- I remember we were having discussions with Ibrahim Al-Jaafari, who was still the Prime Minister at the time, very conscious of the need to dampen down sectarian response to this, and I think subsequent events showed that they did manage
it.
SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: So in the month afterwards, I think the Defence Secretary announced the first drawdown of 8,000 to 7,200 British troops. So you didn't feel that there was a problem in the developing security situation that made it problematic to --

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Our troops were all in the south. So you know, the consequences, had there been an increase in violence as a result, most of it would have been felt in and around Baghdad, Diyala province. So it wouldn't have had much of an impact on our presence in the south, given the preponderance, overwhelming Shia majorities in those provinces.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: Just generally, when that announcement was made, were you closely involved in the decision-making leading up to that announcement?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I don't remember that as a big
announcement. It was a sort of adjustment. I mean, the 8,000, 7,000 -- the big adjustment was going to be from 8,000 to 4,000 , because that was going to be what we called strategic overwatch, where our troops were no longer on the streets, they would no longer be responsible for security. So that reduction to 7,000 wasn't such a big deal as, say, a reduction to 4,000 would be.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: So it wasn't seen as having any great political symbolical significance?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: No, I think it may have been a response to Afghanistan military -- but $I$ don't recall it being a big decision at the time and having to explain it in any great depth.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: Slightly related to that, at the time one of the arguments one would hear about the future of Iraq -- and you have alluded to this -- was that the logic was to partition. That this would -that the movement of populations that you have described earlier might make this possible -- was that ever seriously considered, do you think, to be a practical policy by the British Government?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: No, it was always a clear policy to do what we could to work for the unity of Iraq.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: Was there a point when you thought that might be the result?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes, I think I said in my dispatch that a descent into civil war and possible partition looked more likely at this stage than a sustainable democracy unless we did a number of things. So it was a possibility.

As sectarian violence increased, as things like Al-Askari mosque, there were other incidents. There

back from a descent into civil war.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: The last question on the Iranian influence in all of this: how strong a sense did you get in Baghdad of Iran playing a role? What did you see as Iranian objectives in all of this? What were they trying to achieve?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think the Iranians were trying to have as much influence as they could. So they were basically -- they seemed to be dealing with just about everybody, including Zarqawi at one point, but had most influence with some of the Shia militia.

I think one of their successes was in influencing the Jaysh Al Mahdi, who had, up to that point, been an Iraqi nationalist group. We were convinced, and I said so publicly at the time -- and we had evidence -- that the Iranians were supplying explosives, EFPs, electronic form projectiles explosives -- I can't remember what the acronym stands for now, but they were pretty lethal devices, and that Hezbollah in Lebanon had been providing some training.

So there was a direct Iranian involvement with some of the violent groups and there was also political engagement by the Iranians. I would get that their objectives were to maximise their influence in Iraq, ensure that -- and to probably try and ensure the
coalition didn't succeed.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: How much do you think that the growing tension between Britain, the United States, but also France and Germany, and Iran at this time was a factor in this, in that they could see that Iraq was a place where, if tensions had come to a head over the Iranian nuclear programme, they could retaliate, as it were, through Iraq?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I'm reasonably confident that that must have been in the Iranian minds, that this was a playground in which they could impact directly on our interests, so I'm sure that played a part.

SIR LAWRENCE FREEDMAN: Did you have any recommendations that you could make in terms of how this influence could be limited?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: My recommendations were to expose it when we had, you know, to make it clear -- to get the Iraqis themselves -- and we had some success in getting the Iraqi politicians to make it clear to the Iranians that this was unacceptable interference.

The best thing we could do was to promote Iraqi institutions like a national army, an independent police force, rule of law, all the things we were trying to do anyway. These were things that would limit the extent of any Iranian malign influence, and I think the

Iranians overreached themselves in Iraq. I do think that there is an Iraqi saying that they have reminded the Iraqis -- they have -- reengendered -- if there is such a word -- Iraqi nationalism, and you are finding a lot of Iraqis resentful of this sort of interference. So they may have overplayed their hand.

BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: I want to come back to the question of detainees. You have talked about how they were processed. That was one part of it. But was there any concern about how they were treated while they were in custody?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I think very few complaints about how they were in American custody. I think the problem with the number of detainees was how long they were held. They were not processed, a lot of them were released after three to six months. While $I$ was there, the biggest complaints were against Iraqi detention centres, the MOI detention centres, and some of the horrific things we found there when coalition forces did go into something called the Jadriya bunker, and we also discovered detention centres on the seventh floor of the Ministry of Interior which led to a whole process of dialogue with the Iraqi Government and agreement on investigation commission and also coalition willingness to inspect -- basically raid detention centres that they
were aware of.
So there was a determined effort to try and get to
the bottom of what the Sunnis called the MOI death
squads and politically motivated groups detaining
people. So there was quite a bit of concern about
detention in Iraqi facilities.
BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: What was done about it? What
priority was given to that --
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We gave quite a high priority to it.
BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: -- and was that concern raised with
you by London?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: We didn't need London to raise it with
us. If I was involved in Sunni outreach -- this was
a nail in the coffin of Sunni outreach. Unless we could
address their concerns about death squads, political
targeting of people on the basis of their religious
affiliation, unless we could reassure them about the
independence of the police, the Ministry of Interior was
not a Shia ministry but a national one, unless we could
do all these things, then the prospects of an inclusive
government were nil. But you know -- so in a sense, we
were on this before London --
BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: What practical steps did you take to
actually deal with it?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: In a sense, most of the issues with the

Americans because they had the forces in Baghdad. You know, I spent quite a bit of time with the Minister of Interior explaining to him in political terms why this was bad news for him, why it was bad news for the country. He always said the right thing; I wasn't always sure he did the right thing, but in terms of direct action, it was really the Americans, the Americans raided the Jadriya bunker, they inspected four other facilities. We persuaded the government to set up an independent commission and Inquiry. The deputy Prime Minister Rowsch Shaways, who was the Kurdish deputy Prime Minister, he headed up an Inquiry. So you know, we basically -- the Americans took some direct action, we kept up the political pressure on the Iraqis to sort this.

BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: Can I ask another question? You have been talking about the level of the ambition and the time it will take to bring about change. I mean, you were there only for about 12 months and obviously invested a lot of time in building relationships. Do you think you would have benefited if you had stayed there longer?

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes.
BARONESS USHA PRASHAR: Do you think it was something we should --

SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Well, we did do, we sent

Christopher Prentice. When the ambassador after -Dominic Asquith replaced me. The ambassador after that stayed for two years. I was ready to stay for two years, but we had a policy, a health and safety, welfare policy that nobody should stay longer than a year because it was too difficult. Anyone who volunteered to stay beyond a year was obviously mad and had to be pulled out.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have given us a view of Iraq, of what is now three and a half years ago, when you left. By the time you did leave, on the one hand, the main objectives of British policy for the time had been achieved. There was a constitutionally elected government in being. The security situation, however, was in a very serious condition and getting worse.

If you look at the prospect for the state of Iraq at the time, you thought there was still a serious risk either of a Shia/Kurd diarchy or, worse still, a fission. From a rather good seat in Saudi Arabia today, and this is outside the scope of formal evidence, I think, do you see the prospect now as substantially better from the standpoint of what you described as a seven-to-ten-year project, than it was at the point where you left it in mid-2006?

```
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I do, yes, and I spent a lot of time
    talking to the Saudis about this. I tell them that
    I was a pessimist when I left Iraq. I think I described
    myself as a pessimist who refuses to panic, but I think
    the prospects are much better.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Just picking up one thing you said, part of
        the rationale for that is correct, and indeed
        courageous, decisions taken by the new Iraqi Government?
    SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Yes.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Not least in tackling the Shia militias in
    the south.
    SIR WILLIAM PATEY: Also the coalition sticking to its
    policy that we would only withdraw troops when the
    conditions were right and not against some pre-arranged
    timetable.
    THE CHAIRMAN: Right. Is there any final reflection you
    would like to leave us with?
SIR WILLIAM PATEY: I mean, you touched on it. You know,
    where do I think Iraq is going now? I spent a lot of
    time trying to persuade the Saudis that they should be
    investing more in Iraq in terms of time and effort.
    I do think some of the groundwork has been laid.
    I think I said that strategic failure is a possibility
    but not inevitable. I think somebody else might say
    strategic success is a possibility but not inevitable.
```

That might be where we are now.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I think that's the note on which to conclude this session. We are grateful, Sir William, thank you very much. We will resume in about ten minutes' time for the second part of the morning.
(11.27 am)
(Short break)


