

H. R. PEROT

August 25, 1982

Mr. Ken Follett

Dear Ken:

This letter is in response to your letter on my notes.

Page 2, Note 2 -- Neither Bill Gayden nor John Howell were there. Let's try to get down to the facts after you finish your third draft. I am convinced that Tom Luce and I are right on the sequence of events.

Page 25, Note 2 -- Use this or not, as you see fit. I understand your problem. I have been making this statement since 1969, when EDS first went public. I understand your problem, and don't care what you do.

Page 43 -- And all subsequent State Department comments -- if you will just stop beating up on me, I will surrender unconditionally. As I have told you, I will have the last laugh by selling the State Department a huge job that I would be unable to sell them, if you told the real story (just couldn't resist one last dig as I surrender unconditionally).

Page 60 -- This is simply a fact. The book exists. These steps are required. Are we not going to print the truth, simply because it looks like BS? Ken, handle this any way you see fit. I put this note in, because it is a fact, and lends credence to your statement "EDS had never paid bribes in Iran or anywhere else".

Page 61, Note 2 -- I suggest this change, because I believe it is more easily understood by the reader. It is not important.

Page 62, Note 1 -- I don't care, as long as you understand that Kissinger will. (Possibly you can think of him as a former member of the State Department and grant him more favorable treatment -- unconditional surrender is tough as hell).

Page 79, Note 2 -- This is not important. Handle it as you see fit. I will bet you a cheap steak that you can't find a transcript where I said "it was silly".

Letter to Ken Follett
August 25, 1982
Page Two

Page 98 -- Would you like to talk to Haig? I doubt it is worth your time. It is not an important point.

Mr. Fish

Page 102 -- Who said that [REDACTED] looked like a slob? He is somewhat overweight, but I feel that slob is too strong, and he will be crushed. Again, it is not an important point.

Page 165 & 166 -- We did discuss Dr. Razmara. I think you need to make it much clearer when he became the Deputy Minister. The reader should understand that he was not in the Ministry and had no direct knowledge of our activities. The reader should understand that he was getting all of his information from Dadgar, etc. The casual reader could conclude we were not doing a good job or were dealing in an improper way.

Page 180, Note 2 -- You ask "do I have any real grounds for saying that your account about Sullivan is inaccurate?". Everything that Sullivan told me is completely different from what you have him saying here. He repeatedly assured me that the Shah would make it.

Page 188 -- Goelz -- You are right. I wouldn't have hired him then. But I think the reaction you're getting from Goelz probably comes from comments like this. He did a great deal to help us, and feels that we don't appreciate it, when in fact, we do.

Page 197 & 198 -- I think you are making a serious mistake not to improve the jailbreak -- even if you explain at the beginning of the book that you are doing it to protect the identity of the Iranians involved. It certainly could be "ten times more exciting".

Page 199, Note 2 -- I don't remember telling Paul that Huyser said he would not leave Tehran without Paul and Bill. On the other hand, I am a little shaky after losing our bet on when the men were transferred from one prison to the other, so if Paul says I said that, then Huyser must have told me.

Page 208 -- Talk with Paul about this. I don't believe you are quite on target yet in terms of what he knew, etc. He is your best source.

Page 221 -- I still think you are confusing your reader with the statement from me "How'd it happen?". I believe this is a conversation that you have constructed. It is probably very close to the actual conversation. It is not important. Do whatever makes sense to you. I only bring it up out of concern that the reader will get confused.

Page 315 -- Sculley is certainly a better source.

Letter to Ken Follett
August 25, 1982
Page Three

Page 326 -- I mentioned the Ginsburg story, because it is consistent with the rest of the problems we had with the State Department. I certainly understand your concerns, and agree with your position.

You asked me to reconstruct Simons conversation about the strengths and weaknesses of each individual on the team. Ken, the only person we really talked about was Bucha. Simons spent ten minutes with him, and had him completely figured out.

I don't really remember Colonel Simons going through each man in detail.

If you want to put his analysis of each man in the book, I think we would have to do a great deal of work on each man in order to create a Simons analysis. If you want me to do it, I will try.

We will have each of the men write down his recollection of arriving home, etc. as you requested in your letter.

We are buried in business, and look forward to having you back in Dallas so that we can stop work and have fun for awhile.

Please give my best to Mary and the children.

Sincerely,



Ross

RP/cw

P.S. Have you heard about the Australian who is flying around the world in a helicopter? No one has ever done it before! He was received by Prince Charles, etc. in England. He is now at a major air show in England. Sounds like an exciting trip, doesn't it?

P.S.S. Regarding the second paragraph of your letter to me. Sally and Claire feel strongly that "a little pancake make-up" will not correct my ears and nose. What do you think? It looks like the whole burden will be on the tailor-made suit to attract attention away from my face.