

[REDACTED]

January 3, 1983

Mr. Ken Follett

[REDACTED]

Dear Ken:

Both my wife Nancy and I enjoyed your manuscript very much. We even gave it to my mother-in-law, who visited us at Christmas. At 71, she found it so interesting, she finished the book in two days!

We have found some minor inaccuracies which ought to be changed to make it a better book. They are listed below by page number.

Page 18, Line 23. A thousand Rial note was worth about \$14.00, not \$140.00. Roughly \$1 equals 70 Rials

Page 19, Line 25. Kuche, not kootchie, stalls.

Page 20, Line 25. Ali, not Al Jordan.

Page 74, Lines 5 and 6. Might more accurately read: "...because the situation in Iran was both uncertain and confusing -- but, after September, the general trend of his reports suggested that the Shah was doomed by his own indecision."

Page 195, Line 19. The Shahyad monument (not tower).

Page 211, Line 11. Pittsburgh (not Pittsburg). (Also on page 320).

Page 237, Line 22. "...a 50-Rial tip - about 70 cents - as..."

Page 245 b, Line 29. "Woodward and Lothrop" should be used instead of "Woody's".

Pages 307-8. While Rashid may have been at Gasr Prison and may have done just what he said (beware of self-serving Persians!), the prison "busts" all over town were organized by the revolutionary groups. Rashid (and others like him) happened to be walking across the face of the volcano when someone else's lava came pouring out. I realize Perot likes to think he did it all, but the story would be more accurate (if not as exciting) if it emphasized more precisely at this point the contextual factors.

Page 322, Line 26. "escapers" should be "escapees"?

Page 335, Line 3. It is "Vanak Expressway", not "Stevanak"

Page 449, Lines 24, 25. If "Today (1979) was Jackie's thirteenth birthday, the figure on Line 24 should be six, not sixteen, if they were married in 1960

Nancy and I think you should explain the title "Bull and the Peacock" at some point early on. Perhaps just a reference to the Peacock Throne in the introduction would do it.

I noted with wry amusement the "beating" Perot gives the State Department. I wonder if Perot knows how much, in little ways, his own efforts were discreetly aided by those flying the flag. You even allude to this in a few places, most directly on page 389, but never make an independent statement to balance Perot's feelings. Such a statement by you would give you more standing with the reader and make you seem less like an uncritical apologist for Perot.

As I reread this letter, I realize it may sound to you more critical than we mean it to be -- your book is an excellent story, and we just want to help you make it better!

Best,

John D. Stempel