1. Have now had opportunity to read research study entitled "Elites and the Distribution of Power in Iran" (PR 76 10017 of February 1976). May I suggest that a rather good study is flawed by the use of pejorative words which would severely damage US/Iran relations if paper were to fall into the wrong hands. Examples of my concern can be seen in the photograph on page 46, use of the word "harridan" on page 19, and the term "nymphomaniac" on page 2. The Shah might not be able to do much about it if he read this kind of material in TIME or Newsweek, but he would regard a CIA publication quite properly as US Government and therefore descriptive of US Government attitudes toward him, his mother, and his twin sister. My basic point is this: Do you need to use newspaper language of this kind in a serious study? There is a great difference between making intelligence documents readable and trying to compete with the daily press in tone and language.

2. If this study has had wide distribution in Washington, we had all better start hoping that it does not leak. Normally an ambassador should raise with the State Department a matter of this kind, but I chose this channel directly to you so that attention is not widely drawn to the problem in State or other agencies, thus improving the possibility of leakage. Further, one never knows...
these days when classified material, which at one time would never have seen the public light of day, will show up in Congressional hands and then be assisted on its way to publication by Jack Anderson or someone comparable (viz. CIA aid to the Kurds).

I am not trying to drive a truck with a sledge hammer. I am simply saying that if serious intelligence studies on friendly foreign countries and their leaders are going to be written if the language was derived from "Kurdish Stone", United States foreign policy may be in for a rough time.

Appreciate your hearing me out. Warm regards.