

Dear Roger,

1/26/89

Eulogies tend to be too flowery, too excessive. Yours is beautiful and eloquent and you avoid this trap, with a single exception.

I agree with your evaluation of her, her mind, her work and by and large, her judgement.

Speaking of her friends, you say "she was never wrong." Alas, like all of us, she was with a few of whom I know.

She was wrong in her evaluation of both Epstein and his first book. I accepted her judgement so, before reading the book (I never met him) I helped Tom Gervasi help promote it for Viking. When I read the book, I formed my own opinion of him and of it. Not the same as hers. She persisted in her loyalty to him long after she should have known better, too.

You don't mention Arnoni, *Minority of One*. I never knew him, never spoke to him. I recall clearly Sylvia's bitterness after some years when she told me how she had taken Arnoni's wife in after he had abused her. Others, too. But in this she was, like all of us, merely human.

Aside from Arnoni and Vince Salandria, you get to what I think underlay much of this when you say she attracted younger people (p. 3) and if I remember correctly, in a similar formulation elsewhere.

She'd have made a great mother but we are better off that she never had a child because motherhood may have prevented her great work. She was overwhelmed by this mother instinct with people like Epstein, I think.

I'd forgotten about Tony Howard until I read your quote on the last page. I started meeting with him regularly the week of May 7, 1966. At his home and I think in his office in the Post building. I mean I think his office was there. I gave him one of the first copies of *Whitewash* and we discussed it after he read it.

She was more perceptive than I with Garrison. I assumed he was like other prosecutors and that in all he was saying that he had not disclosed his actual case. I never asked him what his case was and I made no effort to find out. I was interested in other things when it was possible for me to be in New Orleans. I never did any work on Shaw there. We had numerous disagreements. Once I expected Moo Sciambra to jump me over the vigor and intensity of my criticisms, particularly over breaking his word to me. When I learned for the first time what his alleged case was, the night before the day they started impaneling the jury, I broke with him and his case and, despite what the *Times* said about me sitting at the counsel table as his Dealey Plaza witness, I was never in that courtroom and never laid eyes on Shaw. But in the end, she was right and I was wrong. (I refer not to her opinion as much as to her writing.)

She was indeed a fine person, with a magnificent intellect, and she was a gifted writer, particularly when anger inspired her eloquence.

Thanks,

Harold