

These are letters from Dave Lifo to Barry Ernest. They go into a number of things. Those that interest memost are his bad advice to Barry, who was supposed to get the publicity material and picture of Youngblood from the publishers and his claim to have been on the staff of Ramparts.

October 25, 1968

Dear Harry,

I received your check and immediately mailed your book. By the way, the check is made out to David Rifton; if there any trouble cashing it, I will let you know. There shouldn't be.

I am most interested in learning about your interviews with Miller, Brehm, and Holland.

Did you record the interviews, or make up a memo afterwards? If so could you make those three available to me? In any event, what is Miller's position on the "smoke or steam" today? Is he standing firm, like Holland? Or is he backing out?

Before the Liebeler/Lane debate here at UCLA in Jan 1967, former WC attorney Liebeler interviewed Brehm, who is--today--violently antagonistic towards Lane.

I would very much like any info you can send re your interview of Miller, Holland and Brehm.

Also, what type of info did you turn up on the Tippit murder?

I think your Youngblood hypothesis is worth following up. But I wouldn't write the publisher. I don't think you will find anything that way. Have you looked up his testimony, checked where he went to school etc? In general, check the real Youngblood, the one we know about, and then see if, from the chronology of his background, he could be the one in Moore's book. You are going about it vice-versa and I don't think you'll find anything that way, especially if you ask the publisher.

If anything comes of this, let me know. I've been doing some work on some of the other SS agents, but its not finished yet.

Sorry for the delay in answering your letter. I've been swamped in other activities. I'm sorry I couldn't answer right away.

I am most interested in your offer to send me materials re your interviews.

Years ago, I interviewed Allan Dulles for about 15 minutes when he was visiting a dormitory at UCLA; if I can dig up that memo on the Dulles interview, I will send it to you. By the way, if you have a carbon or a good duplicate of your stuff, and send it to me, I can make my own copy at this end, and send back your copy to you, as I have access to a xerox machine.

Best wishes,

David
David

Nov 7, 1968

Dear Barry,

It was very good hearing from you. I have more questions, and some information.

Let me start with questions. Do you write up some sort of memo to yourself to cover these interviews? I hope that you are not just relying on your memory. If you are, even now, I urge you to sit down and write up everything you can remember about these interviews in some form of rough memo. It doesn't matter if it's in top notch essay form, or grammatically perfect. What does matter is that you commit your recollections to paper, with a date on it.

I have been doing lots of research, and I can assure you that that is the only way to fly. Two years from now, if you suddenly discover something, you can look back over your interview report, and see what's in there. But if all you have is recollections, and you try to go over them searching for information, it is all but useless, for you will find that current theories to which you may have an affinity, and past recollections, get all mixed up in one big jumble. Also, there is the very real problem that you don't do half the historical service you might, if you commit your recollections to paper under date at some reasonable time after the interview. If I want to quote something for publication, on someone you interviewed, and you have no memo of it, I could only state what you wrote me about what Witness A told you as you now remember it.

2,4,6,8 years from now, the existence of a series of memos, dated this year, of your interviews, will form a valuable record.

Some of my research concerns the train in the railroad yard. Could you elaborate as much as possible, on what you remember Austin Miller said about it? I have another witness who saw the train, a man standing on the Stearns Freeway who I happened to interview by phone 2 years ago for an entirely different reason. (He saw Tippit just before he died; Ramparts carried some of this in their November 1966 issue.) Immediately after my phone conversation, I dictated a memo of it (I was on the staff at Ramparts then, working on "The Case for Three Assassins"), the memo was typed up, and I just recently located a copy of it here in my apartment. I will send it to you under separate cover as soon as it is xeroxed. (It's a perfect example of why it's important to write up everything you remember, by the way, as soon as possible.)

Anyway, how can Miller say there was no train going by? Does he mean it protruded partly out onto the underpass, but wasn't "going by" in the sense that it was transiting that structure? Any more recollections or interpretations of what you think he meant would be of real value to me.

About your Brehm experience. It really sounds fascinating. Again, you really ought to write it up. I'd love a copy. If you do, I'll make you 7 or 8 copies of whatever you write on that, so you can send them out to others. Here you are, apparently arguing with a witness who has really copped out! It would make really interesting reading. Brehm told the Dallas Times Herald, on the afternoon of the assassination, that he thought the shots came from "in front of or beside the President" because of the way the head moved on impact with the fatal bullet. (See my Ramparts article, Witnesses section, for the exact quote).

Then, he is interviewed by Lane; ~~KENNEDY~~ he tells Lane a modified version of the same thing and then, when he realizes the implications, completely cops out, gets angry at Lane (and for publication!) and prostitutes himself on CBS.

Its really disgusting.

Again, I urge you, your encounter with Brehm---write it up. It sounds great.

Let me try to answer some of your questions.

You ask about the station wagon Holland described to you versus the one in Thompsons book. I haven't the slightest idea as to why he changed his story. But, if you write up, under date, what he told you, future researchers and writers will be able to mention this discrepancy, for it does not speak well for Holland's credibility.

About Mrs. Donald Higgins. Malcolm Kilduff was told that JFK was definitely dead at about 1:13. He wanted to announce it, and asked permission to do so, and LBJ said not to do so until he (LBJ) was out of the hospital and on his way to the airport. I believe that Kilduff made the announcement at 1:30 PM, and that at that time, he announced that the President had died at 1:00.

This is in either the Price Exhibits, Kantor Exhibit (Seth Kantors notes), the Secret Service reports (CE 1024) or all three. But I'm quite sure the President's death, fixed at 1:00PM, was not announced until 1:30.

I don't have a thing on Youngblood. If I ever get anything, I'll certainly let you know. But I'm not working in that area hardly at all. I'm suspicious of him, because of his quick reaction.

Barry, I've got loads of information on the case---one four drawer file cabinet chock full of material, plus sixty seven square feet of shelving, photo files, tape files etc. To send you everything I have on the case is like asking the archives to send everything they have.

Let me know if there is anything specific I can help you with, and I will do anything I can possibly do. Meantime, let me know if you have written reports on Miller. If so, could you make one up, putting down everything you remember, and send it to me? I'll send you back the original, plus 8-15 copies---just tell me how many. But I'd really like a copy. (Also---why does he not want to discuss it? Do you think he saw somethi g??)

Regards,

David
David