I don't remember hearing this one before but the farright used to have field days with a Chicago Jack Rubenstein who was the subject of HUAC interest, as a subject, not as a fink.

Maybe they still are and I don't see. I'd light to have a steak for every Jack Rubenstein in Chicago.

Maybe this is a real one, but our Jack in an attempt to understand anything political or his "union" as a real one are not easy to keep from slipping from the hand.

What interests me about this is his source, the very respectable, eminent, dependable

or whatever he called the reporter and I know he saw Szulc when he was here.

What was Tad doing with an FBI report from the 40s? I don't think it is in the Archives. But suppose it were, how does that fit his known interests. What purpose?

Of course, if it is a fake, there is more. I think he is connected with the best of USA's document fakers.

Was he off on an assasjnation kick in his book and then decided against it? It is not from his NYTimes writing.

Suppose that the original is another Ruby or this is a fake, why would anyone give it to him? Did he not ask his source to prove that this is the one, the only ...?

If it is a gag, why palm it off on Scott?

No matter how I look at this in the little time it has been in my mind, it just does not come out right.

For either or both.

Best,