
From: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 2, 2017 5:12 PM
To: jeffrey E.; Valeria Chomsky
Subject: Question about Max and the Tucson house

We are curious about why Max should be making this crazy demand.

One is that he is acting on the instructions of the children who want to ensure that the Tucson house ends up going to them.

The second is that he is acting on what he takes to be his responsibility as Trustee. And is therefore saying that he would only have been able to agree to distribute \$500,000 from the Trust if the house was owned by the Trust.

Which do you think makes sense, based on your conversations with him, or is both, or something else?

On Thu, Nov 2, 2017 at 4:16 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

max. ! - go slow. it will all work out,

On Thu= Nov 2, 2017 at 12:09 PM, Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] wrote:

Off to a meeting, back in a few hours.

One thing I don't understand. Who made the lunatic suggestion that the house on Tucson should be bought by the trust. We've already bought it, and anything of the sort would always have been entirely out of the question. I've never heard a word from anyone suggesting this craziness.

On Thu, Nov 2, 2017 at 3:48 PM, jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com> wrote:

summary, Deborah is a flake. she said he didn't receive an accounting but will check her emails as she is behind in checking :) . max will resign if asked as trustee, and if harry and one of the girls agrees everything is easy, max made a point to say that the children's inheritance was a concern, so for example if the house in tucson was bought by the trust, instead of in noam's name, there would be no issue. all odd, this is simple, noam worked his whole life and now though there are millions of dollars set aside, feels stressed over money, ITS WRONG. we need to value the people. deborah said she asked you to agree a fee to do so had no response, upon further questioning. she said it was a long time ago, and as she did not hear back she dropped the issue. MISHHUG

[REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:

for the letter Noam has requested to Deborah or for the accounting: no=ing.

Do you understand what is going on?

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

Date: Sun, Oct 29, 2017 at 5:03 PM

Subject: Re: trust

To: Deborah Pechet Quinan [REDACTED]

Cc: Valeria Chomsky [REDACTED]

<mailto:[REDACTED]>

That sounds right to us.

Noam

On Sun, Oct 29, 2017 at 1:00 PM, Deborah Pechet Quinan [REDACTED] wrote:

>

> Dear Noam,

> I will do so. Do you want me to hold off regarding the memo I was plan=ing to prepare for you, pending the discussion with your children? The mem= may not be necessary yet.

> Best,

> Deborah

>

> Sent from my iPhone. Please excuse brevity and typos.

>

> On Oct 29, 2017, at 2:20 PM, Noam Chomsky [REDACTED]

<mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Thanks for the informative letter. I would appreciate it if you =ould craft a letter, as you suggest, which I will use to contact all three=children.

>

> Thanks

>

> Noam

>

> ----- Forwarded message -----

> From: Deborah Pechet Quinan [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

> Date: Fri, Oct 27, 2017 at 4:56 PM

> Subject: Fwd: trust

> To: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

> Cc: [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>

<[REDACTED]> <mailto:[REDACTED]> >, Gene Land= [REDACTED]

<mailto:[REDACTED]> <=> >

>

> Dear Noam,

>

> You are waiting for me to provide guidance as to how you can regain control of the trust funds. My plan is to prepare a memo for you outlining your options in light of the trust terms. I anticipate being able to spend some time on this over the weekend, along with reviewing the drafts of your estate planning documents. Once I have sent the memo to you we can discuss your thoughts and we can then respond to Max. Unfortunately this is a difficult situation, not simple and straightforward, because of the terms of the trust and fiduciary law applicable to trusts. Please see my email of 10/17 for an explanation of some of the issues.

>

> In some situations a trust is drafted so that you would have the right to remove and replace the trustee, and in doing so perhaps find a trustee that would not inquire so diligently as to your personal financial circumstances before making a principal distribution to you. In this regard, please refer to my email of 10/17 where I summarize the trustee removal, resignation and appointment provisions. The trustees can both resign at any time. They appoint successors subject to your approval. If they agree to resign you can find a new independent trustee whom they can appoint. If not, you can remove them but only with the approval of a majority of your children. Do you think your daughters would agree to remove Max and Harry? If so you could then appoint a successor. You would need to find an independent trustee. I can help you craft a letter to your daughters if you think they might agree to do this.

>

> My one additional thought right now that I need to review more closely is that Harry, not being the independent trustee, should not have a say in the distribution decision. If there is nothing in the trust to contradict his interpretation (I need to review the trust again) then Max alone has the power. However this would likely not change the analysis that Max believes he needs to go through since he is accountable to all beneficiaries. He believes he needs some level of financial information from you but in my view that does not need to be detailed. I can discuss with him what level of detail would satisfy him; however, if my understanding is correct that you do not wish to provide him with any backup for his distribution decision, then we should evaluate the removal option and any other strategies I may be able to come up with.

>

> Unfortunately this is not a simple situation and I will do my best to outline some additional options for you. In the meantime please let me know your thoughts regarding the above. I am available for a call as well as at your convenience.

>

> Best,

> Deborah

>

> Sent from my iPhone. Please excuse brevity and typos.

>

> Begin forwarded message:

>

> From: Max Kohlenberg <

<mailto:

> Date: October 27, 2017 at 1:21:50 PM EDT

> To: Noam Chomsky <mailto:

> Cc: "Deborah Pechet Quinan, Esq." <

> Subject: Re: trust

>

> Hello Noam -

>

> I'm afraid I cannot send the money you have requested without further discussion with you and I also feel I cannot have such a discussion with you without Deborah's knowledge and participation, as she is your attorney. Please also note that any distributions from the trusts would also involve Harry, who is the co-trustee of the trusts.

>

> As you will see, I have again copied Deborah on my reply. I will be glad to follow up with a meeting or a call when I return, next week.

> Thanks,
>
> Max
>
>
>
> Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
>
>
> ----- Original message -----
> From: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
> Date: 10/27/17 5:14 PM (GMT+00:00)
> To: Max Kohlenberg [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]>
> Subject: Fwd: trust
>
> There seems to be some confusion. I was responding to your letter of Oct. 16, in which you said you would be getting back to me the next day. That was the last time we were in touch. Since I didn't hear from you, I wrote again, last night.
>
> My letter to you explained the reasons for my request for a distribution from the marital trust. To repeat, "I would like to get on with my life and work without delay. I've worked hard for 70 years, put away a substantial sum of money. I surely have the right to access it."
>
> I don't see what further explanation is necessary, or why it is necessary to bring Deborah into this. I could add that as I approach 90 having worked hard for 70 years and put away a substantial sum of money, I not only have the right to some peace and tranquillity to go on with my life and work, but also to do so without facing an inquisition.
>
> If you are unable to transfer the money this week, could you please detail for me the reasons behind the decision.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Noam
>
> ----- Forwarded message -----
> From: Max Kohlenberg [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]>
> Date: Wed, Oct 25, 2017 at 10:55 PM
> Subject: RE: trust
> To: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
> Cc: Deborah Pechet Quinan [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
>
>
> Good morning (from Scotland) Noam –
>
>
>
> When we were last in touch on this I replied with a cc to Deborah (who I have copied again here) and I understood that you, she and Valeria had discussed my need (as trustee) to know something

more about the back=round for this request and your anticipated needs going forward. Deb=rah got back to me and indicated that the call she and I had tentatively s=heduled was being cancelled.

>
>
>

that. I'll be back on Tuesday.
> If you would like me to reschedule a call with Deborah, or a meeting, =d be glad to do

>
>
>
> My best,

>
>
>
> Max

>
>
>

> From: Noam Chomsky [mailto: [REDACTED]]

<mailto: [REDACTED]>

> Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 6:43 AM
> To: Max Kohlenberg
> Subject: Re: trust

>
>
>

> I didn't hear from you about this, and would like to what is happe=ing in this matter. I would like to get on with my life and work wit=out delay. I've worked hard for 70 years, put away a substantial=sum of money. I surely have the right to access it. Could you =et me know where this stands.

>
>
>
> Noam

>
>
>

> On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 9:55 PM, Max Kohlenberg [REDACTED]

<mailto: [REDACTED]> > =rote:

>
> Thanks for the quick reply Noam. I will get back to you tomorrow=
>
>
>
> Max

>
>
>

>
>
>

>
>

> Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

>
>
>
>
>
> ----- Original message -----
>
> From: Noam Chomsky [REDACTED] <mailto:[REDACTED]>
>
> Date: 10/16/17 9:14 PM (GMT-05:00)
>
> To: Max Kohlenberg [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]>
>
> Subject: Re: trust
>
>
>
> I meant \$500,000.
>
>
>
> Noam
>
>
>
> On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 9:00 PM, Max Kohlenberg [REDACTED]
<mailto:[REDACTED]> wrote:
>
> Forgive me for asking Noam, but did you mean \$500,000, or \$50,000?
>
>
>
> Thanks,
>
>
>
>
>
> Max
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
>
>
>
>

--

=C2◆ please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

</=iv>

--

please note

The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may constitute inside information, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE

Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com>, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved