
From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 2, 2017 9:22 AM
To: Valeria Chomsky
Subject: Re: taxes

yes, the money in trust for them originally came from Noam correct?

On Sun, Jul 2, 2017 at 12:48 AM, Valeria Chomsky [REDACTED] wrote:

2) Carol had been working earlier. But almost all the money was from Noam's income and there were no distinction between the two income flows.

Valeria

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

From: jeffrey E. <jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> >
Date: Sat, Jul 1, 2017 at 11:55 PM
Subject: Re: taxes
To: Valeria Chomsky [REDACTED]

I personally will meet with speak with any one or all of them. so put your mind at ease. they are right in certain regards. however it tells me little re the overall situation. The interest language is ok. =C2 it was designed to merely pass through the same amount that the trust was paying, as they were borrowing the money themselves from pershing. and you were only required to pay the same rate that they were paying. . however I have many questions re the overall. . we can rectify this fairly quickly. =A0 but I want to make sure we have all the documents first. =A0 1 did the children EARN any of the money under discussion or is this all noams. 2 did his past wife earn this money. ? I suggest you tell them that you wish to collect all documents in one place. and then the moment that is complete you will have someone sit with them. . dont let it be me. . tell them as soon as you have all the docs you will straighten this all out. .

On Sat, Jul 1, 2017 at 9:13 PM, Valeria Chomsky [REDACTED] wrote:

Jeffrey,

We just received the following letter.

Noam would like if you could take a look at this letter and let us know if it is accurate or not on the interpretation of the promissory note. And if not, could you please explain why it is not?

Valeria

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

From: Diana Chomsky

Date: Sat, Jul 1, 2017 at 7:32 PM

Subject: Re: taxes

To: Noam Chomsky

Cc: Avi Chomsky , Harry Chomsky, Valeria Chomsky

Hi, thanks for your reply.

We are very, very concerned that you are not understanding and not getting help in understanding what is happening with your finances. Your responses below only increase our concern. The three of us are not able to serve as financial advisors. We urge you strongly to speak directly with Max so that he can clarify what he says in the Memo and explain what the Promissory Note language means.

Just to give you one example of our concern: You focus on one phrase: that the interest will be "not the highest rate in effect." But you are taking those words out of context. We really don't think we should be trying to explain these details to you, but to try to summarize: this phrase applied to the double nature of the loan—the Marital Trust had to borrow money from Pershing to make the loan to you, until the Lexington house was sold. The phrase you quote applies only to that brief period, and has no impact on the interest accruing now or in the future.

We can see why focusing on those six words would make you angry. But the six words mean nothing in and of themselves (i.e., what rate is "in effect"?). But instead of doing the logical thing—getting the full information—you are just so angry that you refuse to find out the truth.

Again, this is just one example of where you are stating conclusions based on faulty or incomplete information. There are explanations for your other issues as well (how the DNI is paid to you, how the interest payments can be made, etc) but rather than us trying to summarize the information for you here, we think it would make more sense for you to discuss them with the people who set all of this up, in the context of a broader conversation. Reading your response only redoubles our sense that you are simply misreading important elements of your entire financial situation, and that you are making big decisions based on faulty information. We feel that you have painted yourself into a corner, in which you arrive at the worst possible interpretation of complex legal language, and then refuse to speak with the very people who could explain it to you, and just get angry at them based on your misinterpretations.

We beg you once again to meet with us and with the people who set up the Trust, the loan, etc., to clarify these issues.

Love, Avi, Diane and Harry

From: =A0 Noam Chomsky =br>To: =A0 Diana Chomsky =A0

Cc: =C2 Avi Chomsky , Harry Chomsky , Valeria Chomsky

Date: 30/06/2017 19:41

Subject: =C2 Re: taxes

Glad to see the memo. I compared the memo with the original document, the promissory note that is the official signed agreement. The memo is in error about the promissory note. The facts are as I already described them. A few comments interspersed into the memo you sent, attached.

I don't see any point in discussions with Max and Bainco. The facts seem completely clear.

If there are other issues, I'd of course be glad to know about them.

I hope we can settle all of this quickly.

D

On Fri, Jun 30, 2017 at 1:56 PM, Diana Chomsky wrote:

As promised, please find attached a memo with information about the Marital Trust, and in particular the conditions on the loan from the Trust, which are somewhat different from what you indicated to us in your previous email.

We have thought for a long time that you have misunderstood key aspects of the financial situation. This is why we have been asking you to meet with us and with Max and Bainco. The issues discussed in this memo are only one part of the picture. We still think that the meeting we have been urging is important and could clear up other issues.

Love, Avi, Diane and Harry

From: 26/06/2017 17:37
Subject: Re: taxes

We're in the process of arranging our finances with the impending sale of the apartment and the move to Tucson, and would like to clear up some unsettled questions.

In my letter to you I outlined what I have determined about the matter. In your letter you said that you think the facts about the Marital Trust and the conditions on the loan from the Marital Trust and the way the interest works are different from what I understand, and that you have different facts.

You said you were working on a memo to lay out the facts as you see them. Any progress on this? I'd like to clarify this so that we can settle just what the facts are.

D

--

=A0 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, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--

=A0 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, and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. copyright -all rights reserved

--94eb2c116a669c2e960553522fd6-- conversation-id 39303 date-last-viewed 0 date-received 1498987334 flags 8590195717 gmail-label-ids 7 6 remote-id 726059