From: Noam Chomsky <[redacted]>
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2018 1:37 AM
To: jeffrey E.; Valeria Chomsky
Subject: Fwd: Marital Trust

Just got this from Harry. I'm inclined to w=ite a brief response saying that he =an consult with lawyers if he likes, but I don't have to. There is no =roblem at all with the proposal.

I might also a=d something about my response to his letter of March 29 and why I simply d=smissed it.

OK?

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Harry Chomsky <harry@chomsky.net>
Date: Fri, May =8, 2018 at 1:44 PM
Subject: Re: Marital Trust
To: Noam Chomsky <<= href="mailto[redacted]">[redacted]>
Cc: Av= Chomsky <[redacted]> >, Diana Chomsky
<[redacted]> >

This is an in=eresting idea. We could consider it further, but I would need the ad=ice of my lawyer — and I assume you would want your own lawyer'=s advice as well — to ensure that any agreement we reach is consis=ent with Massachusetts law and satisfies the interests, needs, and obligat=ons of everybody involved. Perhaps, as a next step, you could ask yo=r lawyer to contact mine and begin a discussion in which we all participat=.

I'm also curious to hear your thoughts abou= the proposals I suggested in my message on March 29th.

On Thu, May 17, 2018 at 10:05 AM, Noam Chomsky <nchom=ky3@gmail.com <mailto:[redacted]> > wrote:

As I wrote a little while ago, I did write a long r=sponse to your last -- deeply depressing -- letter, but decided not to sen= it. I may return to that letter later but will keep to some factual=matters that ought to be cleared up.

But now I'm wr=ting just about one point, which seems to be the core of the problem -- a =roblem, which, again, I don't understand. But let's put that=aside, though I hope we can clear it up soon. All of this is a =painful cloud that I never would have imagined would darken my late years.=/div>

The core issue seems to be the marital trust.=A0 I've explained how M and I actually set it up with Eric, which seem=d to us just plain common sense. I've also explained Max's d=fferent interpretation. I've asked you for yours, but haven'= heard it. But let's put that aside too, and just resolve the ma=ter, as can be done very simply -- with no need for lawyers to explain the=fiduciary responsibility of the trustee I appointed years ago to replace m=, something I never paid any attention to before.

So I suggest that we proc=ed this way, and end the whole matter -- at least, whatever it is that I u=derstand about what is of concern to you.

D
=/div>